

TIGHT BINDING BOOK

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_154038

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OUP—391 29-4-72—10,000.

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 323.2

Accession No.

P. G.

Author

M38 F

15998

Martini, Dean

Title

From well to rebellion

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

EVERETT DEAN MARTIN

*Farewell to
Revolution*

WITH A PREFACE BY LORD LOTHIAN



LONDON

GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, LIMITED
BROADWAY HOUSE: 68-74 CARTER LANE, E.C.

1936

First Edition

Made and Printed in Great Britain by
PERCY LUND, HUMPHRIES & CO. LTD.
12 Bedford Square, London, W C 1
and at Bradford

TO DAPHNE MARTIN

CONTENTS

Preface, by Lord Lothian	v
Foreword	ix
I. What is Revolution?	19
II. The Romantic Irony of Revolutionary Ideas	39
III. Revolution in Ancient Society	62
IV. Revolution Destroys a Civilization	85
V. Social Unrest in the Middle Ages	105
VI. Revolution and Counter-Revolution in the Protestant Reformation	141
VII. Revolution in England—Liberty Challenges the Principle of Monarchy	170
VIII. Was the American Struggle for Independence a Revolution?	199
IX. Why the French Revolution Failed to Emancipate the Masses	225
X. The Proletariat and the Revolutions of the Nineteenth Century	260
XI. Russia Ends the Revolutionary Struggle for Liberty	295
XII. Revolution as National Socialism Destroys Itself	323
XIII. The Futility of Revolution	347
XIV. Revolution vs. Liberalism	352
Index	373

PREFACE

IN the last few decades psychology has come to occupy a recognized place in dealing with the problems of the individual. But only during the last few years has any attempt been made to apply psychological analysis to the deeper and often hidden elements of the collective human mind—that body of thought which controls the political, economic and social activities of man in the mass. The first outstanding attempt was made by a Frenchman, Le Bon, in his analysis of crowd psychology. Mr. Everett Dean Martin's *Farewell to Revolution* is the third work on this general subject which he has published since the war.

The "crowd" or "mass" mind is essentially destructive. To use the old phraseology, it is the manifestation of the "carnal mind," and when excited is possessed by ego-mania, a conviction of its own moral superiority and homicidal passion against those who attempt to resist its will. Crowd mentality is by no means synonymous with the "common people" or the proletariat. Crowd mentality is a simultaneous psychosis which may take possession of any group in a community. It is Mr. Martin's thesis that the essence of a revolution is not the existence of social unrest or the desire for reform but the appearance of this crowd psychosis. This revolutionary crowd mind is something quite different from the modern phenomenon described by Ortega y Gasset in his *Revolt of the Masses*, whereby the mind of the popular mass to-day, stimulated by artificial suggestion from demagogues and the press, becomes infected with, not admiration for, but resentment at, quality and beauty and superiority, and tries to pull standards down to its own level.

Revolution, Mr. Martin points out, is not the work of classes

PREFACE

but of desperate factions, playing upon mass passion and succeeding because the government of the time is nerveless and weak. The people, he says, usually imagine that revolution will bring in the millennium, but in practice the alliance of fanatical idealists and gangsters, power which drives the revolution along, only creates new vested interests in power and exploitation and terror. He supports this view by a detailed examination of what he considers to have been the three main cycles of revolutionary activity since the days of Solon—cycles in which economic conflicts and political issues have been used as rationalizations and justifications for abandoning the attempt to progress by the patient pursuit of reason and justice by constitutional means, and for resort to violence and faction and “giving freedom to the crowd to break all restraint on its will to power.” Each of these cycles, in his view precisely because of the surrender to revolutionary crowd psychology, ended in the repudiation and reversal of the noble ideas which inspired it. The first period was dominated by the ideas implicit in the Athenian and Roman republics, but ended in the despotism of the Caesars. The second began with Pope Gregory in the eleventh century, and sought to establish the unity of Christendom on the basis of Christian brotherhood, but ended in the wars of religion and the emergence of modern warlike and competitive nationalist sovereignties. The third began in England in 1642, and has been concerned to establish constitutional liberty, parliamentary government and the rights of man. But since the October revolution in Russia in 1917, revolution, whether Communist or Fascist, has abandoned liberty and set up despotism in its place as the ideal of government. “Present-day revolution, therefore,” he says, “is crowd movement against liberal democracy.”

Fundamentally *Farewell to Revolution* is a plea for the essentials of the Christian, liberal and democratic tradition, individual freedom, freedom of speech, majority rule, the parliamentary system. In Mr. Martin's view, human progress springs from the degree to which the individual citizen is obedient to moral, spiritual and intellectual principle, learns from the best that

PREFACE

civilization transmits from the past, and resists the temptation to surrender to passion, tyranny or mob instinct. Mr. Martin has rendered a real service in producing this penetrating analysis of the operation in human history of an aspect of the human mind, which often comes forward in the name of progress, but is, in fact, destructive of all those elements upon which social happiness and true progress must rest.

LOTHIAN.

FOREWORD

EVERYWHERE there is talk of revolution. People are disturbed when they think of the future. There are those who look forward eagerly to a sudden violent change in the social order. It is said that the revolutions which have occurred in continental Europe are symptoms of a world movement; that bourgeois liberal democracy is inevitably drifting toward catastrophe. There are loyal defenders of the existing order who seem to see in any suggested reform signs of revolutionary conspiracy. And there are many liberal-minded people, neither revolutionists nor apologists for entrenched interests, who are confused by the din of excited propagandists. These liberals are not averse to the orderly process of change. They may even welcome what they would like to regard as trends toward a better social system. But they hear it said that liberalism is dead, that parliamentary government is ineffective and that resort to force in the settlement of present-day economic issues is unavoidable.

Are such fears or hopes well founded? What is a revolution? When is it likely to take place, if at all? How large a portion of the public has in times past participated in revolutionary movements? What has been the behaviour of the crowd in such crises? What forces, historical, economic and psychological, have transformed social stress and change into deeds of violence? What, in the end, have revolutions accomplished for human advancement? Are we facing a revolution in America at the present time? This book is an attempt to answer such questions in the light of human experience. It is an attempt to meet a serious need for dispassionate and clear thinking in this time of uncertainty. I have sought in a spirit as free as possible from dogma

FOREWORD

or political and economic propaganda to present a critical and realistic account of the revolutions of history.

Surely history should have some valuable lesson for us concerning this extremely important subject. Revolution is not an uncommon phenomenon of history. But are men and women today prepared to face present issues in the light of a knowledge of the past? One reason the teaching of history concerning revolution is not more clearly understood may be the fact that people have the habit of regarding each revolution as something unique and peculiar to the time in which it occurs. A larger perspective, however, shows that revolutions are an almost stereotyped form of social behaviour, that the phenomena which occur in any one of them are repeated over and over with almost monotonous regularity through the ages. It will be found that beneath the surface of historical accident revolutionary phenomena regularly manifest certain symptoms of crowd psychology which may be as definitely recognized as the well-known symptoms of the individual neurosis.

A further difficulty in understanding the historical significance of revolution grows out of prevailing fashions in the interpretation of history itself. Half a century ago the important discovery was made that economic facts play a large part in determining historical events. This, like many new discoveries, was easily over-emphasized. It became the fashion to ascribe exclusively economic causes to everything. This oversimplification of the philosophy of history, this intellectual labour-saving device, easily made popular appeal. We are only now, after a generation and a half of materialist interpretation of history, emerging to such a vantage point that we may again see events in their proper perspective.

It will hardly be denied that a revolution, whatever else it may be, is a phenomenon of the crowd. I have endeavoured to approach the historical survey of revolutionary movements from the standpoint of social psychology. I shall have much to say about the psychology of the crowd. I wish to make it clear that the terms "crowd" and "mass" in this book are not intended to

FOREWORD

apply to any particular class or industrial group in the community. Crowd psychology no longer regards the crowd or mass as the common people or the proletariat. Crowd mentality is a kind of simultaneous psychosis which may take possession of any group in the community. In a revolutionary situation this peculiar mental abnormality would appear to seize upon various groups, irrespective of their economic interests. It is this psychic episode which has much to do with transforming normal social conflicts and community relationships into revolutionary crises.

It is the thesis of this book that we are at the present time at the close of a major cycle of revolutionary activity. I find that there have been three such cycles since the days of Solon in ancient Athens. It would be an over-generalization to interpret these cycles in terms of what many regard as the class struggle. One might show that there is a continuity of economic conflict in each of the cycles, but hardly that the same conflict is continuous throughout all three. There is much justification for the thesis that the cycles which I shall discuss in this book are distinguished from one another chiefly by psychological differences. It can be maintained that economic conflicts and political issues are not so much the direct causes of revolutionary crises as they are the occasions; that is, economic and political ideas in any age may be used as rationalizations and justifications for the resort to violence and faction. Ironically enough, each of the great cycles of revolution, while it seems to have been inspired by an ideal, has ended in complete repudiation of the ideal which inspired it. The group of ideas in the ancient world which seems to have inspired most of the social unrest during the four hundred years before the Christian era may be regarded as a series of variations of a struggle for a kind of ideal equality among men. The struggle ended in the despotism of the Caesars. The second cycle begins with Pope Gregory in the eleventh century. All the revolutionary movements of the succeeding centuries, whatever their specific political or economic demands, were inspired by an ideal of Christian brotherhood. The cycle closed with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 and the

FOREWORD

establishment of modern nationalistic rivalry and the complete sovereignty and independence of warring secular princes. The third cycle began in England in 1642, and all subsequent revolutionary movements until the autumn of 1917 were inspired and rationalized as struggles for constitutional liberty, parliamentary government, and the rights of man. Since October, 1917, revolutionary movements, whether Communist, Fascist or Nazi, are arrayed against precisely those objectives which have inspired revolutions since 1642. Present-day revolution is therefore crowd movement against liberal democracy. It openly avows itself as such and in this respect both Communist and Fascist are the same.

Whether such constitutional liberty as we enjoy is in fact the fruit of revolution rather than of the orderly advance of civilization is a disputed question. There are many indications that revolution has accomplished less for liberty than is commonly supposed. Indeed, such liberty as the nations of the western world do possess would seem to be the result chiefly of the advance of learning since the Renaissance. I doubt if revolutions really solve any problems at all. It is significant, however, that revolutions since 1917 are no longer rationalized by liberal ideas. If the abandonment of liberalism were peculiar to the Communists alone it might be argued that the whole system of liberal ideas was only a symptom of the deeper economic struggle to support the liberal bourgeois state. This argument, however, is invalidated by the fact that the intensely nationalistic revolutions of the Fascist type are equally anti-liberal. The cause for the abandonment of liberalism must, therefore, be psychological, and we are thus justified in approaching the whole subject of revolution from the psychological standpoint.

This book should not be understood as in any sense an apology for the "*status quo*" or an argument against social change however reconstructive or far-reaching. It is enough if I have made clear the futility of revolution as a method for effecting any permanent change whatever. There are many evidences of a trend toward some sort of planned economy; business itself

FOREWORD

seems to be a prime mover in this direction, notwithstanding the protestations to the contrary of many industrialists. The thesis of the futility of revolution should not for a moment be understood as an excuse for resisting much-needed social legislation. It is possible that even the system of production for profit may be a passing form of industrial life. I see nothing necessarily terrifying in such an idea, provided the change is indicated in the development of industry itself and provided, further, that the transition to a less chaotic system be made in an orderly fashion—a fashion which will preserve those constitutional rights which are our cultural inheritance. Effective social change has always been the result of intelligent social planning. The danger of revolution arises when men of all classes show that they are incapable of such planning, or of the requisite problem-solving thinking, and resort to gestures of mob behavior. Both extreme radicals and extreme conservatives may be susceptible in a time of stress to the temptation to resort to such futile, though destructive, gesticulation. The history of revolutions points to the conclusion that we are not the victims of impersonal economic forces working inevitably through insurrection to social reconstruction, but that rather the generations which have to pass through the experience of revolution are the victims of their own failure to deal with reality, victims of their own lack of understanding of history and of insight into their own motives such as better knowledge of psychology provides.

It is perhaps advisable to say a word about the factual material presented in the historical chapters that follow. The wide scope and range of the material surveyed would probably be beyond the ability of any individual student of history to speak of with immediate and expert knowledge. I have been led into many fields of study in which I can make no pretensions to original scholarship, nor has it been my purpose to enter upon new and original historical research. I have not thought it necessary, even if I possessed the knowledge, to present new material or to search for hitherto unknown data. I take complete responsibility for the observations I have made, and have

FOREWORD

limited these observations to the phenomena of social psychology which are manifest in the well-attested historical facts. For the narrative portions of the book I claim no originality. I have relied for the story for each of the revolutions discussed on the work of classic authorities who have studied and written in each field. I have made every effort to limit the historical material to those outstanding events concerning which there is little or no difference of opinion among historical scholars. If the perspective in which I have reviewed the revolutions of history is found to differ from that of the sources I have used, I believe this difference not to involve questions of fact. It is a result of the psychological approach to the subject. As it has, furthermore, been necessary in covering so wide a range of study to abbreviate the narration of each of the revolutions, I have had to omit much that is of interest in each episode. I have, therefore, tried to dwell only on those facts which make it possible to follow the course of events and to set forth the situations in which the factors of the psychology of the crowd have been operative.

I have decided after careful consideration not to document the many historical references, for to do this thoroughly would make the book too long and unwieldy and would detract from its narrative force. I have instead followed the method of giving credit in each instance where the question of authority seems to be important. In the works of the authors quoted, the reader will find the narrative material greatly elaborated as to detail but substantially as I have presented it. For the convenience of the reader, I submit the following list:

Aristotle: *The Constitution of Athens.*

Thucydides: *History of the Peloponnesian War.*

Sallust: *The Jurgurthine War, Conspiracy of Catiline.*

Rainy, R.: *The Ancient Catholic Church.*

Livy: *History of Rome.*

Tacitus: *The Annals.* Book I.

Plutarch: *Tiberius Gracchus and Gaius Gracchus.*

Cicero: *The Letters.*

Wygall, A.: *Life and Times of Cleopatra.*

FOREWORD

Gibbon, E.: *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

Robinson, J. H.: *Readings in Medieval History*.

Neander: *The History of the Christian Church*.

Hume, D.: *History of England*. Vols. IV and V.

Library of Original Sources.

Ward, C. O.: *The Ancient Lowly*.

Young: *The Medici*.

Fisher, G. P.: *The Reformation*.

Smith, Preserved: *Erasmus*.

Ortega y Gasset, J.: *The Revolt of the Masses*.

Adams, J. T.: *Revolutionary New England*.

Carlyle, T.: *The French Revolution*.

Gaxotte, P.: *The French Revolution*.

Thiers, M. A.: *The History of the French Revolution*.

LeBon, G.: *The Psychology of Revolution*.

Zweig, S.: *Marie Antoinette*.

Marx and Engels: *Revolution and Counter Revolution in Germany*.

Marx, K.: *The Civil War in France*.

Lenin: *The Paris Commune*.

Chamberlin, W. H.: *Soviet Russia*.

Trotsky, L.: *The History of the Russian Revolution*.

Vulliamy, C. E., ed.: *The Red Archives—Russian State Papers*.

Fraina, L. C.: *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia*.

Ponafidine, E.: *Russia My Home*.

Mussolini, B.: *My Life*.

Hitler, A.: *My Battle*.

Soule, G.: *The Coming American Revolution*.

Sorokin, P. A.: *The Sociology of Revolution*.

For further elucidation of the theory of the psychology of the crowd which appears in this book, I would refer the reader to my book, *The Behavior of Crowds*, published in 1920.

EVERETT DEAN MARTIN

*Department of Social Philosophy—
Cooper Union, New York*

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

WHAT IS REVOLUTION?

MOST popular ideas of revolution are fictions fabricated by the partisan interests of mankind. The stories told of past revolutionary movements are usually distorted by the accident of the success or failure of such movements. If an insurrection fails, it is condemned; it is mere sedition, mutiny, rebellion, and its leaders are traitors and enemies of the social order and the common good. If it succeeds, its leaders are patriots and heroes, and the movement becomes a turning point in the course of history, a glorious emancipation of the masses, a vindication of righteousness over corruption and tyranny. Revolutionary ideas are thus justifications for the seizure of power and wealth by violent means. The heirs of such seizure are persuaded that violence was necessary and reluctantly employed; that the revolutionary motives were in the highest sense moral; and that those who were destroyed by the righteous indignation of "the people" were wholly evil and justly deserved their doom. So believe the National Socialists of Germany, so believe the Communists of Russia and the Italian Fascists, so also believed the hosts of the Protestant Reformation and the followers of Danton and Robespierre. As a rule only one side of the story of a revolution survives.

There are numerous causes for this distortion of history. Revolutionary mobs, like all crowd movements, are the victims of fixed ideas and of the delusion of infallibility. Conviction at such times becomes so strong that doubt or criticism is disloyalty. Revolutions grow out of faction. They are in fact civil wars—wars of suppression and extermination. Commonly

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

there is no one left to tell the story of the vanquished side of these conflicts. Again, those who participate in such activities are filled with frenzied zeal, sometimes with a kind of ecstasy. They believe themselves to be men of destiny, moving in an historical pageant. This idea of them survives in revolutionary tradition. That there are in revolutions many deeds of supreme heroism and devotion to death is well known. Men forget that such devotion and heroism occur on both sides of any conflict, and that along with idealism, often hardly distinguishable from it, and on both sides, are many exhibitions of cruelty, stupidity, vice and greed. Forgetting these things, people imagine that a revolution is a moral crusade, with all the right on one side. They picture it as a victorious stage in the long process of the triumph of liberty, justice, and humanity over the forces of darkness.

In our times, times of the stimulation of crowds to seize power, or as Ortega y Gasset says, times of the "revolt of the masses," and the consequent plebeianization of thought, and almost universal flattery of the man on the street, the will to revolt has elaborated a sort of obsessive revolutionary ideology. It is often held that the aim of all history is nothing other than the attainment of material abundance and social dominance by the common man. To this end everything and everyone must be made common. Human behaviour is determined chiefly by economic forces and material interests, and since "the master class," because of its economic position and interests, is bound to resist to the death each step of the domination of the masses, revolution is from time to time necessary and inevitable. So, throughout the ages, an innocent and much exploited humanity has been engaged in a series of desperate conflicts for freedom and an opportunity to live. The last and greatest of these conflicts is now imminent. The present capitalist system, or "liberal bourgeois democracy," is nearing the hour of its death agony. It has drawn into itself all the forces of reaction and evil, and its festering body is filled with the germs of destruction. The day of its universal bankruptcy is

WHAT IS REVOLUTION?

at hand. The people must now take control and liquidate the system.

So far the revolutionary argument runs smoothly, being little more than a repetition of certain romantic ideas derived from the eighteenth century. But at this point, when it is asked who now is to inherit the earth, a deadly conflict emerges. There are those who see in the present situation the long-awaited hour of the triumph of the proletariat, and there are those who base their hope on a nationalist dictatorship and planned economy like those of Italy and Germany. Bitter as is the conflict between these two species of revolution, I shall later show that they are really made out of the same stuff and are much more alike than they at first sight appear to be. Each in its way has rounded the circle of historic revolutionary thought and activity. Both are phases of a movement which has at last closed the cycle of the long popular struggle for liberty, equality and fraternity. Dictatorship whether of the Russian or German kind is none of these things. The revolt of the masses comes down at last to an assault on liberalism and a demand for a dictatorship equally slavish in both cases—in both cases strikingly like that which once existed in Imperial Rome under Diocletian.

It is for this reason that I have chosen as the title of this book the phrase "Farewell to Revolution." I do not mean that there is no likelihood of revolutionary outbreak in the future. I shall show that the whole cycle of revolution comes out at last just where it started, that revolutionary propaganda in all ages is devised to turn society from a fellowship of people as persons into the delusion of man acting as "mass," that man as undifferentiated mass does not really want liberty, and that the progress of culture has been achieved not by revolutionary masses, but by lovers of civilization, the inventors, the artists, scientists and philosophers. It is far from my purpose to suggest that even radical changes in our political and economic institutions be resisted. Many thoughtful people recognize the necessity for such changes. But change of this nature has little or nothing to do with revolution. It should be achieved de-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

liberately and by people who are competent, and should not be attempted by mobs in the streets. I doubt if any great problem in history has been solved by revolution, all the propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding. There has doubtless never been a revolution which could not have been prevented, had those in authority been able to recognize a revolutionary situation in time, and had they acted wisely.

What then is revolution? The term is used ambiguously, and the ambiguity causes much confusion. First, we speak of the revolutions of a wheel or propeller or of the planets. In this sense revolution means turning round or rotation, completing a cycle, so that the moving object comes back to the position from which it started. This concept properly belongs to mechanics, and its use to describe political change is always somewhat metaphorical. An illuminating adaptation of this mechanical figure of speech to the history of governmental change was made by Aristotle in the *Politics*.

Aristotle discovered that the successive changes in form of government pass through definite cycles. In general, the cycle may be described somewhat as follows: A conqueror establishes a despotism with himself tyrant, having absolute power of life and death over his subjects. Tyranny gradually becomes modified into monarchy, a form of government in which the right to rule becomes hereditary, traditional and accepted. There grows up a certain sense of mutual devotion and obligation between ruler and subjects. This relationship comes to be supported by custom, law and class distinctions. Class distinctions give rise to a nobility, among whom the monarch tends to become *Primus inter pares*. Gradually the nobility itself supplants the monarch, as in the Hellenic and Roman Republics. This stage is aristocracy. Sooner or later aristocracy degenerates into oligarchy, as it did during the last years of the Roman Republic. The aristocratic position of leadership comes to be a special privilege rather than a social obligation. Powerful and successful plebeians gain admittance to the inner circle of privilege.

WHAT IS REVOLUTION?

Class rule becomes a device for the exploitation of the many by the few. The few have lost their power to command and lead. There results conflict between the exploiters and the exploited. Oligarchy is followed by democracy. But democracy cannot long endure. Its weaknesses and follies and spirit of faction sooner or later render it the victim of the clever politician who with a measure of popular approval establishes a new dictatorship. Thus democracy inevitably gives rise again to tyranny and the cycle or "revolution" is completed. It is interesting to study the course of events today in continental Europe in the light of Aristotle's observation. It must be admitted that such in general has been the history of the cycles of change of government.

Governmental change from one stage to another in this cycle may be sudden or gradual; it may or may not be accompanied by violence. But the suddenness and violence from this point of view do not in themselves constitute the revolution. The revolution is the whole cycle of events, and is not done until things come back again to the place where they started. There is no thought of continuous progress or social evolution in this observation of Aristotle's. Moreover, Aristotle is purely descriptive. He does not say why the cycle of change must go through these stages. He suggests no cause or principle of necessity. He merely observes that such happens to be the course of events.

But the mechanical nature of the terms of this description, likening social change to the rotation of a wheel, later caused the idea of revolution to become associated in men's minds with seventeenth- and nineteenth-century mechanistic theories of the world. Hence social change was thought to be determined by the relations of matter and energy. Social philosophers sought in such social movements a "law of motion," analogous to that of Newton. So revolution was thought to be inevitable and to have cosmic significance. Plebeian preoccupation with the economic interest, after the "industrial revolu-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

tion," naturally led to the attempt to explain the course of history in terms of economic determinism, and to the notion that "economic forces" are the real cause of revolution.

Add to these ideas the romantic optimism of the nineteenth century, also the belief that the evolution of species, a theory propounded by biologists, gives us a law of nature which guarantees social improvement, and there results the widely accepted idea that revolt of the masses is the law of history, a law which inevitably will create for us the perfect social order. So the determination of any crowd or faction to break up the fellowship and order of society, seize power for itself and force its rule by violence can be rationalized as if such contemplated action were a necessary and justifiable culmination of the trend of history. It is necessary only to remember Aristotle's original observation to clear up much of the confusion on this point. About all there is in his original doctrine of the revolutions of history which has immediate practical interest for us is the fact that a democracy, if it has opportunity, is very likely to destroy itself and end in tyranny. At present at least we may dismiss the idea that mass revolt is a necessary factor in social advancement.

Second, the term revolution is used to designate any far-reaching cultural change, as for instance when we speak of the "industrial revolution," meaning the application of power-driven machinery to industry together with the general results of modern industrialism. In the same way we may speak of the revolutionizing effects of Darwinism on nineteenth-century natural science. In this sense the word revolution is misapplied. We do not imply that there is any rotation in such world-changing inventions or ideas. We mean rather that something has occurred which fundamentally affects other things beyond any possibility of return to the earlier view of things. Often something happens, or is discovered, which changes the perspective of our life and thought. As a matter of fact, this is the way things and ideas are related in this world, and this is what makes anything new important. This is the way things happen

WHAT IS REVOLUTION?

in all human life, and it is what makes it so difficult to plot the curves of change in advance. For the important, "revolutionizing" event is often unforeseeable, and it is impossible to predict the changes it will work on other things before it happens.

World-changing ideas and discoveries are not the achievements of the public. Usually the public adjusts itself to them with great difficulty and often it blots out their real implications. As these ideas and discoveries are the causes of such progress as mankind enjoys, it is obvious that progress is achieved by unique original individuals. The masses do not create progress; they usually play only a passive and indirect role in the advancement of civilization. The relation between such cultural progress and social revolt is somewhat ironical. In the effort to appropriate to their own propaganda such new ideas as would necessitate a shift in perspective, revolutionists are often persuaded that they are "advance thinkers." But more frequently their revolutionary enthusiasms are rather irrelevantly grafted on the intellectual advance. A new world-shaking thought undermines old beliefs and weakens established social controls. It may disturb people's established habit patterns and through this lack of adjustment lead to social conflict and unrest. Finally, a great intellectual achievement like that of seventeenth-century science often leads common minds to entertain roseate and fantastic notions of the ease with which humanity as a whole may become triumphant on earth. If we may (and who are *we*?) measure interstellar distances, invent radios, analyze atoms, talk about relativity, we must all be very advanced indeed. We could, as sovereign people, also solve the economic problem, abolish poverty and crime and social injustice—if we as mass would only assert ourselves against those reactionary vested interests which are holding humanity back from its right inheritance.

There is no doubt an element of truth in all this. An important discovery or new insight may so shift the perspective of human life as to require new social institutions. New institutions are the crystallization of human relationships. They

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

cannot be created *ad hoc*. Their creation requires the best wisdom of which the race is capable. Unfortunately it is precisely at such times, when ideas and institutions are in a state of transition, that the unadjusted are likely to lose their heads completely, resort to mob action, and demand the adoption of policies which are designed to resolve their own inner psychic conflicts rather than to solve any social problem.

Social problems are solved only when people of varying types are enabled to live peaceably in the same community. They are not solved when one faction massacres all its critics and rivals. A social revolution occurs when people abandon the attempt to solve their problems and resort to infantile temper tantrums. Such revolution should not be confused with the regular course of social change.

In the third place, the term revolution in common usage means a change of government otherwise than as provided by law. As a definition of revolution this is inadequate. It puts too much emphasis on change of government. There have been revolutions which have changed the government very little—for instance those in Latin America. This use of the term would limit the word revolution to successful revolt. There have been real revolutionary outbursts which had all the essential features of revolution, yet failed. In fact most revolutions have failed sooner or later. As an example, we may remember the revolution that occurred in Austria in 1848–49.

But not every revolt is a revolution. There have been insurrections, riots and mutinies which had no real revolutionary aim. A crowd may become unruly, may defy authority and law and commit acts of violence because of hunger, or anger, or just for the fun of lynching a negro, yet have no intention of overthrowing the social order. *A revolution occurs when a faction in the community without sanction of law resorts to armed hostilities in the attempt to constitute itself the governing force in society.* A revolution is an attempt to seize power in defiance of authority and to use such power without the consent of those over whom it is exercised. There is a commonly accepted

WHAT IS REVOLUTION?

fiction that a revolution is an uprising of the whole people against established injustice. There never was an uprising of a whole people—or even of a substantial majority of the people. All revolutions have been perpetrated by rather small desperate minorities. These revolutionary minorities often profess to be “the people,” or to act in the people’s interests. Invariably they have set up their own crowd dictatorship over the people. What the people get out of revolution is new tyranny for old.

We have heard much talk about the nobility of the human spirit in resisting tyranny. It is obvious that people who are too cowardly or too indifferent to defend their liberties are bound to lose them. But why is it that people who begin a revolution in the belief that they are fighting for liberty, almost invariably accept the tyrannical dictatorship of the revolutionary party which follows the overthrow of those forms of repression that existed under the old order? Liberty is possible only when the sovereign power is made to obey the law. A revolutionary tribunal is a law unto itself, and is thus an enemy of liberty. Whatever people may profess as the motive for revolution, the real motive must be something other than liberty. There is a tradition that our Anglo-Saxon liberties were won in revolutionary resistance to the exercise of the royal prerogative. Plausible as this tradition is, I shall show later that we owe such liberties as we have, not to revolution but to the gradual development of culture, chiefly under the influence of a liberalizing classical tradition.

But whatever we may think about the liberalizing achievements of the revolutions of the past, the anti-liberal nature of the revolutions of the twentieth century is unmistakable. Both the Communist Revolution in Russia and the National Socialists of Germany have established dictatorships. Both have suspended bills of rights, both are avowedly hostile to liberalism. Revolutions are crowd movements. We shall see later how a minority may become a militant crowd, and command a nation by professing to champion its alleged interests. The crowd pro-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

fesses love of liberty, merely because it resents all restraint upon its own tendencies to anti-social behavior. It wants freedom only for its own propaganda. It is determined to crush out all other liberty except its own freedom to be a crowd, and to reign supreme. Every crowd if it has the power will bully and tyrannize and persecute.

Government exists in order to preserve some measure of equilibrium among contending crowds and factions. Otherwise there can be no community, no state, and all men are at the mercy of those gangsters who are able to seize power. A revolution is the temporary breakdown of government. *A revolution is a social earthquake.* The chief difference between an earthquake and a revolution is that the latter conceivably might be prevented by an honest, wise and strong government. Otherwise the analogy holds even to the physical aspect of the communities where either occurs. I happened to be studying some photographs of Havana made during the recent revolution in Cuba. At the same time I made a visit to Long Beach, California, to view the devastation caused by an earthquake in southern California in the spring of 1933. I was amazed to see how alike the streets of both cities looked. A revolution shakes everything to pieces. There is a sense of natural calamity similar to that which follows an earthquake. There is the same meaningless destruction of human life, the same destitution among the survivors, and the same hard task of building the community up again after it is all over.

Again a *revolution is a barbarian invasion and conquest.* One has but to study the frightful inundation of the Roman Empire in the fifth century to discover precisely the social phenomena which are repeated again and again in the history of revolutions. There was the same weakness and confusion of council on the part of the governing classes, the same sense of impending doom which always precedes a revolution. There was the same insolence which always grows with the increasing sense of power on the part of those who are preparing to destroy a social order. In each instance the final crisis is precipitated by some trivial

WHAT IS REVOLUTION?

incident, and then the orgy of destruction and massacre—often wanton, gleeful destruction of life and culture. There is universal terror. A newcomer to power, a cruder type of man, raves and swaggers and plunders where there was once peace and security. All society is made to feel the heel of the conqueror, until at last the conqueror himself learns something of the ways of civilization and begins to show some reverence for the things he had sought to destroy.

Older civilizations lived in fear of the barbarian beyond the border. The barbarian who menaces modern civilization is in our midst. Vast multitudes, *scattered throughout all economic groups in our population*, are "living psychologically beyond their means." At best they have learned only to keep up the external shows of civilization. The spirit of our culture, of any culture, is alien to them. It was once believed that if this multitude could be taught to read it would gain some acquaintance with the world's sincere thought. Now people know their letters, and hardly one in ten could grasp the meaning of so clear and simple and important a book as Mill's "Essay on Liberty." It is impossible to gain the attention of millions for anything above the level of the cheaply sensational. They demand that all values of civilization be reduced to their own cranial attitude; that all public policies pamper them in their prejudices. Never before in history until our own time, with the possible exception of those last terrible days of the Roman Republic, was this half-civilized human type so articulate and powerful as now. It has lowered the standard and destroyed the sincerity of nearly everything which would make popular appeal. Its spiritual image is reflected in the motion picture, the radio programme, the fiction magazine, the press, the political campaign. Organization in the modern world has enormously increased the power of the barbarian in our midst. It is the sense of increasing power, not poverty and exploitation, which causes a group to become revolutionary.

Through force of numbers, standardization on a low level, and organization even of the methods of the dissemination of

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

culture, the half-civilized have become extremely powerful. They have been able to create even about our schools and colleges—often within them—an atmosphere so hostile to culture that it is frequently impossible for anything intellectually genuine to penetrate these regions and survive. The tremendous influence of this type of man on democratic government tends so to weaken authority as to render the government ineffective in resisting the onslaughts of the organized groups which wish to overthrow it. A society which encourages the spread of barbarism in its culture cannot in the end resist the barbarian.

Ortega y Gasset has characterized the whole revolutionary movement of our times as "the revolt of the masses." He has correctly seen the connection between the menace of revolution and that process of vulgarization which has been going on for generations. In a real sense we are all part of the mass and it is obvious that public policy should be aimed at the good of the whole. There can be no valid criticism of the mass from this point of view. However, we have learned that emphasis on man as mass does not necessarily preclude the emergence of all sorts of militant special interests. In fact the over-emphasis on man acting as mass may be a psychological aid to revolution. When attention is centred on undifferentiated man, it is the prejudices and wish fancies of the least differentiated and least mentally mature that tend to gain widest currency. Ortega says that it never occurs to mediocre man to doubt his own plenitude. It is not, he adds, a question of mass man being a fool; today he is more clever than ever, but once and for all he accepts the stock of commonplace, tag ends of ideas or simply empty words which chance has piled up in his mind, and he is prepared to impose such ideas on everyone everywhere. There is no culture where there is no principle of legality to which to appeal, that is, where there is no acceptance of certain final intellectual positions to which dispute may be referred. So in contemporary revolutionary movements, whether Communist or Fascist, a type of man has appeared who does not want to give reasons for his demands. His reason and chief justification is

WHAT IS REVOLUTION?

his imagined sense of power. The ideas of such men are little more than appetites in words.

Let us not assume that the number of mass men, or potential barbarians, is limited to radical or revolutionary parties. Their tribe is to be found also in conservative and patriotic parties. They come forward in every so-called moral crusade. They often find their opportunities in business and public office and even in the professions. We need not wait until the social revolution to witness a large measure of the rule of the second-rate man. Even now, and in every democracy, he exercises a power of command far in excess of his understanding or sense of responsibility. In our present mass-governed society the patrician virtues, without which no state can endure, are often driven into hiding like sound money during a period of inflation. Revolution is the panic stage of a period of social-psychological inflation, with depreciation of the cultural values of civilization. It is the ultimate degradation of power to the lower mental strata. There is a psychological law that the more power men enjoy the more power they demand, until that power becomes absolute, sadistic, suicidal. Plato said, in the *Parable of the Oracle*, that when the man of baser metal, brass or iron, rules the state the state will be destroyed.

Revolution is the supreme exhibition of mob behaviour. It can be best explained in terms of crowd psychology. It will be said in criticism that I seek to ignore or minimize the economic factors in revolution. We shall have occasion to discuss these factors later and specifically. But we must beware of oversimplification. It has long been the fashion to over-emphasize the economic interpretation of history. I have learned to detect an odour of propaganda in all such over-emphasis of the material. I know to what end Marx elaborated the "materialist interpretation of history." Subsequent writers seem to have forgotten that economics is not a science of things. Economics is a science of human behaviour in the making, owning and exchanging of things. As a study of human behaviour economics crosses over into psychology. However important we find the purely eco-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

conomic factors to be—and they certainly are so today—it is even more important that we note how people behave toward one another because of these factors. A study of the history of revolutions since the time of Solon shows that, whatever the economic system, revolutionary behaviour at all times shows certain stereotyped forms and sequences. These behaviour patterns are as clearly recognizable as the well-known symptoms of an individual psychosis or nervous disorder in the average psychopathic clinic. Economic factors play a role no more important, and no less, in the collective madness than in the individual case.

It has long been noticed that the mind of the public is subject to certain seizures of an episodic and cyclical nature, the recurrence of which is strikingly similar to the recurrent manic-depressive attacks of unbalanced individual minds. Many of these public epidemic attacks are trivial and inconsequential. Then we call them fads or fashions—such as the passing interest in miniature golf, crossword puzzles, and beach pyjamas. As soon as it gets over them, the public itself regards them as ridiculous, but it is always susceptible to the next fad. But often the seizures are serious, and may result in much harm or, in some indirect, usually unforeseen, good. For example, “social credit,” “arms-inquiries,” the popularity of a Mae West, Anthony Eden, or a real estate “boom,” or prohibition, or an outburst of race riots and lynchings, or a “clean-up” of stage and film, or a religious revival, or the emergence of a new cult of “faith healing,” or nudism, or a world-wide spasm of prohibitive tariff legislation. And there were the Crusades, the witch-burning mania, the South Sea Bubble, the dancing mania of the fifteenth century—no epoch in history has been wanting in some such episode. The grand maladies of popular epidemic madness are war, persecution and revolution. It is a matter of common observation that wars and financial panics recur at almost regular intervals. Waves of persecution and of revolution also have their cycles, and are repeated again

WHAT IS REVOLUTION?

and again through the ages, always manifesting the same symptoms.

The irrationality of such seizures of the popular mind is evident. Note the periodic interest in certain movements of quixotic moral reform—for instance, the recurrent demand for censorship. The public is suddenly persuaded—usually contrary to fact—that vice has all at once become much more general and shameless. For many years reformers have harangued the public but without response; they are regarded as agitators, cranks, amusing fanatics. Then suddenly, for no apparent reason, with no new arguments advanced and no new effort made to ascertain the facts, the public, all in a day, has a great cause. People in positions of responsibility who might be expected to keep their heads, lose their better judgment altogether and talk like mad men. No one remembers the fact that a John Milton, a John Stuart Mill, or a Voltaire has clearly pointed out the evils and futility of such censorship. The lessons of recent failures are quite forgotten. The great cause demands its victims. But no sooner are the victims sacrificed than enthusiasm wanes. The situation becomes again as it was before—except for the bitterness, dust and destruction left behind by the crowd in its mad rush down the blind alley. The crowd returns to normal, is a little ashamed, laughs at its morbid fears and extravagances, and is ready for the next emotional debauch.

Now it is interesting to note that in such emotional debauches the crowd often forgets all about the glaring evil it set out to remedy. The great war to end war left the nations more military than ever and all busily preparing for the next war. The Crusades did not rescue the Holy Sepulchre. The English Revolution of 1642 was followed by the Restoration and the suppression of dissenters. The French Revolution gave rise to Napoleon. Fascist Italy now leans toward a kind of guild socialism. Communist Russia adopts capitalistic modifications of its programme. National Socialism in Germany suppresses the “brown shirts” and counts upon the support of its rivals, the “steel

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

helmets" and the army. The great cause of popular awakening is only in appearance the true motive. The real motive becomes the excitement of the outburst itself. Thus the real motives in revolution become the excitements of the revolution itself.

Most of the early propagandists of revolution are idealists. They sincerely desire the welfare of humanity and are prepared to sacrifice themselves for their ideals. Their appeal to their converts, moreover, is idealistic. There can be no doubt that most revolutionists are consciously devoted to what they believe is right. But the unconscious, half-recognized motive is different. Violent conflict with the environment often indicates inner psychic conflict. A man is not doing what he thinks he is doing when the desire to improve conditions causes him to resort to violence while an appeal to reason is still possible.

Once authority is broken down a revolutionary crowd is psychologically little different from an American lynching mob. The mob appears when noble ideals may be twisted into justifications of anti-social behaviour. We shall see that the majority of those who have participated in revolutionary outbreaks in the past have been drawn together just as any street crowd is attracted by the unusual. Most of them have never given the cause of revolution a moment's thought before. Only yesterday they were crying, "Long live the King!" The real motives are desire for adventure, for self-importance, for indulgence in anti-social behaviour. A distinction should be made between the real motives and those consciously professed. Just as a lynching mob in its lust for blood honestly believes itself moved to vindicate virtue and protect the home, so the revolutionary mob honestly believes it is fighting for a new and righteous social order. This is the function in crowd psychology of such beliefs in the ideology of revolution. They serve to justify the anti-social behaviour. Mankind as a whole—the criminal class excepted—is too decent to plunder and destroy and kill unless people can justify such action by fictions and pausibilities which enable them to go wild with mutual moral approval.

WHAT IS REVOLUTION?

For a detailed psychological discussion of crowd mentality, I refer the reader to my book *The Behaviour of Crowds*, published in 1920. The revolutionary movements of the last fifteen years have confirmed almost with monotonous repetition the observations and analyses I made of crowd behaviour during the World War. Everywhere and at all times, in all the major revolutions of history, the essential characteristics of crowd movements are the same.

The crowd mind is not the same as the mind of the multitude under normal conditions. Crowd mentality is not that of a collective mind, or group consciousness, for there is no collective mind or will. Mind is essentially personal. Crowd mentality is a change which happens to a number of people at the same time. If a like mental aberration happens to an isolated individual, the symptoms of the changed mental state would be recognized as characteristic of that type of psychosis known as paranoia. The symptoms of paranoia are explained in almost any good book on psychiatry. Here it is enough to state that the paranoiac individual, preoccupied with a certain adolescent ego conflict, succeeds in isolating his thinking into a closed, sequestered system of obsessive ideas, or delusions. Within this system it becomes impossible for the plain testimony of objective fact and the normal social controls and patterns of adjustment to enter. All is distorted to give the patient a kind of rational justification for a deep-seated protest against the feeling of inferiority. This feeling of inferiority causes the elaboration of a system of ideas which serves as compensation. The ego-ideal becomes inflated into a delusion of grandeur or egomania, and the "projection" of the inner conflict upon other persons becomes a delusion of persecution and homicidal wish.

These three symptoms, the obsessive system of ideas, the egomania and the "projection" mechanisms, or homicidal wish, are the uniform symptoms of the crowd whenever crowd mentality appears. In the nature of all of us in the environment of civilization there must be repression of certain native impulses. But in even the most civilized person the repression is never

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

complete. Among the half-civilized the repression is often very inadequate, and the repressed impulses remain always explosive material which may cause wreckage at the first moment of weakening of the forces of repression. There lurk in the inner nature of us all certain vestiges of the wild animal, the primitive savage, the selfish child. Among the truly civilized and mentally mature, repression takes place, as it were, from within. That is, impulse is controlled by "right reason" or law of measure, as Aristotle would say. Among the half-civilized, repression must be imposed by force of the environment. Thus in extreme cases disorder occurs the moment the sheriff turns his back. For others an invisible sheriff suffices for ordinary occasions—religious belief, fear of punishment, hope of future reward, popular moral convention, custom and tabu, and dread of what people will say. Let these control mechanisms become weakened, let belief and convention lose their force by distortion of popular ideas, let authority of government break down—let there be created a pseudo-social environment within which the normal social controls fail to function—and millions of people will play the baby or behave like savages and wild beasts. People are greatly encouraged to revert to these lower forms of behaviour if all those present manifest the same impulses and if they can persuade one another that black is white and make "the worse seem the better reason."

This attempt to make the worse seem the better reason is the function of most crowd propaganda. Propaganda furnishes that needed distortion of ideas and facts which permits people to do wrong with good conscience. Propaganda serves the same purpose for the crowd as does the delusive system of ideas for the solitary paranoiac. So, as I have said, the crowd is a device for indulgence in temporary or partial insanity, by all going crazy together. It is as if an unspoken conspiracy were entered into, according to which a number of people permitted themselves and one another to indulge in anti-social behaviour with mutual moral approval.

The outstanding symptoms of such anti-social behaviour are

WHAT IS REVOLUTION?

infantile or narcissistic egomania, and the will to destroy or kill. Both these traits may assume various forms, but they are always present in crowd behaviour. All crowds, as such, therefore "boost" for themselves, persuade themselves that they are superior to their rivals, are convinced that they are "the best people," that they alone are right and all others wrong, and that their hoped-for triumph at whatever cost is to be a glorious victory for humanity or God, or the nation or the truth. In this they shamelessly exhibit the most naïve infantilism. As to the selfish egoism of the crowd, one need but remember the class struggle, nationalism, the hostility of every crowd to freedom of speech!

It is not necessary to dwell on the homicidal tendencies of the crowd. Every crowd is "against some one." Hence humanity's unhappy record of persecutions, wars, riots; hence the orgies of wanton killings which have stained the record of every revolution. .

As examples of revolutionary movements which show all three of the paranoiac symptoms I have mentioned, notice the two outstanding revolutions of our own times. Those who participate in these revolutions are convinced that their aims are diametrically opposed. From my point of view they are both psychologically the same. The obsessive system of ideas in Communist Russia is the doctrine of Marx and Lenin. That of Nazi Germany is to be found in Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. The egomania of the Russian Revolution is seen in its self-idealization of the proletariat, and in Nazi Germany in the foolishness about the superiority of the alleged Aryan race. The homicidal behaviour of both revolutions is too notorious to require comment.

These things, an opinionated doctrinaire, fanaticism, a device for protesting against the feeling of inferiority by resort to megalomaniac ideas and behaviour, a debauch of massacre (we have a new term for the latter now, "liquidation"), a suspension of the rights of man guaranteed by civilization, a return to despotism, a somnambulistic walking in a dream which has been dreamed over and over again and has never come true, a

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

discouragement of the peaceful arts of civilization, until the wreckage and the conquerors have been cleared away—these are the outstanding features of revolution, not only in our time, but in all time.

For three thousand years the wisest and best of mankind in each succeeding generation have laboured to raise human existence above chaos and terror and to transform the primal biological and economic struggle by reason and mutual respect among men. Slowly a body of common understanding has emerged out of savagery and darkness. Peace has been pursued, but not the Roman peace of factional conquest. The ways of civilized man require for their progress peace and fellowship and some recognition of the common humanity of men and women. Such progress of culture and decency as the world knows—and it is not much—has been achieved by the builders, not by the undoers. Often they have seen the work of their hands demolished by the mob. Perhaps the conflict between the civilized minority and the mob is the great issue which history presents to our generation.

CHAPTER TWO

THE ROMANTIC IRONY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

REVOLUTION in the twentieth century has risen up to destroy the very nineteenth-century liberalism which gave it birth. It is as if the prodigal son had come home, accepted the father's kiss, eaten the fatted calf, and then shown himself a robber and parricide. Communism, Fascism and Nazism each gained power by means of conspiracy against a liberal and democratic government. At this distance, it often appears that the Communists led a revolution against Czarism. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Czar was overthrown six months before the Communist Revolution occurred, while many Communist leaders were in hiding or exile. The Communist conspiracy was later directed against a republic. It took advantage of the very tolerance and liberty granted by that republic. It struck that republic down at a moment of weakness which Communist propaganda and disorderliness had themselves done much to create. It struck in the darkness of the night. It resorted to armed insurrection notwithstanding the fact that Russia at the time enjoyed universal suffrage. It struck only a few days before the meeting of a constitutional convention to which only a small number of Communist delegates had been elected by the people. The Fascist march on Rome was also an attack upon a liberal parliamentary government. So was the Nazi Revolution in Germany. Such also is the aim of Communist propaganda in the Republic of the United States of America. This is what revolution means in our generation.

Communist, Fascist and Nazi hate one another with deadly

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

suspicion and rivalry. Fascism is without doubt the most civilized and humane of the three. But the aim of each is an absolute state in which liberty, as men have thought of it since the seventeenth century, does not exist, a state which draws into itself everything and to which all that is unique and individual is sacrificed, a state which operates with the merciless inhumanity of a machine, yet in a real sense is no state at all, but is the will of a minority imposed on the nation, precisely as a conqueror would rule over a subject people. This state is a revival of Rome under the later Caesars—only without many of the restraints upon despotism once provided by Roman Law. The new revolutionary state is ruled by decree, and from such decrees nothing, not even personal habits and manners and beliefs, may be exempt. Law may be made *post facto* to suit the convenience of the dictator or to give appearance of legality to official deeds of violence. Revolutionary tribunals often presided over by the most ignorant and prejudiced terrorize the populace. A dictatorial government unites in the same personages the powers of the executive, legislative and judiciary, and thus, becoming irresponsible, is placed above the law and the constitution. However well-meaning the heads of such government may be, long experience has shown that under it the individual is placed at the mercy of the petty official, the underling, the favourite of the ruling head. No one dares speak his mind or even tell his neighbour of the injustice he may have suffered. All opposition parties, all openly expressed criticism of the government, are suppressed. Bills of rights for which liberals have laboured many centuries are discarded. Academic freedom and freedom of scientific research may be subjected to the creed or propagandist interest of the ruling minority. Education becomes mere indoctrination. Entire sections or classes of the population may be liquidated or persecuted. The workers in whose name the dictatorship may have been established may be subjected to forced labour under a form of state slavery. Aristotle said that democracies end in tyranny. There can be

THE IRONY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

no question but that the aim of twentieth-century revolutions is to destroy liberty and re-establish tyranny.

How is this travesty possible? I shall try to show that it is in fact nothing other than the deadly logic of all revolutionary philosophy carried to its final conclusion. Since the eighteenth century, the public mind has been filled with very extravagant and utopian ideas of the rule of the people. The rule of the people did not mean the rule of all the people, including the cultivated and competent, each type of man exercising influence in the measure of his wisdom and ability to contribute something important to the councils of democracy. It meant rather the rule of the common masses in defiance of the so-called "classes." It came to mean the prevalence of popular desire and crowd will justified by the power of numbers rather than by reason. But "The People" was sovereign and the sovereign could do no wrong. The cure for the ills of democracy was more democracy—that is, more and more power to the common masses. The transfer of the seat of power to the lower social and intellectual strata was called "the emancipation of the masses." This emancipation was democratic "liberty." Liberty meant opportunity for all. Give all men equal opportunity and they would all rise to their full stature and be happy and wise and good. For man was said to be the product of his environment. In the equitable environment created by the self-expression of the people, there could be no thwarted malformed personalities. The evil, or "sin" of the world was thought to be contingent on the forms of political and social organization. Free government would be good government, and good government would cause the individual to be good, since it would furnish him only good incentives. But to the average man goodness meant primarily "making good," improving his material condition, and freedom meant first of all economic opportunity. Throughout the nineteenth century people came more and more to expect the government to provide the citizen with economic opportunity. This came to be regarded as the chief task of government. All

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

sorts of people brought pressure on the legislatures and the courts demanding what they considered their opportunities. Governmental policies, local and national, were devised primarily to encourage "prosperity." Commerce and industry came more and more to rely upon governmental encouragement of prosperity and immediately "lost confidence" if those policies which were specially lucrative to favoured groups were challenged. Bounties, protective tariffs, land grants, franchises, patents, tax exemptions, immunities and special favours, often obtained by bribery and undue influence, became the rule of the day. Many of the most unscrupulous, most powerful and cunning sought and secured these economic opportunities at public expense and to the detriment of the unfavoured. Most large business enterprises and great personal fortunes were accumulated by such government-created monopolies. Had the nations honestly followed the precepts of Adam Smith and permitted no alliance between government and business, permitting human skill and industry to find their own levels of prosperity under an impartial reign of law, much present social unrest might have been avoided. But as it happened business, big and little, all the while professing a creed of "rugged individualism," set the public the example of dependence on government and did much to teach the masses to believe that the government owed each of its citizens a good living.

The result was just what might have been expected. Popular envy and discontent became widespread. The masses demanded that "prosperity be passed around." Although the average standard of living was doubtless the highest in history, the more everyone had the more everyone wanted. People became obsessed with the thought of the inequalities of wealth as they had never been before. Both sincere reformers and demagogues inspired men to exaggerate their grievances, and filled their heads with impossible schemes of magical social reconstruction. Social legislation, governmental regulation and political reform greatly increased the extent and functions of government and

THE IRONY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

accelerated the trend toward the adoption of bureaucratic and arbitrary measures.

Since the World War, at the very time when invention and organization were daily increasing the productivity of industry, the restraints on international commerce caused by tariffs and other monopolies granted to favoured interests were everywhere closing foreign markets. The public was encouraged, in order to absorb the surplus products, to live beyond its means, advertising induced it to desire more and more and to buy on plans of instalment payment, credit was increased and pyramided. A mania of recklessness, of spending, speculation, gambling and pursuit of easy short cuts to unearned wealth took hold of the public. All values became false and fictitious. Paper fortunes were accumulated, inflating men's egos, and giving them a false sense of security until, like the scraps of paper they were, they were blown away by the first breath of relentless reality.

Matters had in ten years drifted so far that apparently the only course then open was to turn to government with even more dependence and grant it certain dictatorial powers to meet national and world-wide emergency. It is a lesson of history that powers once granted to government are not easily again stripped from it. Such increased powers quickly become a vested interest of the office-holding class and are the stock in trade of the professional politicians. Doubtless any attempt now to strip away the present powers of government and reassert a rugged individualism, which in fact does not exist in democracy, would only land us all in worse chaos than ever.

I have said that the tyrannical dictatorships of continental Europe today show the logic of revolution carried to its ultimate conclusion. For a century more or less, the nations of Europe and America have been under the influence of a revolutionary philosophy, derived chiefly from Rousseau. Whether we, the English-speaking nations, are to follow the course of revolution to its fatal end will depend largely on the extent to which our

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

cultural inheritance, with its classic liberalism and its original republican virtues, has been able to survive the sentimentalities of the nineteenth century and the materialisms and vulgarities of the twentieth.

In our country, as in others, there is a growing demand for a more effectively controlled and more highly integrated industrial system. All industrial societies have drifted much further in the direction of a "planned economy" than most people suspect. The ostensible purpose of revolution in Europe is to achieve a planned social economy under the dictatorship of a faction, allegedly either proletarian or nationalistic. Shall we Americans be able to face this industrial problem without also having to meet the challenge of revolution? Radicals are striving to force the issue in revolutionary terms. Many see in the present industrial "depression" a fulfilment of the Marxian prophecy of the bankruptcy of the capitalist system. Surely there is something inherently wrong with a system in which the very industry of men and women may become their undoing, when mills are idle and fields lie untilled while millions of self-respecting workers are destitute. It would seem that the more people produce the worse off they are. Why is it not so that the more goods a community produces the more its members have and enjoy? Radicals answer that this is because goods are now produced for profit, not for use. Distribution and consumption may take place only if there is first profit. Let the people assume ownership of basic industry and go to work for themselves, then there will be enough for all and no more unemployment. Furthermore, it is said that automatic machinery is daily displacing more and more workers, for whom re-employment can be found only in more effective industrial organization and in generally reduced hours of labour. It is the machine, therefore, which has brought about the necessity for planned social economy, and the socialization of industry. I know no answer to this argument.

Again it is said that our liberal, parliamentary institutions, with their over-concern for protecting private property, had

THE IRONY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

their origin in the pre-industrial stage of progress, and at best are inadequate instruments for the direction of large industrial enterprise. As I recently heard a prophet of social reconstruction say, "You cannot run large-scale machine industry through a debating society." So it is argued that the trend of events points toward the assumption of dictatorial powers by an essentially executive or administrative kind of government. All this is an over-simplified view of the present situation. But an increasing number of people is beginning to take such a view. Their arguments must be met, if possible, by practical solution of industrial problems, preferably under the forms of our constitution. They will never be met by mere conventional patriotic appeals to unemployed millions to remain loyal to old-fashioned business principles, especially if such appeals are made by politicians and industrialists who have helped to bring the country to its present unhappy state. The logic of such appeals might, if the crisis should be severe, tend merely to substitute a Fascist revolution for a Communist one.

I suspect that the very idea of a planned economy—plausible as it may be—is a revolutionary idea. It implies a measure of official control over everyone and everything, an exercise of bureaucratic power abhorrent to many of us. Although we have learned the habit of dependence on government, we resent paying the necessary price of making the government strong enough for us all to lean on. And well we may, for thereby the government becomes strong enough to crush us and destroy our freedom. A planned economy, or nation-wide industrial dictatorship, tends to reduce the citizen to a mere subject and automaton. His obedience to authority must be as prompt as the tempo of the machine; it must be blind and unquestioning. A planned economy is a kind of declaration of industrial martial law. It makes all men the slaves of the state, whereas classic liberalism has always sought to limit the state to the necessary minimum. It is inconceivable, for example, that such social experimentation could be attempted in America without arousing violent resistance, resistance which could be overcome only by

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

overwhelming military force. The maintenance of such force over the citizenry of the Republic would be impossible without tyranny. This argument assumes that the citizens do none of the planning—it is all to be done for them by the government. Is not this a false assumption when applied to an enterprising people who are used to representative government?

It is conceivable that a more effective programme of industrial planning might be put into operation voluntarily even to-day if, as it is assumed, the development of industry itself requires it on penalty of general bankruptcy. Communism is not the only alternative to industrial chaos. We should remember that the communistic state which is proposed as the solution of our most recent industrial trends is a very old idea. It has been proposed before in other types of society, and has been restated in modern terms to make it seem to suit the exigencies of the hour. Furthermore, it does not follow that industrial planning, even should it prove desirable, necessitates a violent uprising of the masses, or a dictatorship of the proletariat or of a gang rule established in the name and alleged interest of the workers. A revolution at a time like the present would be irrelevant, and would become possible chiefly because, in a period of rapid change, the established habit patterns of many people would be broken up. There is, however, always the likelihood that while any important readjustment is in process, certain propagandist groups will discover in the situation the occasion for the seizure of power and the opportunity to force their own interpretation of the issue upon the community as a whole.

In any economic problem there is bound to be conflict of interest. Solution is possible only when there can be realistic thinking, calm deliberation, mutual understanding and willingness to try to see the opposite point of view and reach some basis of common adjustment. But as a rule the behaviour of conflicting groups is out of all proportion to the true importance of the issues involved. Group behaviour in such conflicts often becomes infantile and is characterized by what psychologists call

THE IRONY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

"the all or none principle." Everything related to the situation becomes, as James once said of the effects of certain anæsthetics, "just utterly utter." Men speak in superlatives, make extravagant gestures, distort the perspective of their outlook on life, until the distortion spreads like a malignant infection paralyzing reason throughout the community. One would imagine the battle to be Armageddon with the issues of Eternal Destiny weighed in the balance. But on examination (when it is possible to learn the truth at all) the issue may be over a resolution or plank in a political platform which no party takes seriously and the politicians have no intention of putting into practice. Or it may be a dispute between labour and capital over recognition of a union or the question of who shall collect union dues—or matters which make little difference in the daily life of anyone. Or the more serious issue may be over a proposed increase or decrease in wages, questions which could easily be settled by reasonable men in a few hours by studying the facts of the case.

The romanticism of revolutionary ideas deserves more notice than it has received. I have never known a revolutionist who was not a hopeless romanticist. I use the term in its technical and historical sense. Revolutionary philosophies are the sociological manifestation of the Romantic Movement of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. There is the same revolt against form and discipline, the same opposition of an idealized notion of nature toward cultural achievement, the same supremacy of emotion over the intellect, the same tendency to deny the significance of reality and substitute for the truth what one wishes to believe. There is the same identification of innocence with ignorance, and of freedom with escape from reality, the same compensation for inner boredom by resort to imaginary and exotic heroics and adventure, the same subjective moodiness, often world weariness.

The romantic type of mentality is well known to psychopathologists. It is easily detected by use of the Jung word association test in which the subject tested is requested to respond

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

quickly to each of a series of test words with the first word that comes into his head. The response words given by the romantic type show an excess of adjectives and definitions that reveals an attempt to compensate for an inner emotional inadequacy. People with untrained minds and limited experience easily turn to romanticism as the only compensation they know for a somewhat barren existence. Witness the confession and "True Story" articles in some of our newspapers. Watch almost any cinema audience respond to the usual programme of distorted ideas and false sentiments. Recently I heard an audience in New York break into spontaneous applause when there was exhibited on the screen a picture of Dillinger, the notorious gangster murderer. There has always been a close historical relation between romanticism and revolutionary propaganda and movements. It is no accident, therefore, that the Romantic Movement gained its great vogue at the time of the democratic revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In democratic America people still think that sentimental romanticism is the same as idealism. Nazi Germans speak of their movement as "Steel Romanticism," and I shall show that Marxian Socialism can best be understood when it is seen to be a kind of romantic mechanism.

In Edith Hamilton's delightful little book *The Roman Way*, there is an illuminating discussion of romanticism in the ancient world. This type of mentality is well named; it was characteristic of the Romans rather than the Greeks. The latter with their emphasis on the necessity of clear, critical intelligence, their love of form and proportion, their sense of humour, and ability to appreciate beauty in reality were never much given to romanticism. Their life was too full of adventure and significance to require such psychological escape and compensation.

For the average Roman this was not the case. He was conventional, unimaginative, practical and repressed. When not repressed he was violent. His worship of power and military glory demanded much false sentiment and compensatory think-

THE IRONY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

ing. Less civilized than the Greeks, and trying to imitate Greek culture, the Romans did not succeed in giving their existence the grace, freedom and beauty of the Greeks. Like certain peoples who have succeeded them—probably in part as a result of Roman influence—the Romans' way of life oscillated between the sordid and the puritanical. The Romans invented the idea of the "womanly woman," the notion that death in battle is glorious and that virginity is virtue. Beginning with a writer like Virgil, Miss Hamilton shows that the thwarted Roman spirit sought and found compensation for its inner failing by resorting to all those ways of thought and sentiment which later came to be known as Romanticism.

In order to see the relation of revolutionary thought to Romanticism it is necessary to list only the following salient features of the latter. There is first a dependence upon emotion rather than intelligence as a guide to behaviour. Normal people learn to control their emotions, but emotionally starved people "work up" feeling. Hence there grows up a cult of sentiment. Rousseau used to weep over the "noble sentiments of nature." In revolutionary movements the cult of sentiment becomes one of arousing social enthusiasm, and since feeling so aroused is commonly ambivalent (that is, may also give rise to its opposite or easily pass over from one to the other), revolutionary movements consist of an intensification of love and hate. Both love and hate are mingled in devotion to the great cause. Revolutions professing love of humanity ordinarily exhibit an intensity of hatred probably nowhere else manifest in civilized society. Read Marx's account of the Revolution of 1848, or the *Communist Manifesto*, or Trotsky's *History of the Russian Revolution*, or the English translation of Hitler's *My Battle*—which is said to be much more mild than the German original—or pick up almost any radical propagandist publication. One is amazed that the human spirit can breathe such poisonous bitterness and survive. Such also were the hatreds on both sides of the Reformation, the French Revolution, the Commune of Paris in 1871. *The majority of revolutionists of all times have been*

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

consumed with wrath toward people they have never seen. In our times such homicidal mania is often dignified by the name "the class struggle."

Secondly, Romanticism is characterized by flight from the real. "Stone walls do not a prison make, nor iron bars a cage." Men seek escape from a drab and unsatisfactory reaction to stimuli by fabricating wild and wonderful imaginary adventures. The *roman* was an adventure story. So the idea of the revolution is a picture of humanity's great adventure. It is all just too wonderful. Simple folk are suddenly transformed into heroes, and social outcasts become leaders of thousands. It is the Cinderella story come true, and all the world is about to enter the magic land of heart's desire. When later we discuss the Russian Revolution we shall see how, during the first outbreaks in March of 1917, the population of Moscow lived for days with much the same feeling a child has on Christmas morning. This element of adventure is one of the strongest appeals of revolutionary propaganda, and especially to youth.

Thirdly, Romanticism idealizes the objects of its interest. There is exaggeration of everything. Objects and events are always bigger, brighter, more heroic than subsequent experience finds them to be. The mountains pierce the sky, the thunder shakes the foundations of the earth, the soldier has the strength of ten men, the ground trembles when he walks, the flowers lean over and caress the lovely princess. Romanticism also idealizes the neglected things, often giving them unsuspected significance—the primrose by the river's bank, the noble savage of Rousseau's imagination, the idiot to whom Whitman addressed a poem, the life of the peasant and tradesman.

Hence one result of Romanticism was the indiscriminate idealization of the so-called "lower classes"—or man acting as mass, and in the nineteenth century of the proletariat. According to Rousseau there was more wisdom in a tribe of North American Indians than in all the universities and courts of Europe, and humble shopkeepers, he reminded Voltaire, are

THE IRONY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

superior in knowledge to the philosophers. It is natural that Rousseau's idealization of "The People" should have led to a religion of humanity, in which man as such was deified. The radicalism of the nineteenth century originally had much in common with this religion of humanity. It took over the concept of the divine nature of man, only it limited humanity to the proletariat. The rest of mankind were thought of as enemies of the people, exploiters and parasites and not quite human. Labour alone was both competent and entitled to rule the world, or, nowadays, if not labour, then the pure Aryan, or the convert to Fascist principles.

Fourthly, the romantic story is melodramatic. The whole environment seems to be conspiring for or against the hero. By a sort of "delusion of reference" the whole course of events takes on the importance of the outcome of the story. So in sociological Romanticism, history becomes melodrama. All the events of the ages are seen as leading up to the one outcome of the revolution and the social reconstruction. So the Nazis have learned to view all the history of Germany from Arminius to Hitler. So Robespierre thought that the world order had been constructed and wound up at the beginning in order to run down precisely to the French Revolution. So Marxists talk about the economic determinism of history, and the inevitability of the cooperative commonwealth.

Fifthly, there is in Romanticism a spirit of world weariness, or *Weltschmerz*. Examples of this are *The Sorrows of Werther*, and Byronism. The Romanticist enjoys weeping in the cosmic theatre. Many revolutionists carry this spirit over into social philosophy, where it appears as the pathos of the present evil social system. The system, any system devised by human beings, perhaps, must be bad enough, but many revolutionists can see nothing good in it at all. At one time it was the fashion for social Romanticists to forsake organized society and build communistic colonies. With the closing of the frontier this spirit ceased to be one of withdrawal and turned to expressions

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

of discontent and hopes of revolution. A certain amount of discontent is a good thing. It shakes society out of its complacency and tolerance of abuse. But we happen now to be trying to understand the spirit of revolutionary movements, and so can hardly avoid noting that much social discontent is inspired by romantic habits of mind. The world weariness of Romanticism has become the wish for the destruction of the present order, all at once in a spasm of revolutionary agony.

The break between the older liberalism and radical propaganda dates from the hour of the decline of Classicism into Romanticism. Liberalism had remained true to the classical spirit. It was Ciceronian in its realistic sense of the need of law and reason. It conceived of freedom in the Aristotelian sense as first of all freedom of the mind and the government of the individual by "right reason." If older liberals professed democratic principles, they had in mind the great democracies of antiquity which survived only so long as they enjoyed the leadership of a disciplined patrician class, and whether the sovereign power were king or people, liberalism insisted that such power be definitely limited by constitutional restrictions so that it might not turn tyrant and destroy the best men in the state along with the worst. Such liberalism had few illusions about the divinity of man. It was humanistic, however, in that, like ancient philosophy, it recognized and prized human excellence and achievement—without the guidance of revelation or the blessing of the sacraments.

The humanist view of man was well-expressed by Pico della Mirandola during the Renaissance. In the *Oration on Man* Mirandola said that the creator had decreed that unto man there should be bestowed naught singular, so that to him should belong in common whatsoever had been given to his creatures. Man should have neither a fixed abode nor a form in his own likeness. But whatever gifts he should choose according to his free will, "Thou shalt define thy nature for thyself." For thou man art made neither heavenly nor earthly, but art as

THE IRONY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

it were thine own maker, having power to decline unto the low brute creatures or be reborn unto the highest, according to the sentence of thine intellect.

Here is a bold statement of the freedom man had possessed from the beginning and which Mirandola meant he should retain—the power of each man, within the limits of nature, to determine his own character and destiny. Milton restated this position in different terms in his argument against censorship. Here was a philosophy of freedom without idealizing man as mass. Hobbes, Locke, Hume and Voltaire each in his way held the same point of view. All these writers were opposed to the dogma of absolute government and sought to give a rationalistic and humanistic account of political institutions. All these writers were truly liberal and classical in temper. Whatever philosophical errors they may have made, they were remarkably free from romantic delusions. Hobbes, while he believed that government is founded on fear, and wrote about a social contract, nevertheless strenuously opposed the illiberal spirit of the revolutionists of his time. Locke restated the dogma of the “consent of the governed,” but his scepticism saved him from romantic idealism. Hume with all his intellectual freedom saw in the “enthusiasm of the rabble” a menace to liberty and culture.

The break between liberalism and radicalism is clearly discernible in the writings of Rousseau. Voltaire said that reading Rousseau made him want to go on all fours. Rousseau was not a liberal, but a dogmatic, romantic revolutionist. I doubt if there is a revolutionist alive today who has not been influenced consciously or unconsciously by Rousseau. I have often sought to amuse myself by going over contemporary revolutionary “literature,” striking out the obvious Rousseauisms and noting what remains. I find that even among the Marxists there is very little left that is revolutionary. It is from Rousseau that revolutionary thought derives most of its sociological romanticisms. Those who are interested in a somewhat extended analysis of this writer I would refer to Irving Babbitt’s book, *Rousseau and*

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

Romanticism, or to the chapter in my book, *Liberty*, on "Romantic Liberty."

Here it is sufficient to note that, according to Rousseau, the people—that is, man acting as mass—is the only legitimate sovereign. Liberty consists in the individual's participation in the collective will according to an alleged "social contract." If anyone objects to such liberty he must be "forced to be free." This sentiment easily justifies certain coercive measures of revolution. Popular sovereignty, moreover, may be neither delegated nor divided. Therefore let there be direct action and the tyranny of the majority. For the mass will, being supposedly made up of the wills of all, can do no wrong. There is no necessity for constitutional restriction to guarantee the rights of individuals and minorities. Let the people rule. Their rule is to be the return to the enjoyment of natural rights. Freedom is the gift of nature, not an achievement of civilization. Civilization corrupts and belittles man. Who then are "the people"? Theoretically we should include all the people. Practically Rousseau has in mind those who are closest to nature, the humble peasants and artisans. These are the people who must be emancipated from the master classes. Such emancipation is *the revolution* and revolution is "return to nature." Nature, our benevolent mother, is always right; so, therefore, is natural man. Of course, as we see the world at present it is full of evil, the result of our unnatural environment. If anyone is vicious and depraved it is not his fault; the wicked social system has made him so. Just abolish the system and men will be good, because there will be no longer any incentive for evil doing. So the way to improve humanity is not for each man to strive to rise to the highest, as Mirandola said, but rather to draw up a new constitution for the government.

To realistic minds, those who take the trouble to ascertain the facts, this whole argument is a distortion of psychological and sociological truth. It is pure romance. It is, moreover, quite obvious that this Rousseauist doctrine is the dynamic element in most revolutionary propaganda today. All the Nazis need

THE IRONY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

add is the identification of the sovereign will with the absolute nation-state, and to conceive of "the people" as the racially pure members of the National Socialist party. All that Communists need add is the economic interpretation of Rousseau's environmentalism in terms of the capitalistic system, the identification of "the people" with the proletariat and the emancipation of the masses with the socialization of industry.

There was a general ferment of sociological romantic sentiment in Europe at the time Marx and Engels wrote the *Communist Manifesto* in 1845. Napoleon had been overthrown only thirty years before, and the Congress of Vienna which followed Waterloo was so reactionary that many minds were driven to the opposite extreme. The exploitation of labour under the developing industrial system was often ruthless and terrible. Rousseauist ideas had been spread all over Europe by the French Revolution. The memory of Babeuf was still in men's minds. Anarchist philosophies like those of William Godwin, Bakunin and Proudhon each claimed their adherents who believed that with the abolition of the state, law and property, all men would become reasonable and peaceable, labour would be so light as to become a form of recreation, genius would be given its opportunity and would burst into flower. The evolution of the race beyond the political stage was about to bring universal happiness and perfection.

There was a general idealization of the dignity of work, and so of the worker, especially on the part of youthful bourgeois reformers. It is interesting to note in passing the very small number of men of working-class origin who have risen to places of leadership in the radical revolutionary movement. Few of the outstanding leaders of the proletarian revolution have themselves been working men. This is understandable; it was felt to be a humanitarian duty of intellectuals to arouse labour to the historic task of its own "emancipation." Social enthusiasm in opposition to "legitimist" reaction carried democratic sentiment over into utopian idealism. There were Fourierists abroad and Saint Simonists and Owenites all with their pro-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

grammes of social reconstruction. In philosophy the Romantic Movement appeared in Schopenhauer's doctrine of "the world as will" and in the Hegelian teaching of the absolute and perfect state to be evolved out of a dialectic of history. Marx in the *Critique* definitely says that he retained these two Hegelian concepts, nearly "standing Hegel on his head"—that is, interpreting the dialectic or evolutionary principle of history in materialist rather than idealist terms. Already there was social revolution in the air. The detonations of the continental conflict of 1848 could be heard on the horizon.

Note the romantic ideas in the *Manifesto*: "The history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of the class struggle." "The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms." "It has simplified the class antagonisms, society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat."

"The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his 'natural superior.' . . . It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervor, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy waters of egotistical calculation. . . . In a word, for exploitation veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation."

"The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns."

"The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of bourgeois property" and "the weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself." (This picture, partly true of England in 1845, was obviously inapplicable to continental Europe, as the abortive Revolution of

THE IRONY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

1848 demonstrated. The bourgeoisie in 1845 were still held in check by the "legitimist" reaction.)

"The work of the proletarians has lost all individual character and consequently all charm for our workman." "In proportion therefore as the repulsiveness of the work increases, the wage decreases." (Here is the protest of the return to nature against the machine, rather than against the bourgeoisie.)

"But with the development of industry the proletariat not only increases in number; it becomes concentrated in greater mass. . . ."

"The lower strata of the middle class . . . all these sink gradually into the proletariat."

"The proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class."

"All previous historical movements were movements of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority in the interest of the 'immense majority.'" (This was not true in Marx's time and has never been true; it is romantic exaggeration.)

"The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air."

"... We have traced the more or less veiled civil war raging within existing society up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat."

"What the bourgeoisie therefore produces are its own grave diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."

"The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property."

"You must confess that by 'individual' you mean no other person than the bourgeois, than the middle-class owner of property. This person must, indeed, be swept out of the way and made impossible"—[that is, liquidated.]

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

"But don't wrangle with us so long as you apply to our intended abolition of bourgeois property the standard of your bourgeois notions of freedom, culture, law, etc. Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property." [What a distorted view of the history of culture, liberty and law!]

Note the ending of the *Manifesto*. "When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by force of circumstances, to organize itself in a class, if, by means of revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with those conditions, have swept away the conditions of class antagonisms and of class generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.

"In the place of the old bourgeois society with its classes and class antagonisms we shall have an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

Here, obviously, are many of the stock in trade ideas of nineteenth-century propaganda. Scientific and materialistic as Marx was, he retained much of the dramatization of life and the world which was typical of the romanticism of his time. The materialist, finding himself still in need of religion, preserved the old Messianic faith of Hebrew and Christian thought by resort to the paradox of romantic mechanism. Inexorable economic forces are substituted for the God of Biblical prophecy, but just the same this impersonal providence will bring the course of events to a deserved dramatic conclusion. The long suffering are to be vindicated, and the mighty put down from their seats. There is to be a period of trial and great tribulation, like the bowls of poured-out wrath of the

THE IRONY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

Apocalypse. After that the meek are to inherit the earth, class distinctions will be abolished, the political state will give way to the kingdom of righteousness and all men will become like brothers. History has a direction so that these prophecies are inevitably to be fulfilled.

Like Rousseau, Marx held that the trouble with mankind is the present social system. Abolish the system and all will be well. There seems to be no doubt that then the common masses, the proletariat, will be quite competent to achieve the ideal society where all other classes have failed. Let us remember again what Rousseau said about the wisdom of humble peasants and tradesmen.

How greatly were the emotional possibilities of existence intensified by devotion to the great cause of revolutionary adventure! There are thousands of people whose self-appreciative feelings may be kept alive only in devotion to some such cause as social reform or revolution. Only an intensely romantic person could have had the lifelong, uncompromising devotion to revolution that Marx had. His one aim in life was to prepare the proletariat for this drama. Historically and psychologically the heir of the French Revolution, he devoted all his energies, all his brilliant mental gifts to the task of carrying out the terrible logic of revolution to its conclusion.

Science was becoming popular in the early nineteenth century. Under its influence—aided no doubt by the passion of the average man to improve his material condition—a materialistic metaphysic made strong appeal to certain "advance thinkers." Marx employed his great abilities in the impossible task of restating the romantic dream in materialistic and deterministic terms—that is, in terms of seventeenth-century mechanism. The difficulty is that neither Romanticism nor Mechanism is a sound philosophy, and taken together the two are incompatible. Hence the platform of social revolution remains today a warped plank. Attempt to nail down either end of it and the other buckles up. All the enthusiasms of this sort of radicalism are romantic, as are its imagined pageantry of history, and its release of crowd

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

emotion. So it must preach liberty and practice forced labour, talk about equality and set up the dictatorship of a faction. So it imagines it can achieve the emancipation of the masses, with mechanistic techniques according to which the individual is regarded as an automaton. So it grows indignant in its demand for "social justice," yet according to a strictly materialistic and mechanistic philosophy it is impossible even to talk about justice. How can there be considerations of justice in a world where everything is inevitable and determined by strictly material forces? The idea of justice implies ideas of responsibility, and of praise or blame. But mechanical forces have no responsibility, and it is impossible to praise or blame them.

Seventeenth-century mechanics, for purposes of scientific method only, chose to ignore all qualities, and conceive of all objects in terms of particles of matter in motion. Mechanism was the attempt to state in mathematical terms the relative masses, positions and movements of particles of matter. This method of studying objects gave accuracy and new insight into phenomena such as heat, planetary movements, falling objects, the pressure of gases, etc.—in fact, into anything where measurement was of primary concern. But nineteenth-century sociologists and economists envied the exactitude of seventeenth-century mechanics and sought to apply its abstractions to their own phenomena. So it became the fashion about the time Marx began writing to seek in social science an equivalent for Newton's laws of motion and his formulation of the law of gravitation. It is not surprising that such attempts resulted only in very bad metaphors.

Now in the twentieth century mathematical physics has revised many of the older presuppositions of seventeenth-century mechanism. For minds which have outgrown mechanist metaphysics and nineteenth-century Romanticism, there remain in the writings of Marx numerous brilliant criticisms of classical economics and of the capitalist method of production and exchange. But Marxism loses much of its revolutionary significance for contemporary thought, and is seen rather as an his-

THE IRONY OF REVOLUTIONARY IDEAS

torical phenomenon of nineteenth-century thought. So I think the mind of our century is coming to regard this one serious attempt to give to revolutionary enthusiasm some philosophical validity and intellectual respectability. The rest of revolutionary philosophy should be regarded merely as wishful thinking and crowd propaganda.

There is, however, another side of serious practical import in the writing of Marx. He it was, observing the Revolutions of 1848 and 1871, who worked out and bequeathed to such persons as Lenin, Trotsky, Mussolini and Hitler a strategy of civil war and technique for revolutionary propaganda and conspiracy. This technique has been of much use to both Communist and Nazi leaders in the work of compromising liberal governments, stirring up and organizing discontent, overthrowing republican liberties and establishing minority dictatorships. We shall see more of this side of Marx when we come to talk about contemporary revolutionary movements. In this chapter I have sought to trace briefly the ironical history of a century and more of revolutionary thought, which began with the romantic idealization of the mass, and ends in the destruction of all the liberties which classical liberalism has through many centuries laboured to establish.

CHAPTER THREE

REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT SOCIETY

IT has often been said that if knowledge and understanding of history could be more widely diffused, there would be no more revolution. People would see the futility of such behaviour and would employ methods of social improvement better calculated to achieve desired results. This argument assumes that mankind in the mass is teachable, that men are able to think dispassionately at moments when crowd enthusiasm is epidemic. But it is easier and much more exciting to substitute for the lessons of experience certain convenient dogmas such as the "class struggle," the "materialist interpretation of history," or the idea of the masses struggling heroically throughout the ages for liberty and justice, against exploitation and tyranny. It is always easy for men to persuade themselves that the future will be different from the past, that the revolution they now desire is an exception. "This is *the* Revolution."

For those who desire to know what revolution is, however, there is no better way to learn than to see this social phenomenon in historical perspective. Historical processes have not often been studied from the psychological point of view. Certainly too little attention has been given to them from the standpoint of the psychology of the crowd. What, psychologically speaking, is a revolutionary situation? What behaviour precedes social revolt? What sort of rulers are they who in their failure to govern go down in ruin? How does the mass behave in revolution? What sort of leaders emerge? How large a portion of the population participates in revolution? How faithful are revolutionary movements to their professed aims? What do revolutions

REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT SOCIETY

really accomplish? With such questions in mind, I will try to give a brief survey of some of the outstanding revolutions of the past.

We shall find that whatever the issues at stake, revolutions in all times are strikingly the same. Differences in time and professed aim are relatively superficial. Behaviour in revolution right down the centuries is stereotyped, varying little from age to age. In fact there is less difference between the revolutionary behaviour of two thousand years ago and that of today, than there is in ordinary behaviour and interests from age to age. A revolution is a sudden breaking down of the civilized habit patterns of a community. At first thought, one would imagine that such a breakdown would result in every variety of atypical behaviour and thought. But we know this is not the case when an individual's habit patterns are broken down in mental disease. Each type of psychosis has its definitely recognized symptoms. We are safe in assuming that dementia three thousand years ago showed very much the same symptoms as dementia today. The manic-depressive patient doubtless went through the same stages, or cycles, then as he does today. It is similar with revolution. Revolutions whenever they occur commonly pass through the same cycles with the same sequence of successive symptoms. They begin in similar situations and end in the same ways, either in reaction and counter-revolution, or in their own forms of dictatorship. I will sum up and specify the successive stages of this revolutionary cycle, after we have passed in review various historic revolutionary episodes.

There is not much to learn from the revolutions of ancient Greece. Most of the details are lacking in the accounts that have come down to us. Aristotle, in his dissertation on the "Constitution of Athens," tells us that the Athenians experienced eleven revolutions during a period of little more than a century and a half. Athens was a turbulent republic indeed. We gather that most Athenian revolutions were caused by conflicts between the debtor and creditor classes, with an occasional demagogue enjoying a brief period of tyranny. The issue at stake

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

seems usually to have had to do with redistribution of wealth and the personal ambitions of political leaders. The Athenians were not very romantic so they did not commonly rationalize their revolutionary enthusiasms as struggles for eternal righteousness. Aristotle is certainly realistic about Solon and Pisistratus, and the politicians who came into power after the Periclean Age. We know what Socrates and Plato thought about the ignorance of the masses. But we know also that in time the popular assembly in the Areopagus came to exercise supreme power in the government, that the Athenian citizens enjoyed a large measure of liberty guaranteed them by the constitution, that at one time one-fifth of the citizens were on the pay-roll of the state, that Athenian politics were corrupt, that revolutionary factions had even then learned the techniques of exterminating opposition parties, that in the end Athenian democracy destroyed itself and made Philip of Macedon dictator.

Our best insight into revolutionary behaviour in the ancient world is derived from the history of the last century of the Roman Republic, 130 B.C. to 30 B.C. Moderns can learn much about revolution in general from the study of this century in Rome. Our knowledge of the period is fairly adequate. There are certain lessons for us in watching the course of the downfall of this great republic. The Roman revolution began in a struggle for the freedom of the common man and ended by the common man's destroying, under the leadership of the Julian party, most of the liberties of ancient society, and putting an end to liberty for many centuries. Furthermore the overthrow of the Roman Republic was the first "world revolution," the first revolution which the masses believed was historically determined. When Octavian assumed dictatorship of the Roman world and took to himself divine honors, at the behest of the Roman proletariat, men were convinced that a whole cycle of the ages had closed and a new cycle begun. This revolution was moreover rationalized by extravagant utopian ideas. Even such intelligent writers as Horace and Virgil could regard the Caesar as "Prince of Peace," "Lord

REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT SOCIETY

of Lords," inaugurator of the "Golden Age." Finally, we shall find in this Roman revolution most of the phenomena which appear again and again in the history of revolutionary movements: the unrest of the masses, the weakness of the existing government, the decadence of the ruling classes, the increasing demands of popular factions in the measure that they become conscious of a growing sense of power, the ambition of popular leaders, with their conspiracies and counter-conspiracies, the rôle which the army usually plays in revolution—it has been much the same from Marius and Sulla to Trotsky and Hitler—the fear of counter-revolution, the mob action of street crowds in their orgies of killing alleged enemies and members of the opposition, the breaking up of the revolutionary party into mutually destructive factions, the dictatorship and universal slavery of the masses in which it all ends.

Along with their Romanticism, the Roman people were sturdy and practical. They had a genius for organization quite unique in antiquity. They surpassed their neighbours in statecraft, engineering and military technique. The Romans of all classes were a conventional people, slow to adopt new customs, proud of their ancestors, trained to endure hardship, loyal to the state.

The population was composed of three classes. The poorer class, the plebeians, consisted of self-respecting artisans and peasants. The plebeians were free men. They had the right to vote in the popular assembly, and though not professional soldiers, as citizen soldiers of Rome they made up the armies which in time conquered the world. Hard and stubborn in resistance they knew how to stand up for their rights in opposition to the more privileged classes in the population. For several centuries, down to the end of the second century B. C., it seems that the demagogue and the professional politician were unknown in Rome.

The middle class, called "equites," or knights, was composed of members of the learned professions, gentleman farmers and leading business men. Many members of this class were people of wealth. Their ships and their commercial establishments

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

could be found all over the known world. Many of the highest offices of the nation were held by men of this class. Cicero was one of them.

Finally, there was the small and powerful patrician class. Originally the members of this class were descended from the old nobility which had existed during the period of the monarchy that preceded the Republic. In fact it was the nobles who had driven the royal family out of Rome and established the Republic. For centuries members of this class had given leadership to the nation. They were distinguished for their simple living, their virtue and their Spartan self-discipline.

The Republic was founded about 500 B. C. when the nobles put an end to the rule of the Etruscan Kings. From that time until revolution established the Caesars as kings of kings, Romans of all classes were as sincerely opposed to monarchy and tyranny as were ever the free citizens of democratic America. The constitution of the Roman Republic provided that there be elected each year two consuls or presidents who, with the advice of the Senate and the popular assembly, were to hold office as chief executives and commanders of the army. Originally the consuls were chosen by universal manhood suffrage from the patrician class. Later this restriction was removed and men of all classes were equally eligible to hold any office in the state. Gradually other administrative offices, all elective, were added: "quaestors" (treasurers and assessors), "censors" who guarded public morals and religion and chose the members of the Senate, and "tribunes" of the people. These last were elected by the popular assembly as its special representatives and guardians of the rights of the people. They had the right to sit in the Senate and had power to veto almost any measure under consideration and demand its submission to the assembly of the people for ratification.

The Senate was composed of three hundred members. The censors, elected by popular vote, had the duty of selecting its members. Membership required that one be distinguished for service to the state and have had long experience in public of-

REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT SOCIETY

fice. The patrician class throughout the Republic dominated the Senate, although many men of plebeian origin were admitted. Professor Breasted points out the contrast of the Roman Republic under such leadership to that of Athens, which was ever at the mercy of the whims of the inexperienced. He says that the Roman Senate was the greatest council of rulers which ever grew up in the ancient world—or perhaps in any age.

At the close of the second century B. C. there was still general popular respect for public office. The people had gained extensive powers in the government, and all this had been achieved without serious inter-class strife or revolution. The stability and wisdom of the government had gradually extended the sway of the Romans, first over Italy, then over Greece, Spain, Gaul and the Orient. Rulers of foreign lands came to appeal to the Roman Senate to settle their disputes. The city grew in numbers and in wealth, in culture and power, and this prosperity was attributed to the virtue and devotion of the people of Rome to their state.

In 156 B. C. Carthage, the commercial and military rival of Rome, was destroyed, and a change began to take place in the spirit and behavior of the Roman people. If in the middle of that last century of the Republic you could have talked with the average Roman business man, or lawyer or army officer, you would doubtless have found him much like the typical middle-class Englishman today. He would have laughed at the new fashions which were being imported from Greece, the Paris of those days. He would have thought the new school of poets and dramatists were going a little too far, and would have expressed a longing for the good old days when the censors kept public morals pure. He would have deplored the "modernism" of the younger generation, would have thought governments too tolerant of political corruption, and would have told stories of friends of his who had made big money in the market. He would have assured you that he was an optimist, but would have thought that certain politicians were leading the proletariat into danger-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

ous radicalism. He would have spoken of Marius as a demagogue and would have said he intended to vote for Sulla at the next election, for it was time decent citizens came to the support of the government. He would have been worried about the number of unemployed in Rome, and have said Rome was being filled with dangerous foreigners who ought to be sent back where they came from. If you had mentioned slavery, he would have said that slaves in Rome were much better off than those in the Orient, and that any slave who showed industry and merit could win his freedom. He would have pointed out a number of prosperous men who had once been slaves. But as for the rebellious foreign rabble, and slave agitators, he would like to see them crucified along the Appian Way.

We have a clear picture of a pre-revolutionary situation in the gradual decline of the Roman Republic after the Punic Wars. A serious and long drawn out war has more than once precipitated revolution. War is frequently followed by a period of demoralization. During the conflict new leaders emerge out of the nonprivileged classes, new fortunes are accumulated which excite the envy and resentment of thousands who risked their lives in actual combat for the salvation of the country. Vast numbers of returned soldiers have gained a new sense of their organized power. A large demobilized army, having in service developed special loyalties among its members and for their leaders, is often dangerous thereafter to the public peace. After demobilization many soldiers are idle, they see the politicians and their favourites enjoying the spoils of war. What is more natural than that the soldiers demand their share of the spoils?

After the defeat of Carthage Rome was filled with a vast unemployed proletariat, many of whom had been in military service so long as to be practically unfitted for any employment except war and politics. Thousands of slaves had been captured during the conquests and these slaves were sold to wealthy Romans and were used to work their private estates, which were growing always larger. Slave labour began seriously to displace

REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT SOCIETY

free labour. In 133 B. C. Tiberius Gracchus and later his brother Gaius, grandsons of Scipio, conqueror of Africa, tried to initiate certain reforms which would serve to place numbers of ex-soldiers on the land. According to the Licinian Law, conquered land became the property of the state. Much such land had been given over to persons with political influence and was tilled for private profit. In their appeal for popular support for their reforms the Gracchi resorted to precisely the kind of radical propaganda that Lenin used in 1917 in his cry, "To the Peasants the Land!" There were similar agrarian riots and there were menacing "demonstrations" of the urban unemployed against the propertied classes. Although the Gracchi each in turn gained strong support in the popular assembly, they aroused the hostility of the Senate when they were suspected of being demagogues with the aim of setting themselves up as tyrants. That certain of the words and acts of Tiberius Gracchus were intemperate and seditious there can be little doubt. The result was general panic, in which first Tiberius and later Gaius were slain by members of the Senate party.

Whether the agrarian reforms attempted by the Gracchi would have averted the disasters which later destroyed the Republic, no one can now say. But after the death of Gaius, Rome had ever to deal with a huge proletarian mob of unemployables. The name proletariat is today used by radicals to designate the working class. But this Roman proletariat was not the same as the old plebeian working class. It was an idle, rapacious rabble. It came to dominate popular assemblies, and to set up and overthrow public men according to its pleasure. It was called "The People." It capitalized its franchise for political favour; it became the easy ally of ambitious politicians and successful military leaders. Its numbers displaced the plebeians of the old citizen army, and became mercenary soldiers, paid out of the spoils of conquest, prompted to plunder and rob by generals who sought popular favour. It prepared the way for the military dictatorship which followed after Julius Caesar led his proletarian army across the Rubicon in his march on the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

capitol. Politicians swelled its numbers by granting citizenship to ex-slaves and others of their henchmen gathered from all over the world. They entertained it with gladiatorial shows, and fed it for their own political advantage at public expense. At one time, when the total population of the city was about nine hundred thousand, there were three hundred thousand people who received the daily dole of corn. It is said that Julius Caesar, most ambitious politician of them all, when he returned with Cleopatra in triumph after the murder of Pompey in Egypt, gave sixty thousand free dinners to his proletarian ward politicians in the city of Rome.

The eligibility of men of all classes to public office greatly stimulated ambition. The man began to seek the office, not the office the man as in the days of Cincinnatus. Election to any office now depended on the favour of the proletariat. It became necessary for superior men to compete with low adventurers for popular favour. Quality of leadership and standards of honesty declined. Public office became a short cut to enormous wealth and power. After the entrance of plebeians into public life there were scandals even in the Senate. Various senators became the paid agents and propagandists of alien governments, subject princes and other foreign interests. At the beginning of the last century B. C. decent people were shocked over the discovery that venality in the Senate had involved the Roman people in a long and costly and shameful war in Numidia. In subsequent years such practices were shamelessly regarded as the usual thing. Beginning with this Numidian War the armies of Rome, now composed of paid mercenaries, tended to become the private property of their commanders. They were turned against Rome itself and were used to enhance the political fortunes of the politicians who were so fortunate as to be placed in command.

A few honest and able men like Cicero remained in public life. But many men of the type whose services in earlier centuries had contributed to the greatness of the Republic, now withdrew in disgust or fear. Sallust the historian was one who

REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT SOCIETY

retired from public life. Writing about 63 B. C. he says, "Instead of modesty and self-denial and virtue, I saw boldness, corruption, rapacity around me." He says he became "disgusted by general depravity." "Ambition taught men to think one thing, and say another." The ambitious would "even make friendships for personal advantage." "Vices sapped their way at first by slow degrees, at length spreading like an epidemic contagion, morals and liberal arts went to ruin, and government, before a model of justice, became profligate and oppressive." "Soldiers flushed with conquest thought of nothing but plunder and depredation." "Luxury became the business of life."

It frequently happens in a decadent democracy, that as the mob and its popular idols gain in power, the public becomes impatient, factious, disorderly. The legal procedures of ordered society break down. It was so in Rome. Crime and conspiracy multiplied, elections became riotous. There were mutual accusations of scandalous nature between rival aspirants to leadership; suspicion became general.

It is not surprising that this state of affairs led to a succession of civil wars. The first serious outbreak of civil war within the city happened about sixty years after the victory over Carthage. The occasion for it was the unsuccessful Numidian War. As I have said, an unsuccessful war is frequently the occasion for revolution. Note that the French Revolution of 1789 followed the unsuccessful Seven Years' War with England and her allies, that of 1871 followed the defeat of Napoleon III in the Franco-Prussian War. The Russian Revolution of March, 1917, was precipitated by mismanagement and defeat in the World War. Both Germany and Austria were plunged into revolution by the defeat of the Central Powers.

The Roman-Numidian War of 104 B. C. had dragged on without issue and to the humiliation of Rome, largely because certain bribed senators were interested in the cause of the Numidian prince. Popular indignation at Rome resulted in the election of Marius to the office of consul. This aged general was then sent by the popular assembly, and in defiance of the Senate,

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

to take command of the Numidian campaign and bring the war to a victorious end. This he speedily accomplished. His victory was followed by a triumphal entry into the city, in which the King of Numidia was dragged in chains through the streets to the delight of the populace. Marius was re-elected consul.

Marius was a plebeian of peasant origin. He had risen from private soldier to the rank of officer under Scipio in the Spanish campaign. He was a man of unusual military skill, violent disposition and little culture. Plutarch said of him that if he had only studied the classics and philosophy he might have achieved some measure of temperance and self-control. The Numidian victory made him a popular idol. "A soldier of the people had saved Rome." In his campaign for re-election there was much violence. His party seems to have got out of control. Mobs attacked members of the senatorial party. Marius's campaign was one of intense hatred for aristocrats, and his election, said to have been accomplished by intimidation, was a direct challenge, not only to senatorial bribe-takers but also to the older republican elements in the community.

Being a better general than civil governor, Marius immediately after his re-election led his army into Gaul, where he re-organized it and improved its efficiency. He also recruited it with professional, paid soldiers directly responsible to himself, a policy which subsequent revolutionary leaders did not fail to follow.

While Marius was absent with his army, his democratic followers in Rome had things very much to their liking—until the inevitable counter-revolution overwhelmed them. The aristocratic Sulla, member of the senatorial party, happened to be in command of the army in Italy. Sulla led his army into Rome to restore order. He drove out the radicals, disfranchised the popular assembly and placed the government under the dictatorship of the Senate.

Marius then returned, bringing with him a division of cavalry. There was a general massacre of senators and leading citizens. The revolutionary government was again established. But

REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT SOCIETY

not all the techniques of revolution were known in Marius's times. He seems to have thought that all that was necessary was to crush the opposition party and issue certain decrees transferring supreme power to the assembly of the people. He did not appear to understand that a revolutionary government once established by force must be maintained by the force of military dictatorship. Evidently he was so unsophisticated that he took seriously the revolutionary propaganda about the right of the people to rule, he seemed to think their rule would be automatic. This novice in the strategy of revolution again left Rome to the mercy of the counter-revolutionary Sulla and his Italian troops. Sulla once more marched on Rome. There was another reign of terror and of mass murder. Hundreds of the leaders of the radical party were proscribed and killed, and their property confiscated. Power was again transferred from the popular assembly to the Senate.

Order was temporarily restored, but the community once torn by factional strife did not return to social peace. The revolution smouldered under the surface. Shortly after the conflict between Marius and Sulla, another revolutionary conspiracy threatened the state. This was the so-called conspiracy of Catiline. There can be little doubt that Catiline and his followers aimed with popular support to slaughter the leading men of Rome, seize their property and make themselves dictators. Cicero, then consul, discovered the plot in time. He persuaded the Senate to grant him temporary dictatorial power. He then had the ringleaders of the conspiracy arrested and executed and Catiline, defeated, was killed in battle. In gratitude the Senate honored Cicero by granting him the title *Pater Patriae*—father of his country. Sallust gives an account of this conspiracy and its propaganda, including Catiline's great oration, which shows certain similarities between the ideas of Catiline and those of certain revolutionary propagandists of our own time. Said Catiline, "The cause in which we are embarked has been explained to you all in separate conferences. . . . What must be our condition, if we have not the spirit to redress our grievances and vindicate the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

rights of men? What I desire to know is the true state of the commonwealth. A few imperious demagogues have seized all power into their own hands. . . . The good, the virtuous, the noble, and ignoble, are all blended in one undistinguished mass; a mere vulgar herd, without interest, without place or preferment; obliged, like slaves, to bend to those, who, if a thorough reform took place, and restored the government to its true principles, would shrink and tremble before the majesty of the people. At present, everything is engrossed by a proud and insolent oligarchy; power, riches, honours, are in the hands of the few, or scantily dealt out among their creatures at their will and pleasure. To us they have left nothing but disgrace, contempt, and danger, the terror of prosecutions, and the pangs of gripping poverty. . . .

"Is there a man, who feels the energy of his nature, who in these times can look tamely on, and see the senators and the patrician order riot in such heaps of wealth . . . while we are left to pine in want and misery of heart? Shall the nobles build their splendid porticos and shall we in the meantime want a cottage for the reception of our household gods? Behold your tyrants at an immense expense purchasing pictures, statues, vases curiously wrought in gold and silver. . . . We have beggary at home, a load of debts abroad; desolation before our eyes, and not the smallest hope of relief to assuage our misery. . . . Behold, my friends, behold that liberty for which you long have panted; behold riches, honours, and immortal glory, all within your reach.

"Catiline promised to cancel all their debts, a proscription of the rich, the honours of the magistracy, sacerdotal dignities, plunder, rapine, with all the usual perquisites of war, and whatever the insolence of victory could extort from the vanquished. . . ." [Quoted from Sallust.]

Cicero did not permanently save the state. He lived to see his work undone by the proletarian party under the leadership first of Julius Caesar, and later of Mark Antony and Octavian. He died after vain attempts to save the liberal constitution of

REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT SOCIETY

the Republic, a victim of assassination at the hands of Antony's henchmen, and his head and hands were hung upon the rostrum in the Forum where his oratory had once swayed the crowd.

The course of events which led to the death of Cicero, and the end of the Republic, was brought about by three notorious leaders of the proletarian party, Pompey, Caesar, and Crassus. Bitterly as the crowd hated the aristocracy and the rich, insistent as it was upon a redistribution of property, jealous as it was of the rights and power of the people, it actually supported these favoured leaders in constituting themselves a dictatorial "triumvirate," and dividing among themselves the rulership of the Roman world and the spoils of office. Pompey had been discovered by the popular party when he was an army officer in Spain. He was an able commander and orator, a clever politician and a popular leader. In 70 B. C. he was elected consul by the popular party on a platform pledged to the repeal of the reactionary Sulla laws. In 67 B. C. he was given supreme command of the land and sea forces of Italy with the purpose of delivering Mediterranean commerce from the menace of pirates. Pompey seized the opportunity to make himself, in the name of the Roman people, ruler of Asia. He conquered the city of Antioch, the old capital of the Selucidae. He settled quarrels among Asiatic princes. He made Judea a Roman province and opened up the road to Egypt. He succeeded in gaining great influence in the latter country. He made himself general advisor of the Egyptian government, established a Roman garrison at Alexandria, and became the attorney representing Egyptian interests before the Roman Senate.

On returning to Rome, Pompey found that he needed an efficient political machine to preserve his popularity during his absence. He made an alliance with young Caesar and a rich man named Crassus, who financed the new political organization so long as his aid was needed, and was then easily disposed of. Julius Caesar was a nephew of the revolutionary leader Marius. He early entered politics as a champion of the people's party and was suspected of complicity in the Catiline conspir-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

acy. He was very much the young-man-about-town, a high liver, a professional politician, desperately in debt and intensely ambitious. In 59 B. C. Caesar was elected consul as the candidate of the proletarian party. He entered the office pledged to secure certain grants of land to the veterans of Pompey's army, and other measures for redistribution of the land. How far these reforms were actually carried out I do not know. Later when Caesar became sole consul and military dictator he became the author of numerous acts of reform legislation. He knew always how to keep the support of the common masses.

Caesar's most important official action was to secure for himself the command of the army in Gaul for a period of five years. Every schoolboy who knows any Latin at all knows something of his exploits in Northern Europe. Caesar's qualities of personal leadership, his courage and the brilliant success of the campaigns in Gaul brought to him the unqualified devotion of the army. The army became Caesar's to do with as he chose. The Senate, also his old ally Pompey, became jealous of his popularity and uneasy lest he use his military force to overthrow the Senate and make himself military dictator. The Senate voted to forbid Caesar to bring the army back to Italy. But the day of voting was over.

Henceforth it would be the power of the sword which would decide matters at Rome. Pompey left the popular party and became the armed protector of the Senate. Caesar with his legions crossed the Rubicon—a stream which marked the official boundary line of Italy. He thus placed himself in open rebellion against his country. He marched on Rome, as his uncle had done before. Pompey and the Senate fled, and Caesar, the revolutionist, in open revolt was re-elected consul by the proletarian party. In the civil war which followed, Pompey's army was defeated in the east, and its commander was treacherously murdered in Egypt whither he had taken flight. Caesar in pursuit of Pompey had followed him to Egypt. There he met the young queen Cleopatra, settled the quarrel between her and her brother, married her according to Egyptian law, became

REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT SOCIETY

the father of her son Caesarion, was given royal and divine honours by the Egyptians, and then moved his royal family back to Rome in triumph. The common people received him gladly. The Senate was with some reluctance forced to submit. Caesar was master of the Roman world. He was elected sole consul for life, and assumed many other offices of the state including Pontifex Maximus, or High Priest, and Imperator, commander-in-chief of the army. As a dictator Caesar was magnanimous toward his political enemies. He forbade the orgies and massacres which commonly follow a revolutionary overthrow of government, and it is said he spent the last months of his life planning to induce or force the Senate to recognize in Italy the titles of royalty he had assumed in Asia and Africa. The popular assembly would have crowned him king.

The assassination of Caesar in the Senate in 44 B. C. did not restore the Republic, as Brutus and others had hoped. The mob, after the funeral of Julius Caesar, attacked the senatorial party and burned the homes of those suspected of the counter-revolutionary conspiracy. Thousands of representative Romans were killed or driven into exile. A second "triumvirate" consisting of Mark Antony, young Octavian Caesar and a certain Lepidus, annihilated the counter-revolutionary army, reduced the Senate to submission, and then proceeded to publish a long list of leading citizens who were to be hunted down and assassinated without trial. Whatever leniency Julius Caesar had shown to conservative republicans was now abandoned. The mob had its fill of plunder and murder, and there were added to the list of those proscribed for death all those whom any member of the revolutionary triumvirate had any reason to hate, fear or envy. Each one of the three leaders betrayed his personal friends if another desired their death—or their property, and the crowd rejoiced in the triumph of the people and the dictatorship of the people's party.

But the popular victory was not the utopia the people had imagined it would be. It usually happens that no sooner has a revolution become victorious than factions develop within the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

revolutionary party itself. This is to be expected, for the old restraints of law and order are temporarily in discard. Everyone is living in a state of tense expectancy, over-stimulated emotion, and suspicion. A new group of men has tasted absolute power, and their ambition carries them beyond all bounds of reason. Each faction accuses the other of betraying the people's revolution, of aspiring to tyranny, of counter-revolutionary aims.

In Rome the jealousy between Antony and Octavian soon broke forth in open hostility which no truce could hold in restraint. Octavian, as Caesar's heir, laid claim to all the honours which had been conferred upon Julius Caesar. Antony championed the cause of Caesarion, the son of Caesar and Cleopatra, and sought to establish at Alexandria an empire embracing both Egypt and Eastern Asia. Civil war followed between the parties of Octavian and Antony which involved the entire Roman world. After the defeat and suicide of Antony, Octavian as Caesar Augustus in 30 B. C. assumed imperial authority and divine honours. The mob worshipped him as a god. Liberty, after 500 years of republican government, finally perished from among the nations. For the following five centuries, the dictatorship of the Caesars remained a tyranny of the army over the civilian population. Proletarian politics in one generation had squandered all the rights and liberties of the common man which the old self-respecting plebeian class had zealously guarded since the expulsion of Tarquin. The Revolution had at last humiliated the proud old patrician class, and had succeeded in exchanging for the disciplined leadership of that class the rule of adventurers, soldier politicians and favourites of the imperial household.

Shortly before his death Cicero wrote, "I am being so worn out with anxieties, that I regard myself as doing wrong in the mere fact of remaining alive. For I have lost not only many very intimate associates whom either death has snatched from me, or exile torn away, but also all the friends whose affection my former defence of the Republic, accomplished with your aid, had

REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT SOCIETY

gained for me. I am in the very midst of their shipwrecked fortunes and the confiscation of their property; and I not only hear—which in itself would have been bad enough—but I have before my very eyes the sharpest of all pangs, the actual sight of the ruin of those men by whose aid in old times I quenched that conflagration. And in the city in which I once enjoyed such popularity, influence, and glory, I am now entirely deprived of all these. I retain, indeed, Caesar's supreme kindness: but that cannot make up for violence and a complete upset of the established order of things. . . . For if we are seeking freedom, what place is free from the master's hand?

" . . . We were not fighting with the weapons with which we might have prevailed—deliberation, weight of character, and the righteousness of our cause, in all of which we had the superiority—but with muscles and brute force, in which we were not his equals.

" . . . But seeing that the power of the man whom we fear is so widely extended, that it has embraced the whole world, do you not prefer being in your own house without danger to being in another man's with danger? For my part, if I must face death, I would rather do so at home and in my native country."

And Tacitus a little later said, "After the battle of Actium, when the interests of peace were served by the centralization of all authority in the hands of one man, there followed a dearth of literary ability, and at the same time truth suffered more and more, partly from ignorance of politics, which were no longer a citizen's concern, partly from the growing taste for flattery or from hatred of the ruling house.

" . . . The sea swarmed with exiles and the island cliffs were red with blood. Worse horrors reigned in the city. To be rich or well-born was a crime: men were prosecuted for holding or refusing office: merit of any kind meant certain ruin. Nor were the informers more hated for their crimes than for their prizes: some carried off a priesthood or the consulship as their spoil, others won offices and influence in the imperial household: the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

hatred and fear they inspired worked universal havoc. Slaves were bribed against their masters, freedmen against their patrons, and, if a man had no enemies, he was ruined by his friends.

“ . . . Indeed never has it been proved by such terrible disasters to Rome or by such clear evidence that Providence is concerned not with our peace of mind but rather with vengeance for our sin.”

Meanwhile, during the same century in which the Republic was destroying itself, there occurred a series of slave revolts which at times assumed revolutionary proportions and menaced public peace. Slavery in Rome was more extensive and brutal than it had ever been in Greece. Each army returning to the city after conquest brought with it many hundreds of captives taken in war. As Shakespeare's Mark Antony says of Caesar, "He hath brought many captives home to Rome whose ransom did the general coffers fill." The sale of such slaves to wealthy land-owners and business men and the consequent slave labour on a vast scale tended to displace the free peasant and artisan. Guides in Rome today will tell you that the miles of mosaic floors in Hadrian's villa near Tivoli required the labour of thirty thousand slaves. While the importation of slave labour was one of the causes of unemployment in ancient Italy, the institution of slavery had other sociological effects. All labour was degraded; the average man sought to earn his living by his wits or in military service. Money procured from the public sale of slaves was used by politicians in office to buy food for the idle proletariat, and to provide special favours for their followers. The presence of so large a number of people in the community who had not the rights of ordinary free men tended to demoralize the population, and as the slave population came to approach in numbers that of the free, the growing discontent of the slaves could threaten the peace and security of society. The slaves of Rome were actually fighting for their liberty, and there is reason to suspect that much subsequent revolutionary propaganda about the "emancipation of the masses"

REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT SOCIETY

may have had its origin in those slave revolts when the struggle for freedom really meant something.

About the time of the conflicts between Marius and Sulla there was a general uprising of slaves in Sicily. C. Osborne Ward in *The Ancient Lowly* says that the insurrectionary slave government on this island was able to oppose the Roman legions sent to restore order, with an armed force of many thousand men. It seems improbable that such a slave army ever existed, or that if it did exist it could have secured sufficient arms and provisions to offer serious armed resistance to Rome. If, as we are told, this slave rebellion continued ten years it is more likely that it resorted to guerrilla warfare and banditry, like that in certain parts of China today. However there seems to have been an active secret revolutionary organization among the slaves of Sicily, which suddenly and without warning burst into open violence. All over Sicily there were agrarian riots, like those of the peasants which occurred in the early stages of the French and Russian Revolutions. The estates of the wealthy were looted and burned, the families of the owners either massacred by members of their own households or dragged before a revolutionary tribunal for torture and execution. The fury of the mob increased—as always with increasing sense of power.

Such organization as this movement had seems to have been that of a mystical or religious cult. This would have been natural, since many slaves had been brought from the near east. The leader of the cult, later elected dictator of Sicily, was a slave named Eunus, a worshipper of Ceres, and a magician. It was believed that Eunus, the prophet of Demeter, had been sent from heaven to be the messiah, the miraculous deliverer of his people. On assuming dictatorial power he appears to have opened the prisons and to have liberated several thousand convicts, many of whom he enrolled in his army. Eunus found it increasingly difficult to maintain discipline over his followers, among whom there was much debauchery and quarreling. Finally he was betrayed into the hands of the Romans by a group

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

of his followers, and Calpernius Piso with an army recruited largely from the proletariat of Rome speedily put an end to the revolt and crucified several thousand captured rebels. This revolt of the slaves is historically important because of certain mystical ideas which at that time became associated with social revolution. Some of these ideas survived in primitive Christianity.

The second social revolt of importance took place during the years 74-70 B. C. It is known as the revolt of Spartacus and the gladiators. It is a wonder that gladiators in Roman society did not rebel before the time of Spartacus, for gladiatorial contests had their origin in most barbarous superstition. In the early days of slavery it had been the custom in Rome, when a rich man died, for surviving members of his family to sacrifice on his funeral pyre a number of his slaves to serve him in the other world. Gradually, with typical Roman logic, the custom became modified into the gladiatorial combat. Since the slaves selected for sacrifice were to die anyway, it was thought proper to let them kill one another. The public watching such exhibitions might generously grant continued life to the slave who showed himself the bravest and put up the best fight.

In time gladiatorial duels became a favoured kind of popular entertainment, and wealthy men had numbers of their slaves specially trained for the gladiatorial profession. At last at Capua it occurred to Spartacus and his companions that the skill for fighting which they had acquired might, instead of being used to kill one another, be used to gain their liberty.

With two hundred companions, mostly gladiators and slaves whose work was connected with the public shows, Spartacus escaped to the slopes of Vesuvius. Here, after beating off a detachment of the army in a surprise attack at night, he issued a general emancipation proclamation of the slaves of Italy. He also promised to carry out the land reforms of Tiberius Gracchus and restore the public domain to the peasants. Many hundreds of men joined his following. His roving bands were active throughout the length of the Italian peninsula. But just as in

REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT SOCIETY

Sicily before, all the efforts of the leader to enforce discipline on his followers failed. There was insubordination, robbery, outrage. Roman citizens who were captured were often—out of revenge—forced to fight as gladiators for the amusement of their captors. The insurrectionists naturally had to live off the country through which they passed. There was much pillage and wanton destruction. In a battle near the Po, Spartacus was able to defeat, or escape, from the legions sent against him under the command of Lentulus and Crassus. Finally Pompey with a detachment of the army from Spain joined forces with Crassus and suppressed the insurrection. Spartacus was killed in battle, hundreds of his followers were captured, brought to Rome and crucified on the Appian Way.

So ended social revolution in the pre-Christian world. Spartacus had no revolutionary system of philosophy, but it seems that he did contemplate a significant social reconstruction. His revolt is interesting to us, not only because of the dramatic and desperate struggle he made for freedom and justice, but also because of some of the causes of his failure, the behavior of the revolutionary crowd, its disorder and blood lust, the hearty support which the Roman proletariat gave to the suppression of this and other slave revolts. The proletariat insisted upon its own supremacy over the aristocracy, but it had no sympathy for the rights of those "whose ransom did the general coffers fill." Pompey was immediately, after lining the high road to Rome with the exposed impaled bodies of rebellious slaves, elected President of the Republic by the people's party, given supreme command of the armies of Italy and, in alliance with Crassus, started on the career which led to the dictatorship of the first triumvirate and the final reduction of everybody to a state of slavery under the tyranny of the Julian party and its popular idols, the Caesars. I trust I have made it clear that the triumph of Caesar was the first attempt at the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the story of the ruin of the Roman Republic we can see many of the elements of revolution, elements which reappear

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

with regularity in subsequent centuries—even in the revolutionary movements of the twentieth century. We see what constitutes a pre-revolutionary situation. In this situation we find a mingling of economic, psychological and moral factors—the demoralization of the ruling class, the ever-increasing power of the mass, the part played by the army in using force against a liberal government, and the fact that the crowd after each concession to its will to rule, demands more and more power. There were also the breakdown of the forces of law and order, the futile attempt of representatives of the old order at counter-revolution, their defeat and massacre by the mob, the period of suspicion and lawlessness and terror, the establishment of a despotism in the name of the emancipation of the masses, the development of faction and strife among revolutionary rulers and within the revolutionary party, the resulting civil war, the emergence of the victorious tyrant with his military dictatorship, the popular acceptance of tyranny and loss of liberty, the ultimate surrender by the masses of the very revolutionary cause itself. But the story of revolution is only begun. We will turn now to the closing days of the Roman Empire and note the similarity between revolution and barbarian invasion, then trace the efforts of men in the late Middle Ages to regain something of their liberties and culture out of the ruins of a thousand years.

REVOLUTION DESTROYS A CIVILIZATION

REVOLUTION gave over the Roman world to the despotism of the Caesars, and revolution, world-wide and disastrous, was their undoing. The story of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire is history's answer to those who in our time believe that revolutionary dictatorship is only a temporary and necessary means for the creation of an ideal social order, that it can really represent the interests of the working masses, or that it can abolish the evils of capitalism and of democracy. Most of the abuses which had existed under the Republic were augmented under the Empire and new unforeseen abuses were added. The proletariat had fewer rights than it enjoyed before, and there was now no tribune of the people like Tiberius Gracchus to voice its grievances or champion its rights. The office of tribune was commonly held by the Emperor himself. For the first time in the history of the nation, the head of the state surrounded himself with the praetorian guard and maintained his authority by military force. Romans became citizens in name only, they were really subjects. It required two hundred years, years in which the stern repression of a Tiberius or Claudius alternated with the licentiousness of a Nero or Caligula, for this military dictatorship to become a really benevolent despotism. By that time the people of Rome had become so oriental-ized, so accustomed to palace scandal and intrigue, so dependent on government, so regimented and lacking in initiative and in public spirit, so hopelessly demoralized and submissive and world weary, that there immediately followed on the death of Marcus Aurelius another hundred years of misrule, terror,

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

bankruptcy and weakness. The state became too weak to defend itself and its effeminate subjects appeared not to care. Government was no longer their affair. It was placed at the mercy of **military conspirators, freedmen, imperial favourites and retainers** and the barbarians within and without the borders of the Empire. The closing years of the Empire with its cultural decline, its loss of leadership, its political weaknesses, and with its barbarian masses, like all revolutionary parties, demanding more and more after each concession, is a vivid and enlarged picture of the typical revolutionary situation at any time. The final seizure of power by the barbarians is in essentials the prototype of the Revolutions of 1789, 1917, and 1932.

In an earlier chapter I said that there is a relation between revolution and the decline of culture. This cultural loss, all propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding, is discernible in both revolutionary Germany and Russia today. The barbarian invasion was characterized by much the same psychological attitude toward civilization as that of Rousseauist antipathy to culture in much contemporary revolutionary propaganda. At the close of the fourth century A. D. it put an end for hundreds of years to such civilization as remained in Western Europe. But culture was already on the decline in the Roman Empire, and the decline, as is the case with most revolutions, was one of the causes of the final catastrophe.

For a time, during and immediately following the Augustan Age, there were ostentatious gestures of cultural interest. But even poets like Virgil and Horace found it necessary to sing the praises of the ruling family. Architects were busy, but their work was mostly a massive, sombre imitation of the Greek style. The same is true of sculpture. The decline of this art in the second century A. D. may be observed in those remains to be found today in almost any museum collection of classic art. Art was not free. Neither were literature and philosophy. Note the fate of Seneca in the reign of Nero. Soon the art of Rome lost whatever originality it had ever had, and became an imitation of decadent Hellenism. In literature this decline began early. A

REVOLUTION DESTROYS A CIVILIZATION

few historians like Tacitus, Suetonius, Plutarch, lingered on. But creative genius practically ceased to appear. Lucian in the second century is almost the last great writer of Rome. The Augustan Age does not compare with that of Pericles four centuries earlier. Men had been free in ancient Athens.

But if liberty were dead in Rome, there was at least a sense of relief that the century of revolutionary strife and civil war was over. There was peace. To be sure, it was a Roman peace. But men of Augustus's time were grateful for that and they could still look forward to an era of good will, as is indicated in the *Eclogues* of Virgil, and the angelic chorus of Bethlehem. The peace was broken in the uprising against Nero, and again at the time Titus conquered Judea. But in general it held even though there was required a vast army "all dressed up and no where to go." Vespasian sought toward the close of the first century to modify somewhat the rigours of the dictatorship. Neva restored to the reconstituted Senate some measure of its former power. Trajan in 101 A. D. endeavoured to revive as much of the old aristocratic republic as was consistent with imperial rule.

In a sense the rule of the great emperors of the second century was reactionary and counter-revolutionary. But it was better government, and nobody seemed to remember or care much about the lost enthusiasms of the people's revolution against the old senatorial party. As frequently happens after the homicidal passion of revolution quiets down, members of the scattered older nobility were invited to return from their exile in the provinces. The names of Brutus, Cicero and Cato were again honoured, and men of ability were encouraged to make their contributions to civilization. Pliny wrote that in Trajan Rome had found at last a prince who did not fear men of eminence—an indication that the popular revolution was drawing to an end, and tyranny passing beyond its first crude states. There was also under Hadrian the enactment of needed social legislation. Public education was provided, orphanages established, and great sums of money were expended on public works and unemployment relief. Liberty of conscience, however, had

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

not been restored. The correspondence between Trajan and Pliny shows that there was some official prosecution of the new Christian sect about this time, although the Emperor seems to have resorted to persecution reluctantly and instructed his agent to ignore the new sect whenever possible and to inflict punishment upon Christians only when they were convicted of crimes other than that of membership in the sect.

These general policies were continued by succeeding emperors during the greater part of the second century. Hadrian, who was emperor from 117 to 138 A. D., gave scrupulous attention to the duties of office, visiting every part of his vast empire, beautifying its cities, improving the civil service. But today one has only to walk among the ruins of Hadrian's enormous "villa" near Rome, to discover how far the rulers had departed from "Roman simplicity" since that day when the popular assembly offered the crown to Julius Caesar. Antoninus, named the Pius, and the philosopher emperor Marcus Aurelius brought Imperial Rome to the highest levels of civilization the Empire ever reached. The death of Marcus Aurelius in 180 A. D. marked the end of good government.

Gibbon says that under the Antonine Emperors the Roman name was revered. The administrative officers were above the temptation to conquest. There was a general love of order and justice. Barbarian nations sometimes voluntarily sought to be included in the Empire. Government according to law had been restored. There was a general spirit of toleration, all religions were permitted. "The superstitions of the people were not embittered by the rancour of theological dispute." Among the intellectuals an urbane scepticism, like that of Lucian, was fashionable. The prevailing philosophy was that of Stoicism, with its splendid intellectual honesty, civilization of spirit, and rational living. This "philosophy of the gentleman" was shared by the leading magistrates, including the Emperor. As Gibbon says, an effort was made to realize the ideal of Plato's Republic, in which kings should be philosophers and philosophers rulers.

REVOLUTION DESTROYS A CIVILIZATION

The number of enfranchised citizens of Rome increased in this brief period from eighty thousand to four hundred and sixty thousand, a small portion of the population in an Empire of one hundred and twenty-five millions. This proportion was about the same as that which exists in Soviet Russia today. But the "privileges" of the Romans had been extended to all parts of the Empire. Slavery had been steadily on the decline since the end of the wars. Those who remained slaves were being rapidly granted their liberty. There was also a general gain in humanity and in civilized manners. Many of the larger cities of the Empire had become again self-governing. Good roads stretched to the boundaries of the Empire. The construction of public buildings and the work of popular education were being rapidly pushed forward.

But already, while Marcus Aurelius was emperor, there were disturbing evidences of decay. The public had lived too long under despotic rule. Men's spirits had been crushed in the destruction of their freedom and independence. There was a decline in intellectual courage and in genius. With the single exception of Lucian there was not one writer of originality in the whole Empire. The spirit of scientific investigation had declined. Even philosophers were under the spell of the authority of the past.

The death of Marcus Aurelius was followed by one hundred years of revolution, disorder and general bankruptcy. Commodus, his son and successor, in the brief reign of a few months undid nearly everything his predecessors had laboured to build up during the preceding eighty years. The reign of this monarch was so scandalous and oppressive that he was murdered by members of his own household, and Pertinax, one of the conspirators, was named emperor. Then the praetorian guard, allegedly acting in the name of the proletariat, established its own dictatorship and offered the imperial office for sale to the highest bidder. It is needless to say that the purchaser lived only a few weeks to regret his terrible mistake. The following

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

ninety years witnessed the rise and fall of eighty emperors in rapid succession. An inner decay had robbed Rome of her stability.

The government was unable to balance its budget. Even with increased taxes, it became necessary to sell the imperial jewels. Agriculture declined. The crushing land tax drove the independent peasants from the soil; many were reduced to serfdom on large estates and lost their resourcefulness and energy. Idle lands had to be tilled and barbarians were permitted to cross the boundary and settle as "coloni." Multitudes of idle peasants took refuge in the cities. There was scarcely food enough to keep the swollen urban population alive. The cost of living rose. Finally the government offered to give free land to any who would cultivate the soil. Even this measure failed, and the authorities were obliged to resort to enforced labour on the land. The once sturdy yeomanry now gathered in the cities became pauperized and had to be fed by the state. Once more there arose a vast idle urban proletariat, supported out of public funds and kept amused with circuses.

The population generally declined in numbers. Cities surrendered their charters and became dependent on Rome for the administration of their internal affairs. Citizens lost all sense of public responsibility; everywhere leading men turned away from public life, many of them to the church and to monasteries. The middle and professional classes were taxed out of existence and speedily sank into the ranks of the proletariat. There was general business and financial depression. There was serious shortage of metal for the coinage of money. Gold passed out of circulation. The government resorted to a policy of "inflation." Cheap money containing much alloy was put in circulation. Silver coins were reduced to a five per cent silver content. The denarius, worth about sixpence today, became worth less than one-half of one cent.

The government fell behind in the payment of salaries. The army was unpaid and became mutinous and demoralized. When the government could not collect taxes in money, it had to ac-

REVOLUTION DESTROYS A CIVILIZATION

cept grain and farm produce in payment of taxes. A vast system of government storehouses had to be built. Still there was want and starvation. The Emperor was obliged to keep a large standing army in Italy to maintain order, while troops stationed at the frontier were taken from their garrisons and put to work on idle farm lands. One province after another rose in rebellion. Roman citizens, Christian and non-Christian alike, declined military service.

It became increasingly necessary to recruit the legions from among the barbarians. But the barbarians were accustomed to a discipline quite different from that of Rome. They knew how to fight only in their own mass formation. So the military discipline and tactics which had been the strength of Rome since the beginning of the Republic were abandoned. Roman armies became like the barbarian hordes which they were paid to hold in check. The new soldiers became the terror of the townsmen among whom they were stationed. These barbarian troops became the only powerfully organized body in the state. They soon discovered that they could make and unmake emperors. Barbarian soldiers rose to positions of the highest authority in the government. And barbarian soldiers had little respect for the emperors who were their own creatures. Daily the ignorant and foreign masses gained increasing control over the state. Persecution was revived as religious controversies spread.

As Breasted says, "The supremacy of mind and of scientific knowledge won by the Greeks in the third century B. C. yielded to the reign of ignorance and superstition."

After the death of Caracalla in 212 A. D., the army itself broke up into factions. In several provinces at the same time there were rival claimants to the imperial throne. Most of these so-called "emperors" were little different from Mexican bandits of the early twentieth century. In the weakening of Roman order, the northern barbarians saw their opportunity. Then there began that process of the strangling of an entire civilization in Western Europe by envious multitudes who could not comprehend its values and were too ignorant to appropriate to their own ad-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

vantage even the material wealth which attracted them. When a lower type of man displaces a higher type, either as invader or as social revolutionist, there is only one work left for him to do—destruction.

The Eastern Goths attacked the coasts of the Mediterranean. Other bands of marauders overran Greece, leaving desolation behind them. Tribes from the North wrought havoc in Gaul, Spain and Northern Italy. The vandals crossed over from Spain into Northern Africa. Their numbers daily increased, as they moved eastward, by camp followers, criminals, adventurers, and mobs of the unemployed. Cities were burned, while thousands, many of whom had never before seen a city, stood by and laughed as temples and palaces crumbled in the flames. Priceless statues and marble columns were ground to pieces to make plaster for mud huts. The people of plundered lands, seeing the Empire unable to protect their lives and homes, organized in their own defence. The reign of law gave way to the rule of force. All through the provinces cities of Greek and Roman design with their broad streets, sanitation, baths, open spaces, public forums and buildings devoted to the arts of civilization, were abandoned to ruin. The population sought refuge in fortified hill towns, huddled together within stone walls. Gaul seceded from the Empire. Asia Minor, Syria and part of Egypt broke away and formed the short-lived Kingdom of Palmyra.

In 284 A. D. Diocletian became Emperor of Rome. This man of iron rose from the rank of common soldier in the provincial army of the Balkans. He is said to have been of African descent. His rule was a mixture of oriental despotism and planned economy. He deprived the Senate, already reduced to the functions of a local board of aldermen, of its last vestige of power. In the midst of general poverty he adorned his despotism with all conceivable regal splendour. He was crowned with a royal diadem. Before his high throne there was a footstool before which all who came into his presence were required to lie prostrate in the dust. He decreed that he be worshipped as the Sun God, and ordered that his birthday, the twenty-fifth day of De-

REVOLUTION DESTROYS A CIVILIZATION

ember, be celebrated throughout what was left of the Roman world. Again the public was given bread and entertained with circuses.

Diocletian created a thoroughly bureaucratic system of government. Taxes were increased until private property was almost confiscated. Business was ruined. The government resorted to those oriental methods for raising money which had been used by the kings of Babylon and Nineveh. A number of the most prominent citizens of each town was selected and compelled to provide the government with an allotted sum or suffer the severest penalties—no matter what methods were used to raise the money. Working men were put to forced labour under government taskmasters. And just as occurs in Russia today, whole villages were compelled to emigrate to new regions selected by the government for their residence and their labours. Wages and prices were arbitrarily fixed by bureaucratic enactment. Public officers, concerned with keeping up general morale and efficiency, kept an eye on the humblest citizen and regulated all he did. In Diocletian's "planned economy" the individual had almost no other function in life than to toil for the state, gaining a bare existence with a standard of living about like that of the peasants on the Nile in modern times. All cultural progress in the ancient world came to a standstill with Diocletian. There was no more art, or letters, or freedom of thought.

It was under Diocletian that the ancient Christians endured their severest persecution. During the first years of his reign, the Emperor was friendly to this sect. According to Rainy and Neander, he seems at first to have granted the bishops special favors and to have used them, wherever possible, for the furtherance of his plans. Suddenly he sought to exterminate the entire sect.

The historians suggest various motives for this change. He may have sought popular favour by yielding to the pressure of the non-Christian mobs. Christians at this time were popularly suspected of abominable secret practices, and were often hated because of their puritanical censoriousness, their disputatious

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

spirit, their doctrinaire habit of mind. Christians also refused to participate in public festivities, and although individual Christians could be found in all walks of life, in general they refused to bear arms or cooperate with the government. In fact they were developing an ecclesiastical government of their own within the state. They attacked the state religion of which the Emperor was high priest, refused to worship his image or obey such laws and decrees as conflicted with the Christian conscience. They were known to have torn down public notices announcing pagan ceremonials, to have caused riots in front of pagan temples, and on occasion to have attacked and desecrated the very altars of the gods.

Since the days of Marcus Aurelius the Christian sect had greatly increased in numbers; it carried on a very active propaganda and its growing sense of power sometimes led its members into ill-advised and coercive behaviour toward their neighbours. That Christians were not always meek and long-suffering we know from accounts we have of the quarrelsome nature and sometimes even homicidal results of their theological controversies among themselves. Moreover, many Christians were foreigners, some were of Jewish ancestry. The cult itself having had its origin in the ghettos, Christians were frequently regarded by the mob as Jews and suffered from the same episodic attacks of anti-Semitism to which ignorant gentile majorities are often subject.

Or it may be that Diocletian regarded the Christian sect as seditious and revolutionary. That there may have been more or less open Christian opposition to his laws is not unlikely. From the beginning these believers had declared it necessary to obey God rather than men. It would have been impossible for Christians to follow the dictates of a conscience which condemned most of the practices about them without coming into at least passive disobedience of law. There was a certain "antinomian" element in their religion—a certain contempt for law and the powers of this world.

The Christian believed he had been raised up by divine

REVOLUTION DESTROYS A CIVILIZATION

grace, above the law of sin and death. He was taught in his Gospel to "call no man Master, for *One* is your Master." His religion frankly challenged the entire "present evil world," or social order. He did not hesitate to pronounce its doom. "Babylon (the Christian cryptic name for Rome) is fallen." Even as intelligent a writer as Tacitus spoke of the Christians as "enemies of the human race." They watched and prayed, waiting for the Messiah to return "as a thief in the night," overthrow the "kingdoms of this world," put down the mighty from their seats, exalt those of low degree and establish the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. Julius Caesar, shortly before his death, had outlawed secret societies; and it was always a question whether the Christian church, ostensibly organized as a burial society, yet practising peculiar ritual and holding its mystical beliefs, did not carry on its activities in violation of the law.

As people in time grew to despair of the proletarian revolution which had overthrown the aristocratic Republic and established the dictatorship of the Caesars, much of the older revolutionary enthusiasm and hope of a better world was transferred to the growing cult of Christianity. "Wait I say on the Lord." We shall find that whenever in the history of Christendom there have been periods of revolutionary activity, there has also been an attempt to revive the spirit of primitive Hebraic Christianity. From the Roman point of view Christianity was but one among many of the eccentric eastern cults which thrived among the lower classes, all of them more or less dangerous to the state.

When a government—especially one which lays claim to absolute authority—attempts to suppress a movement which it regards as seditious, and fails, it seriously weakens its prestige. This is just what happened when Diocletian sought to stamp out the Christian religion. The cruelty of the persecution made martyrs of the persecuted, and served only to justify their cause, keep Christianity a live issue, spread its propaganda and gain sympathy for it. In the end the policy had to be given up. The Christians had beaten the power of Rome and they knew it.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

Henceforth, as happens with similar crowd movements, they were determined to capture Rome.

An edict was issued at Milan in 313 A. D. repealing the prohibition against Christianity and declaring universal religious toleration. But mere toleration was not what the Christian sect now desired. From the day the Christians came out of their hiding places they insisted that Catholicism be recognized as the established religion of Rome. Their official representatives could now speak for a powerful organization. They demanded for the churches various special favours from the government. They became a power in imperial politics with which emperors must henceforth reckon.

Perhaps one of Diocletian's motives in trying to destroy the church was the hope, subsequently entertained by numerous princes in Christendom, of seizing its wealth. It was said that the church as an organization was growing rich. Many rich Roman converts gave their property to it. No less an authority than Saint Jerome gives us an account of the questionable methods sometimes used by clericals to induce people to endow their religious organizations. By the end of the third century the clergy, set apart from the body of laymen, became definitely a ruling class in the church. This ruling class had developed its own hierarchy of deacons, priests, bishops, archbishops. In their method of organization one discovers the Roman habit of mind of achieving unity out of diversity through government imposed from above. The church, when it emerged into freedom, was no longer free in itself. It had copied the very bureaucracy of the imperial government of Rome. The Empire now had a rival spiritual empire within its boundaries. Gibbon and other historians have thought that the church contributed materially to the final downfall of the Empire.

Constantine made every concession possible to the priests without actually making the Catholic church the established and official religion of the Empire, or without himself becoming a communicant. But his concessions, instead of bringing peace to the tottering Empire, only increased strife among its

REVOLUTION DESTROYS A CIVILIZATION

various Christian sects. Beneath the surface of violent theological controversy there arose a life and death struggle for imperial favour between two great parties within the church. For the sake of the public peace, Constantine in 325 A. D. called a council of representative churchmen at Nicaea to settle the dispute and determine the official statement of Christian doctrine. Eusebius who was present at this council suggests that the Emperor himself sought to settle the controversy by imperial intervention. If so, both Constantine and later Constantius wavered, for we find imperial favour being given at one time to the party of Arius and at another to the Athanasians. In one form or another such doctrinal conflicts disturbed the Empire throughout the remainder of its unhappy existence.

The power which the Christian sect had since the issuance of the Edict of Milan come to exercise over the rulers of the Empire was manifest when the youthful Julian, successor to the imperial throne of Constantius, tried in vain to withdraw the special favour of the Emperor from the Catholic religion and revive in some measure the traditional religious ceremonies of the Roman people. Julian, who was a trained student of the Stoic philosophy and enjoyed the support of some of the ablest philosophers and scholars in the Empire, succeeded only in arousing the open hostility of mobs in the streets and gaining the accursed name "apostate." Julian was a mild mannered, civilized man; there is no evidence that he persecuted the Christians, though Milton said that he did forbid them to read the non-Christian classics. His attempt to restore older temples led to religious riots. On the occasion of his visit at Antioch and Ephesus, he was reviled in the streets, the mob burned the temple of Apollo in the Grove of Daphne and destroyed and looted the great temple of Diana which had been considered one of the wonders of the ancient world. Julian, then, in order to divert public interest and restore his popularity, organized a military campaign against the Persians. He was slain in battle and tradition has it that his last words were "Galilean, thou hast conquered."

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

After Julian, the emperors capitulated to the church, Whether or not this capitulation hastened the course of barbarous revolution which speedily brought an end to Roman civilization, there is no evidence that Christianity was really effective in preventing the catastrophe. From the very day Rome became officially Christian, the course of events leading to its downfall moved with accelerating speed.

Theodosius in 395 A. D. was the first emperor to be baptized as an orthodox Christian. Catholicism then became the official religion of the Empire. A decree was issued not only establishing the church but outlawing all other religions, just as Christianity had once been outlawed. And not only was Christianity accepted, but universal acceptance of official belief was required by law. "We brand all others, except Catholics, Christians, Trinitarians—with the infamous name Heretics." For the first time in Roman history, heresy became a crime and severe penalties were provided to suppress liberalism in matters of religion. Even Diocletian did not persecute the Christians for doctrinal reasons. All kinds of separate national religions were permitted in Imperial Rome. Christians were persecuted because of their alleged sedition. Now Christians persecuted not only non-Christians but also the heretic within the church. Those radicals who today condemn liberalism for its alleged lack of conviction and believe that only rigorous indoctrination can strengthen the will of a people, might do well to remember what happened to Rome after Theodosius.

To be sure the temples of the gods were deserted and demolished, but much heathen superstition was carried over into Christian belief and practice. The dictatorship of the church was not different in some respects from other dictatorships. When all their ancestral customs were forbidden, people became terrified. This requirement, like most revolutionary sudden changes, upset their habits of self-control. Pagan ceremonies were often practised secretly. Thousands, as a consequence, lived in fear of their neighbours. There was suspicion, malicious curiosity, spying. Laws were passed imposing penalties on all

REVOLUTION DESTROYS A CIVILIZATION

who should fail to reveal to the authorities any evidences of idolatry they may have discovered. As a result the churches were filled with insincere, ignorant proselytes, whose presence tended to lower the general standards of Christian living and cheapen the quality of faith.

Belief declined into credulity. Childish miracle stories and the worship of the saints became popular. As the establishment of the church tended to degrade its religious life, so in turn did it still further weaken the Empire. Many sincere, intelligent men and women became disgusted with the whole prevailing mode of human existence and, like Jerome, sought seclusion in the wilderness. The life of ascetic denial of the world attracted thousands who might otherwise have devoted some part of their abilities to the good of the state. It is significant that just at the time when Christianity became officially triumphant, literally hundreds of thousands of men and women were impelled to abandon home and family and property and to seek the spiritual life as hermits and monks and nuns. During this period the wave of monasticism attained epidemic proportions and was often manifest in extreme forms of solitary exile, voluntary poverty, self-denial and self-inflicted torture.

The cultivation of the monastic virtues of poverty, chastity, obedience, of seclusion and contemplation, had in turn certain effects on the mind of the ordinary lay public. The ascetic was often regarded as a holy person possessing miraculous powers. Monkish virtue came to be regarded as something which could be enjoyed vicariously by worldly believers, merit being transmitted to sinners through faith and prayer. The monastic virtue, though often characterized by heroism and saintliness, tended to emphasize a negative kind of goodness: meekness, abstinence, innocence, long suffering, non-resistance, penitence, credulity, unworldliness.

But what Rome needed at this time, when peace and order were threatened on every frontier, was a reassertion of those republican and patrician virtues which had been the strength of the nation in the days of the elder Brutus, of Scipio Afri-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

canus, of Regulus and Cato—virtues of self-mastery and discipline, devotion to the common good of the state, wisdom and courage and temperance and justice. All the achievements of a thousand years of civilization were in jeopardy—the wisdom of a Socrates, the poetry of a Homer or Virgil, the drama of an Aeschylus and Euripides, the statecraft of a Cicero, the master ethics of an Aristotle, the science and architecture and manners which the Romans had learned from the Greeks.

Meanwhile the imperial palace had fallen into petty intrigue, the legions were made up of barbarian mercenaries, there was secessionist jealousy and rivalry between Rome and the new capital of Constantinople. The government was bankrupt and industry was at a standstill, while monks prayed in secluded cloisters and prelates struggled with one another for political influence. Theologians wrangled over the Donatist heresy or leveled anathemas at Nestorians, while public attention was occupied with magic and miracle and the fear of eternal punishment.

Then came the end. It came with fire and blood and terror. It came with the running feet of mobs, with the shrieks of the dying and the curses of savage men. On the embers of what had been the capital of the world the long night of the dark ages closed down. As often happens the end came swiftly and was precipitated by trivial events. The Goths fleeing from the Huns had crossed over the Danube, then guarded chiefly by German soldiers. These Goths were permitted to settle within the Empire; more followed; Roman armies were defeated at Adrianople. Rivalry between two imperial officers over the guardianship of the minor sons of the deceased Emperor led to an appeal to the chieftain of the Goths for aid in settling the dispute. Rome was pillaged by Goths and Vandals. Barbarian hordes swarmed over all the Empire. Italy fell into the hands of Germanic tribes and Odoacer became German King of Italy; then this rule was passed to the illiterate Theodoric, King of the Goths. All semblance of empire had vanished and with it the culture of the ancient world. In 476 A. D. Justinian closed the

REVOLUTION DESTROYS A CIVILIZATION

schools of philosophy in the eastern part of the Empire and the university of Greek culture came to its end. The miserable condition of Italy was almost beyond description, cities became depopulated, their proletariat and artisan classes destroyed and scattered to become serfs of the conquerors. Agriculture almost ceased. It is said that in the once rich province of Tuscany, the human species had become almost extinct. Anarchy reigned over Western Europe where once men had known law and society.

Only the Catholic church remained, the church whose gospel had once condemned "the wisdom of this world," and had given men hope of a new social order to be established by Christ, in which the last should be first and the first last. It is an irony of history that the religion which in its beginnings defied the power of Rome, later became the custodian of such fragments of culture as survived the ruins of a world civilization. The church undertook the slow, painful task of civilizing the conquering barbarians and of rebuilding, after centuries of lawlessness, ignorance and strife, the foundations of another European civilization. The rebuilding must have seemed almost hopelessly slow and the concessions which had to be made to lawless, savage chieftains and superstitious mobs, even after their formal acceptance of religion, were often humiliating and disheartening. For a thousand years Rome remained a small second-rate city, half in ruins, the majority of whose ignorant population could not read the inscriptions on the crumbling buildings of antiquity and believed that occasional works of art dug up out of the débris had been specially created by the devil to tempt and deceive the faithful.

The slowness of the progress in rebuilding civilization is illustrated by the *Peace of God*, a compact which was drawn up at Cologne, in 1083, six hundred years after the capture of Rome. In this covenant the Christians made solemn agreement not to kill and plunder on certain holy days.

"Inasmuch as in our times the Church, through its members, has been extraordinarily afflicted by tribulations and difficulties, so

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

that tranquillity and peace were wholly despaired of, we have endeavoured with God's help to come to its aid, in the midst of its sufferings and perils. And by the advice of our faithful subjects we have at length provided this remedy, so that we might to some extent reëstablish, on certain days at least, the peace which, because of our sins, we would not make enduring. Accordingly we have enacted and set forth the following: . . .

"That from the first day of the Advent of our Lord through Epiphany, and from the beginning of Septuagesima to the eighth day after Pentecost and through that whole day, and throughout the year on every Sunday, Friday, and Saturday and on the fast days of the four seasons, and on the eve and the day of all the apostles, and on all days canonically set apart—or which shall in future be set apart—for fasts or feasts, this degree of peace shall be observed; so that both those who travel and those who remain at home may enjoy security and the most entire peace, so that no one may commit murder, arson, robbery, or assault, no one may injure another with a sword, club, or any kind of weapon. Let no one, however irritated by wrong, presume to carry arms, shield, sword, or lance, or any kind of armour from the Advent of our Lord to the eighth day after Epiphany, and from Septuagesima to the eighth day after Pentecost. . . .

"If a slave kills a man, he shall be beheaded; if he wounds a man, he shall lose a hand; if he does an injury in any other way with his fist or a club, or by striking with a stone, he shall be shorn and flogged. If, however, he is accused and wishes to prove his innocence, he shall clear himself by the ordeal of cold water, but he must himself be put into the water and no one else in his place. If, however, fearing the sentence decreed against him, he flees, he shall be under a perpetual excommunication. . . .

"The statute of this noble peace is especially enacted for the safety of those engaged in feuds; but after the end of the peace they are not to dare to rob and plunder in the villages and houses. . . .

"If any one attempt to oppose this pious institution and is unwilling to promise peace to God with the others, or to observe it, no priest in our diocese shall presume to say a mass for him, or shall take any care for his salvation; if he is sick, no Christian shall dare to visit him; on his deathbed he shall not receive the eucharist,

REVOLUTION DESTROYS A CIVILIZATION

unless he repents. The supreme authority of the peace pledged to God and generally extolled by all will be so great that it will be observed not only in our times, but forever among our posterity. . . ." *

It was revolution in the Roman Empire which finally destroyed the civilization of antiquity. Revolution ruined the Republic, established the dictatorship of the Caesars, under which, even with the benevolent despotism of the Antonines, the human spirit was broken, and men became dependent upon a state they were no longer competent to defend. Interest in public affairs waned. With the loss of freedom, culture declined. With the cultural decline of the citizenry, barbarism reappeared within the Empire. It was barbarism within and without the borders which had destroyed the state. The army played an important role in the fall of Rome, just as it does in all revolutions. There has seldom been a revolution in which the disloyalty of the army, either as a result of betrayal or breakdown of discipline, was not the deciding factor. In Rome, the army first came under the command of unscrupulous politicians who were elected to office by a revolutionary proletarian party. Thus the Republic came to ruin and military dictatorship followed.

At first the Emperor used the army to subdue the populace. After the time of Marcus Aurelius, the army dictated to the Emperor. And as the army became less and less Roman in character and more and more barbarian, discipline was relaxed. Barbarians rose from the common ranks and became emperors of the Roman world. This new government caused widespread poverty and depleted the treasury. But these economic factors were not the direct causes of the ruin of the state. They served to weaken the authority of government, just as did Christianity, and other factors both social and psychological. No government can survive which does not know when and how to concede to the demands made upon it. There are conditions under which wise concession and compromise become primary functions of

* From Robinson, *Readings in European History*.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

government and increase its security. And there are conditions under which concession is suicidal. Examples of the latter are concessions to groups which themselves show an unwillingness to compromise, which defy the authority of law and give evidence of determination to seize the power of the state for themselves. Such groups only multiply their demands after each concession, and increase in sedition as their power increases. The alleged grievances of such groups, even when true, are not presented to be satisfied, but to compromise authority and justify the crowd's will to power. A wise government, like a wise parent, learns to foresee the ends toward which such crowd propaganda points and to avoid serious situations. The Romans sealed their doom when they permitted the Goths to cross the Danube and tried to use them in the settlement of their own disputes. After that the whole barbarian world knew that Rome was defenseless.

The behaviour of the invading barbarians, its transformation from respect to contempt, its exhibitions of long-nourished resentment, desire for wealth and power, assertion of barbarian rights and love of plunder and destruction, are all to be found again and again in the subsequent behavior of revolutionary crowds. Had the peoples of Northern Europe been civilized, they never would have behaved as they did at the end of the fifth century, and for many centuries after the fall of Rome. Rome would have remained the centre of power and culture just so long as its influence remained vital and genuine. Then, as Northern Europe developed, the centres of influence would have shifted to the North without breaking the continuity of civilization. Europe and America doubtless would be today much further advanced and happier than they are. Much is lost, when civilization, law and order break down, much that can only be brought back with great difficulty, for it is easier to destroy a civilization than to build one. It is no exaggeration to say that revolution in Rome set back the progress of Western civilization for a thousand years.

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

THE medieval system consisted of three irreconcilable elements. They were, first, the ways of the barbarian with his inherited traditions and his innate tendency to violence. Second, the genius for uniformity, organization, institutionalism and repression together with the mixture of romanticism, utilitarianism and puritanism which the Catholic church had derived from the Romans; for we must always remember that the Christianity and much of the civilization of Western Europe and America were transmitted to us through the influence of Rome on our barbarian ancestors. Third, there was a disturbing, world-defying gospel of spiritual inspiration, social millennium, and individual salvation, derived from the early Christian disciples.

These warring elements still exist in our culture—along with a fourth, derived from the Greeks through the Renaissance, and certain mechanical achievements of our own. This fourth factor, known as modernism, we shall discuss later; it need not concern us at present. It is doubtful if we have yet succeeded in bringing these conflicting ways of life into as harmonious an arrangement as did the thirteenth century. Then for a time all were brought together under the eye of Eternity to the end of the attainment of sainthood. But the harmony was never without strain and it did not continue. The medieval system was challenged long before it crumbled in the storm of the Reformation and the rise of secularism, nationalism and democracy.

The barbarism of the conquerors of Rome became transformed, in subsequent centuries, from the original savagery,

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

with its nomadic impulses, its customs and tabus, into the feudal system of land tenure based upon military organization and a bond of personal service and protection between superior and inferior. The church itself, in its missionary wrestling with barbarian chiefs, was forced to become a feudal land proprietor and to adopt many barbarian customs and superstitions. But it served to mitigate savagery and rapine with some measure of Roman legalism and Christian charity.

Roman law, surviving in canon law, taught the barbarians some respect for legality and order and some recognition of human rights, thus helping to prepare the way for the modern civil community. The conflict of prelates with princes, the former often championing the cause of the oppressed and supported by the powerful institutionalism of the church, first taught the rising nations that legal limitation to the power of the sovereign is a requirement of civilization. The church, with its historical community and institutional authority, was able to wear down dynasties and outlive them, giving barbarians respect for something above human ambition and brute force. Roman discipline, bringing as it did an increasing number of believers under the rigorous rules of monasticism, did much to tame barbarian passion and violence.

Originally the cenobites were not clergymen, but pious laymen. In the great wave of asceticism which occurred during the last two centuries of the Empire, it is not surprising that there should have developed various extravagances and irregularities. In the early part of the sixth century Benedict, an order-loving, spiritual Italian, established a monastery in the Campania and elaborated those Benedictine rules of life and organization which again brought the spiritual inspiration and ascetic life under Roman discipline. The monasteries were in a sense colonies of devoted Christians, seeking refuge from an evil world, devoted to meditation, prayer, human service, labour and the practice of primitive Christian communism.

Monasteries became places of refuge, they became missionary centres in the wilderness, about them the forests were cleared

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

and the fields tilled, within them certain of the cultural interests of the lost civilization became sequestered. Such scholarship as existed in the early Middle Ages was chiefly that of the monks. Here historical chronicles were compiled, Latin manuscripts treasured and copied, and peaceful arts taught. Many of the monasteries gradually became centres of medieval scholarship and education.

The story of the conversion of the northern barbarians to the acceptance of Christianity is one of heroism. I have seen ruins of early churches in the Scandinavian countries which were equipped for military defense against the attacks of hostile savages. In the midst of successive raids of Lombards, Franks, Saxons, Germans, Normans, which occupied Central Europe for centuries, and in the feudal struggles for power which continued the strife and bloodshed, many new emphases had to be given to that gospel message which had once made its appeal to the ghettos and proletarian sections of the ancient cities of the old Roman Empire. Conversion was not always accomplished in sweet reasonableness. The terrors of eternal punishment were invoked at times, also myths, miracles and magic. Sometimes force and political pressure were also employed.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Christianity for many became little more than acceptance of creed and ceremony. The distinction between the Christians living in holy orders and those living in the world became sharpened. Great leniency and forgiveness were extended to the latter. In time the laxness in matters of Christian practice came also to characterize the behaviour of large sections of the clergy and the monks. The sins of the flesh, and of simony and of nepotism, crept into the administration of the church. Bishops and abbots were frequently appointed to their sacred offices by princes and barons as reward for military service or to secure their loyalty.

At the end of the sixth century, it is said the church owned one-third of the land of Gaul. Its holdings in other lands were doubtless equally great. Monastic orders prospered in wealth and influence. Monks became employers of peasant labour and

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

often lived in luxury and ease. Abbots sometimes put on armour and took to the field of battle. The profanation by gaming, carousals and lust, of sacred precincts devoted to prayer and spiritual contemplation, and the transforming of church buildings into military barracks, were not unknown. The general impression increased that the practice of the precepts of Christ was rare.

The first protest was demand for reform of the clergy and monasteries. It was in the demand for such reform that the social unrest of the Middle Ages had its origin. This unrest spread from protest against clerical abuse to revolutionary hostility toward the entire medieval system. The cry for reform, raised at Cluny in Burgundy in the year 910, was never again stilled until the long council at Trent which closed in 1563 affected the Catholic reformation and the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 ended the Wars of the Reformation.

As we look back upon the abuses and decline of medieval society, certain thoughts come to mind which it might be well for revolutionists of our times to ponder. What, in the light of these events, becomes of contemporary theories of the economic interpretation of history? Most of the demand for reform and social unrest in the Middle Ages was not aroused by economic issues. It seldom consisted in protest against the evils of monarchy and serfdom. Indignation was stirred rather by the moral delinquencies of those who had been set apart to perform the sacerdotal offices of salvation from sin. The battle cry was ever "Back to the original gospel of Christ and His Apostles." The Christian church had become barbarized by its contact with the barbarian peoples. This is also a thought for utopian idealists to ponder.

What revolutionary movement may be expected to keep faith with the people beyond the moment of its seizure of power, what revolutionary plan of human association or social reconstruction may we hope will, in the future, resist the forces of corruption? What scheme for the perfection of man is worth the price of the agony of revolution in the light of our knowledge

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

that the Church of Christ became contaminated by the very barbarians it sought to convert to righteousness?

Or again, what can be hoped for from our own barbarians today? Has not the history of the church in the Middle Ages shown that barbarism degrades everything which touches it? In all the long history of mankind, no movement has ever been so uncompromising in its opposition to the evils of this world as was the early church. With utmost heroism and at the price of martyrdom, it had been able to defy Imperial Rome while all the world lay prostrate at the feet of the Caesars. It had passed through the persecutions of Septimus Severus and Diocletian and emerged stronger than before. By inspiration and by precept and example, it was committed to a tradition of spiritual values with an intensity of devotion unequalled on this earth. Its moral precepts were supported by rigorous rules, by an all-seeing vigilance, by an efficiency of organization which only Roman ingenuity could devise. In matters of doctrine where it chose to assert its force, it could suppress heresy and schism with determination. It was convinced that it had a world to conquer and a heaven to gain by practising what it preached.

During the tenth century and after, it did set up its papal authority in defiance of barbarian kings and emperors, but not in the same spirit nor with the same results as its earlier defiance of Rome. The contest of the papacy and empire, while originally inspired by the spirit of reform, became a struggle for world dominion and political influence. In the end it aroused popular resistance to both state and church.

Explain the scandals of the Middle Ages as we may, say as we can with much truth that they were exaggerated and that medieval culture contained much that was beautiful and glorious, the fact remains that the church suffered through its attempt to Christianize the peoples of Northern Europe before they had become civilized. It was obliged to lead Europe to culture along the path of miracle and magic and the supernatural.

In the ancient world the course of procedure had been just the reverse; Christianity appeared after the Greeks and Romans

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

had learned the ways of civilization—in fact after their cultures had passed the zenith and were sinking into decline. Among the barbarians Christianity was the voice of an old and world-weary spirit, seeking to direct new peoples in whose experiences were none of the profound pessimisms, disillusionments and subtleties of the sophisticated religionists of antiquity. And in the declining years of Roman society, the church had offered escape rather than championship of ancient culture. Its gospel narratives were preoccupied with the end of the ages, the renunciation of the body, spiritual regeneration, the Kingdom of Heaven. They show little, if any, interest in science, art, philosophy or statecraft. The world was corruption and the wisdom of this world was foolishness.

Confronted with the task of passing on to the barbarian nations the essentials of a civilization in which it had never been primarily interested, the church found itself in an occupation for which its previous experience had ill fitted it. That it finally achieved the culture of the thirteenth century is some justification of its belief in divine providence. For even though the church dramatized the world of the spirit and spoke the universal language of the human heart, its symbols had new meaning for the peoples of the great forests, its legends were misunderstood, and its admonitions often fell on deaf ears.

The institutional regulations of the church, its Roman habits which lingered on in Catholic Christianity, could overawe the barbarian, but at least they were as alien to him as had been the more visible empire which his ancestors had overrun in the fifth century. When Christianity as anything more than superstition did make vital appeal to the masses, it was usually because of that element in it which the people imagined had been the primitive Christian community with its spiritual protest against the powers of this world. It was this primitive Christian way of life and thought which inspired the revolutionary outbursts of the Middle Ages against organized state and church.

Here again we discover the relation between barbarism and revolution, even when revolution is rationalized in religious

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

terms. The student of the history of revolution in the western world may well have concern about the barbarism of our racial inheritance, barbarism which still lurks under the thin crust of our formal Christian culture. In very truth this culture was imposed upon our people by the Roman Empire and its successor, the Roman Catholic church. We differ from the Greeks and Romans in that we still live under forms of civilization which are not our own. There is something doubly pathetic in the belief of the German Nazis that they are vindicating by acts of brutality an imaginary Nordic Aryan culture. The very cathedrals and universities of Northern Europe, including those of Germany, are monuments to a lost Mediterranean civilization. Two thousand years after the Hebrews built Solomon's temple, the Germanic converts to Catholicism at Cologne proclaimed their covenant of the Peace of God as their highest conception of civilization. More than a thousand years after Plato and Phidias and Euripides and Gautama, the Buddha, and Confucius, and the author of the Book of Deuteronomy, no great teacher of this type had yet risen in Northern Europe. The early literature of the northern Europeans consists chiefly of romantic stories about military heroes. Seven hundred years after the death of Cicero, the Germanic and Celtic peoples were still living on a level very like that of the North American Indians of the seventeenth century.

No satisfactory explanation has been given for the long continuance of barbarism among our European ancestors. They seem to have had many contacts with civilization, yet for centuries they neither adopted older cultures nor evolved a civilization of their own. There is reason to believe that Phoenician merchantmen had visited the coasts of Great Britain and Gaul long before the Christian era. Northern European tribes had been in occasional contact with the outposts of Greek and Roman civilization for many centuries, and hundreds of years after the official acceptance of Christianity, Europe was still half barbarian. Thomas à Kempis could be murdered in the sanctuary of Canterbury, Nuremberg had its torture chamber, Henry

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

the Eighth and the dukes of Guise remained barbarians under the skin. Ghibelline noblemen engaged in building the towers of San Gimignano. Citizens of Perugia, under the temporal rule of the Pope, used to spend Sunday afternoons throwing stones at one another in the streets.*

When Marco Polo at the beginning of the thirteenth century crossed the desert of Gobi and visited the Great Khan in the Tartar capital of China, he returned with accounts of a civilization so far in advance of that of Europe that few people could believe him. The thirteenth-century culture itself was in part the result of the Crusades in which, during two hundred years of fighting to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from the "infidel," Europeans learned something of the culture and arts of the Arabians. Before the Renaissance, the great centres of learning in Western Europe were located in Spain and were almost wholly Mohammedan and Jewish. All attempts, I know, to prove there was culture during the "dark ages" only show that there was still left some memory of ancient learning in a monastery, here or there. The culture of Modern Europe is largely a result of the Renaissance, and the Renaissance was known as the "revival" of the learning of Greek and Roman antiquity.

Not only were the peoples of Northern Europe the last to adopt civilization and attain world-wide importance, but our culture seems to be less original with us than were the cultures of those who preceded us. Chinese culture was essentially the work of the Chinese. The civilization of Egypt was created chiefly by Egyptians, that of Judea by Judeans, that of Persia by Persians. The Greeks and Romans, no doubt, borrowed much, but they added much that was their own. The fact that we of European ancestry are different in this respect probably accounts for many of our cultural anomalies: the fact that we so commonly believe one thing and practise another, that "culture" still seems to most of us to be a genteel luxury, that art is idiosyncratic, that the public is interested in learning chiefly for utilitarian reasons, that thousands become criminals and neurotics without the teachings of traditional religion, that the

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

populace is on the whole content with false values and second-rate ideas, that we seek protection against ourselves by means of censorship and prohibitions, that the surface of social life has but to be ruffled for mob violence to break through the crust, that revolutionary propaganda is shot through with Rousseauist dreams of return to nature, that revolution releases the barbarian in us.

As the social abuses of the Middle Ages were largely the result of the half-suppressed barbarism of Europe, so the attempts to eradicate these abuses were commonly defeated by outbursts of this same barbarous spirit. The reforms begun at Cluny were attempts to recover original Christianity as men of the eleventh century understood it. In the monasteries the rules of poverty, chastity and obedience were again enforced. Female visitors, gambling, hawk hunting, luxury, were prohibited. Monks were forbidden to engage in the business of the merchant or soldier, since it was held that these enterprises "could not be carried on without sin."

The monk Hildebrandt, Gregory the Seventh, in 1073^{*} was elevated to the papal throne as a result of the clamour for reform by the common people of Italy. Gregory was by birth a commoner and his outspoken denunciation of those in high positions in church and empire made a strong impression on the masses. "Who does not know," he said, "that kings and princes derive their origin, not from God, but from arrogance, robbery, cunning and murder, and from crimes of every description." According to Neander, his exposure of the sins of the higher clergy was equally devastating. "There is hardly a bishop," he said, "who has obtained his office honestly." Hence "nearly the whole world is lying in such wickedness that all seems to destroy the church."

In one sense the reformist activities of Pope Gregory were the expression of a movement of common men, laymen and lower clergy against the nobility, and the princes of the church and the Empire. The Empire, the Holy Roman Empire, of the Middle Ages, was a very different thing from the old empire of

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

Rome. It was a sort of loose federation of German and Frankish princes presided over by a nominal successor of Charlemagne. This Empire and the church had become the ruling powers in Europe and it was over these that Gregory attempted to create a moral dictatorship. He determined to punish abuses. He blamed the evils of society on the bad example of the clergy. This idea of holding the rulers or the "system" responsible for the ills of humanity has often reappeared in revolutionary thought. John Milton reasserted it at the time of the revolution in England. It inspired the French cry "à bas les aristocrates" during the Revolution of 1789. It is in constant use today by radicals in their denunciations of "the capitalists."

Pope Gregory further placed great emphasis on the love of man as the foundation of virtue, and this emphasis, true so far as it goes, but lacking in insistence upon the necessary relation between virtue and intelligence, has been popular with democratic movements ever since. Wyclifites later made use of this doctrine in their opposition to prayer and fasting and the sacraments as means of grace. Nineteenth-century democrats revived the doctrine in their emphasis on brotherly love or right feeling over right thinking as guide in matters of public policy.

The Pope again expressed the point of view of the layman and the common man in his order prohibiting the marriage of the clergy. The man in the street, as Nietzsche once said, may easily be led by the nose in the name of "morality." To the masses, morality is almost identified with sexual tabu, and a furtive sense of guilt about sex is very common. So the idea is popular that celibacy is a characteristic of spiritual and moral superiority. Moreover, the offices of the church were becoming hereditary. Clergymen gained, through the operation of the feudal system, titles to church property and bequeathed such property together with clerical titles to their sons. In this manner the clergy tended to become a wealthy class and to forsake the common people. Gregory's requirement of celibacy was an attempt to check this tendency and to keep the clergy relatively poor.

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

The resulting conflict of the Pope and the people against the higher clergy and the wealthier members of the priesthood developed into a bitter struggle throughout Western Europe. The Pope in his determination to purify the church "showed no concern for those priests already found living in wedlock and who had families." Naturally such men resisted papal authority. The cause of the married clergy was championed by numerous kings and princes who had been in the habit of appointing their friends and relatives to lucrative church offices within their domains and so resented papal interference with what they regarded as their rights.

The Pope appealed to the people against their sovereigns and the appeal resulted in civil disobedience, a lesson which later revolutionists in their appeal to the masses never forgot. I have often heard men say that the great value of the Catholic church is that it is conservative and is always found on the side of law and authority. There were times in the Middle Ages, during the struggle between the papacy and the Empire, when this was not so. And there have been other occasions when it was not so. Müller, in *The Secret and Power of the Jesuits*, says that the very democratic doctrine that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed—a principle advanced by John Locke and appearing later in the American revolutionary Declaration of Independence—was promulgated by spokesmen for the church in their opposition to the protestant prince, Henry of Navarre. The doctrine was used to justify the revolt and disobedience of his Catholic subjects. Once the attempt of the Emperor to defy Pope Gregory quickly brought that penitent and humiliated prince to his knees before the Pope at Canossa.

The crowd in the eleventh century, in its hostility to the "corruptions" of the higher clergy, went to extremes of fanaticism and mob violence, which in turn reacted against the church itself. Heresies and new fantastic cults of all sorts appeared, which the church never again succeeded wholly in crushing out. Although the Pope won his point about the celibate clergy,

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

and succeeded to some extent in effecting much desired reform in the administration of the church, a force of popular anti-clericalism had been liberated which in certain circles continues to this day. From Gregory's time until after the Reformation, it became fashionable for malcontents, whatever the object of their grievances, to denounce the "immoralities of the clergy" and demand reform of the church.

As Neander says of this conflict, "How easily in a time of barbarism the people pass from superstitious veneration of the clergy, to fanatical detestation. On occasion of any calamity, a bad atmosphere, pestilence, failing of crops—the complaint is against the clergy." Gregory, having stirred up this opposition, now found it turned against himself. The spirit of revolution was again alive in the world.

In the Crusades we have a good picture of the violence and mob action of which medieval Christians were capable. After Gregory, crusading became epidemic in Europe for a century and a half. The mania for rescuing the Holy Sepulchre from the heathen blazed up quite suddenly after the preaching of Peter the Hermit. The movement was encouraged by Pope Urban II, no doubt for political reasons. On the occasion of his blessing the first crusading army, he urged his Christian soldiers to stop fighting one another and turn their weapons against their common enemy, the Infidel. So akin in its crowd appeal is the crusading spirit to that of revolution, that vestiges of it still survive in certain reformist and revolutionary movements of our own times.

Peter the Hermit, the monk later of Amiens, returned from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem about 1085. He had suffered great hardships, for the Moslems, after their capture of the Holy Land, had discouraged Christian pilgrimages to their country. Peter is said to have been a small man, somewhat deformed, terribly emaciated by fasting and self-torture, a truly religious fanatic. He passed through Christian villages riding on a mule. Everywhere he was an object of interest. Wearing a cowl, and barefoot, he incited the crowds to frenzied revival of religious

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

enthusiasm. Thousands everywhere flocked to hear his preaching of repentance of sin and his pointing out the way of salvation. The effect of his preaching was profound and startling. People burst into tears of religious ecstasy. Entire communities were swept into fervour, with symptoms like those which the crowd showed later at hearing the preaching of Savonarola in fifteenth-century Florence, and again in the terrified congregation of Jonathan Edwards at Northampton, and in the camp meetings on the American frontier many centuries after the Crusades. Rich people, hearing Peter preach, stripped off their jewels and cast them at the feet of the preacher. The converted clutched at his garments and even plucked hairs from his mule and kept them as holy relics.

This beginning of evangelistic preaching is historically important. With it began that technique of emotional, often ignorant, appeal to the masses which tended to reduce preaching to mere exhortation and propaganda and deprive the religious instruction of the people of much of its intellectual content. The method of mass appeal, later resorted to by Franciscans and Dominicans, led to Luther's severe denunciation of the preaching of the friars. Yet it was employed by the "poor preachers," followers of John Wyclif in England, who became the predecessors of the Wesleys, Cotton Mathers, and various other revivalists, demagogues and such-like, who have done much to make public sentiment what it is today. It is a matter of no small import for social psychology that the average American of British descent for one hundred and fifty years gained most of his notions of the world and of good and evil from ignorant, itinerant evangelists.

The sociological results of evangelism are many. It tended to keep alive in religion a spirit of fanaticism which not only led to the formation of numerous fanatic cults, but spread over into other fields of popular interest, such as patriotism, party politics, utopian ideas of human perfection and repressive crusades for so-called moral reform. It gave rise to numerous heretical and revolutionary movements during the late Middle Ages and

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

became a powerful weapon of offence in the hands of the leaders of the Reformation. By its tendency to represent the influence and ideas of the layman and the uneducated, and to substitute the leadership of the emotionally excitable convert for that of a trained clergy, it gave rise to the popular cult of sentiment and general distrust of scholarship and intelligence in public affairs. It developed those devices of popular oratory which were later used by demagogues and leaders of revolution. The historical connection between evangelistic preaching and revolutionary mob behaviour is not accidental. There is a causal relationship. From the beginning, such preaching tended to produce extremist and intemperate habits of mind, and easily led to mob violence.

It is paradoxical that the preaching of the gospel should lead to war and massacre. But history is filled with such paradox. Peter the Hermit provided repentant sinners with a definite and exciting programme of doing penance. He called upon his converts to march on Jerusalem and recapture the Holy Sepulchre. On the authority of the Pope he offered "plenary indulgence" to all who should join the military expeditions. He told lurid, horrible tales of the suffering of Christian pilgrims and stirred his hearers to a passion of revenge. The universal Kingdom of God was about to be established on earth and the armies of the Lord would be instrumental in its establishment.

The clever statesman knows how to take advantage of crowd movements, but he must calculate on more than immediately desired results. It happened about this time, 1095, that the Christian Emperor at Constantinople was greatly alarmed by the menace of increasing Moslem forces in Asia Minor and requested Pope Urban to come to his assistance in the defence of Christendom. In passing it perhaps should be said that the eastern and western Catholic churches had grown apart after the division of the Empire and the barbarian invasion. The schism was broadened by certain doctrinal differences. It has been said that Pope Urban had hopes of extending the authority of Rome over the eastern, now the Greek Orthodox church.

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

But motives of personal ambition are not necessary to explain the Catholic insistence on the unity of Christendom. The church had opposed schism from the beginning.

At the council of Clairmont, the Pope described the bondage of Jerusalem and the sufferings of the saints there. He urged the princes of the Empire, for the love of Christ, to take the sword and deliver the holy city. He announced there would be indulgences, forgiveness of sins, release from prison and debt, even from monastic vows, for those who should volunteer for service in the holy war.

Those apologists for the common masses who say that wars are forced upon an unsuspecting and naturally peaceable humanity by certain unscrupulous members of the "master classes" are evidently unacquainted with the history of warfare or with the psychology of the crowd. The day on which war is declared has usually become a day of public rejoicing. On hearing the first news that war is imminent, the eyes of men and women glow with excitement. A holiday spirit prevails throughout the land. People gain a new sense of the nobility of existence and of their own importance. There is a general sense of expectancy, of release of energy, and as nothing unites mankind so easily as the consciousness of a common enemy, the members of the community experience a new, thrilling feeling of fraternity and good will. So popular does a government which declares war become for the time being that rulers have been known to engage in war against their better judgment and risk defeat in order to gain the applause of the crowd.

In the eleventh century the crowds took up the crusade before plans could be made or provisions secured. Thousands of people, peasants and workers and clericals, men, women and children, the devout and the criminal, some armed, many unarmed, under the leadership of Peter the Hermit, poured into Constantinople on foot and on horseback and with ox carts. Sections of France were almost depopulated, so many left to become soldiers of the cross. Peter and his followers, knowing nothing of military affairs, believed that a great, divine miracle

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

would grant them victory. As they had taken few or no provisions, the good of the cause demanded that the peasants of the regions through which they passed feed them. The peasants of Hungary gave them a chilly welcome. Naturally there was suspicion and resistance, met by some acts of lawlessness and pillage. Thousands of the crusaders died of starvation or were killed before they reached Constantinople.

When the survivors reached Constantinople, the Greek Christians there, in turn, became alarmed and hurried them across the straits whence they began their fatal march over Asiatic hills and hot sands, through hostile bands of natives. Not one lived to behold the walls of Jerusalem.

But this was only the beginning of the Crusades. In the summer of 1096 the authorized and organized Army of the Cross reached Constantinople. This army was led by rich noblemen and financed by Christian kings. The Emperor of the East detained the crusaders for months until the leaders swore they would become his vassals. On the march toward Jerusalem, these Christian soldiers enjoyed the success of an Alexander and his Macedonians. They conquered a territory fifty miles wide and five hundred long on the east coast of the Mediterranean. When a city was taken, the leader who had captured it for himself was crowned king and often remained with his garrison of soldiers to keep open the line of communication.

After a year and a half, Godfrey de Bouillon reached and stormed Jerusalem with an army of twenty-five thousand men. The capture of the holy city was followed by one of the most bloody massacres in history. Mohammedans at prayer in their houses of worship were slain without mercy. The crusaders rode their horses into the great mosque in blood up to their bellies.

It is one thing to capture a city and quite another matter to hold and govern it in a distant land. The government of Jerusalem became a very worldly business. Many of the knights sent

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

out to give safe escort to pilgrims themselves turned bandit. In 1145 the Moslem armies recaptured much of the territory which the crusaders had conquered. A new crusade in 1147, which followed a religious awakening led by Bernard of Clairvaux, failed. The armies were betrayed at Antioch and not one in ten who had set out on the expedition returned to Nicaea. Bernard is reported to have said that the annihilation of this army was not an unmixed evil. Many criminals had joined the expedition; their behaviour throughout the campaign had been scandalous. Bernard found consolation in the thought that the futile expedition had rid the country of some of the worst elements.

In 1187, Jerusalem was recaptured by the Moslem chief, Saladin, a truly civilized ruler. Crusading had now become a gentleman's occupation. Three Christian kings joined forces and led their armies against the infidel Saladin. Louis the Ninth of France (Saint Louis), Richard Coeur de Lion of England, and Frederic I (Barbarossa). Frederic had been crowned emperor after he had agreed that Arnold of Brescia, popular preacher and critic of the higher clergy, be burned at the stake. The Crusade, like all revolution, was ceasing to be a mass movement and had been taken out of popular leadership. It is interesting to note that many of the noblemen who participated in this Crusade, including Frederic II, son of Barbarossa, after coming to know Saladin and holding philosophical discussions with his learned circle, became "free thinkers." Richard and Louis quarrelled. Richard, returning home, was made a prisoner in Austria. Louis reached Jerusalem but was obliged to abandon it.

Two subsequent attempts to capture the Holy Land were without result. Each of these, like the earlier attempts, had its origin in an intense religious revival. One, in 1201, led by Baldwin, became involved in war with the Christian emperor at Constantinople, remaining in that city sixty years. So far as I can learn, this crusading army never came into conflict with a Mohammedan force. The other, in 1212, was the famous

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

"children's crusade." This expedition, made up mostly of children, who had acquired the crusading spirit in a religious revival, was betrayed after sailing from Venice and its members sold into slavery in North Africa.

Like most mass movements, revolution included, the Crusades failed of their object. The results which followed were indirect and unexpected. The cultural interest broadened for many European Christians. The intellectual awakening of the thirteenth century followed. Universities were founded and were attended by thousands of students. Gothic architecture reached its maximum of perfection. There was a revival of interest in literature and in art, in science and in philosophy. With Saint Francis, there came to man a true revival of simple Christian piety and with Saint Thomas Aquinas a statement of Christian belief in intellectually respectable terms.

Meanwhile, other forces, forces of social discontent were gathering, which were destined to challenge the very existence of the medieval system. The reforms of Gregory VII and the Crusades had kept the mind of the masses in an almost continuous state of crowd excitement. War had called out new, unsuspected energies of the people. Evangelistic preaching, appealing as it did to popular prejudice and enthusiasm, had intensified mass sentiment and tended to render it militant. As popular sentiment became articulate, mass men tended to become class conscious. "When Adam delved and Eva span, who was then the gentleman." New and utopian ideas of the Christian community took hold of popular imagination. Occasionally the demand was heard for the restoration of ancient liberties.

During the long conflict between the popes and the emperors, popular respect for authority had been more than once shaken. Philip of France had said, "Let every man know that should the king show no signs of repentance, the Pope would, with God's help, use every means to wrest his kingdom from him." During the Crusades all the characteristic traits of crowd mentality were encouraged and, as those same traits are also

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

typical of revolutionary movements, it was only necessary for them to find new objects of resentment within the medieval system for revolution to break out in Christian Europe. The Crusades had been long and unsuccessful wars and, as I have said, such conflicts commonly precede revolution. Furthermore, it was impossible for conflicts between church and empire to encourage disobedience of civil authority without arousing partisan movements which cause the nations to become conscious of themselves as "the people" and renounce all worldly authority including that of the Pope.

Strange as it may appear, it was often the strong and sincere popes who encouraged this partisan spirit by stating the issue in terms which all could understand. The great Innocent III was such a pope. He occupied the throne of Saint Peter during the early thirteenth century. Much of the cultural and spiritual quality of living which distinguished that century was the work of this man. Innocent was no puppet of feudal politicians. He was a man of great ability, great learning, great force of character. He determined to put an end to chaos and anarchy. The distinction between temporal and spiritual authority was not as clearly drawn as it is now.

Innocent III conceived of the papacy as an international dictatorship or monarchy of the world. The church was an international brotherhood of man, based on the recognition of the spiritual meaning of life and the law of God. This was a time when men were occupied with building and constructing—building cathedrals, and cities, and systems of education and logic and theology. What Saint Thomas tried to do with the universe of discourse—organize it solidly under the idea of eternity—Innocent tried to accomplish for the practical life of man.

Civilization is impossible unless human life can be given some perspective and some goal; unless the cooperative achievements of mankind can be directed toward some commonly accepted idea of excellence; unless there is recognition of human personality and of spiritual aspiration. The cultural significance

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

of medieval Christianity lay precisely in that it stood for these things. Religion and culture for Catholicism were real and vital because they were integrated with the whole daily life of society. Catholic faith was the rock of ages on which the culture of the Middle Ages was founded. Catholic dogma controlled men's thought, Catholic authority regulated their morale and human relationships, Catholic tradition inspired their art, Catholic ideals of sainthood gave them something to live for.

What more logical than that kings and princes be brought to acknowledge the law of Christ and that the people of Europe, who had not yet become nationally conscious in the modern sense, be held together in unity, spiritual, ethical and political, under the leadership of the religion which had become woven into the fabric of their daily existence? To serve such a purpose is the proper, social office of religion, when religion is real. Give up this idea and one of two alternatives must be chosen; either faith becomes mere inspiration without form and shrinks to whimsicality and solipsism, or men must give up religion and learn to govern their lives by philosophy as did the wise men of antiquity.

History bears tragic witness of the terrible cost to the peoples of Europe of their failure to achieve some such internationalism as Pope Innocent attempted. Since 1470, Christian Europe has been cursed by more than twice as many wars as has the entire non-Christian world with more than twice the population of Europe. It is European and American Christians who have developed the homicidal technique of war. It is Europe which today lies in exhaustion from military strife, crushed under the burden of armaments, paralyzed by nationalist fears and suspicion.

However, the nations might likewise have had to pay heavily for the advantages of an ecclesiastically led internationalism. Who knows but that Europe might have become like Tibet under the rule of the Grand Lama? As it was, Pope Innocent's programme aroused much resentment everywhere. He interfered with the control of the clergy by secular princes, sent papal

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

legates to exercise authority over kings and bishops. In 1213 he became involved in a quarrel with King John of England, a quarrel which had important results. This king, by his evil character and despotic rule, had made himself a proper object of both papal and popular disfavor. When the Pope sought to appoint Stephen Langton Archbishop of Canterbury, John placed England in defiance of papal authority—thus setting a precedent for Henry VIII. But John, unlike Henry, did not enjoy much popular support at the time. All England was placed under the “interdict”—in modern language, the Pope ordered a general strike of all the clergy of England. The priests refused to perform any services for anybody except baptism and extreme unction. On papal authority, Englishmen were released from obedience to their King and the King of France was ordered to send forces to England to maintain the public peace.

The English rose in rebellion. King John, in terror, submitted and made an alliance with Rome for the purpose of subduing his rebellious subjects. But Englishmen, in disgust at the whole procedure, were not so submissive. Before order could be restored, the nobles forced the king to sign the “Magna Carta,” guaranteeing Englishmen certain civil rights and liberties and placing legal restrictions upon the power of the sovereign. This was the first constitutional bill of rights in England. Certain of its provisions remained the model for all subsequent liberal constitutions down to the abandonment of liberalism by the Russian Revolution of 1917. Englishmen never forgot this lesson. From the time of King John onward, there was talk of liberty, the rights of Parliament, and “the insatiable avarice of Rome.” This last phrase is quoted from Neander’s *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, a work which gives an extended account of the psychological effects of the struggle of the papacy with the secular princes.

From the beginning of the thirteenth century until the close of the Protestant Reformation, the peace of the church and of medieval society was almost continuously threatened by hereti-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

cal and revolutionary sectarian movements. The challenge to authority, both ecclesiastical and civil, became more and more widespread. Mass uprisings were no sooner put down in one part of Christendom than they broke out in another part. The social unrest was chiefly manifest among commoners, lower clergy and heretical members of monastic orders. The common people were beginning to have ideas of their own.

So widespread did heretical and sectarian movements become, that for the first time religious and civil authorities adopted severe methods to check the spread of heresy which threatened to destroy the very unity and doctrinal integrity of Christendom. The Dominican order was founded and took upon itself the special task of hunting down and eradicating the poison of heresy. Inquisition and persecution followed and the secular power was, on more than one occasion, led to resort to wholesale slaughter, military force and massacre, in wrestling with the growing spirit of revolution. The heresies of the period usually had political and sociological implications. Ordinarily they represented the common man's interpretation of the New Testament and were advanced to inspire and justify attempts to force society to live according to the literal precepts of primitive evangelical Christianity. The gospels when they came into the hands of men of the masses, became explosive propagandist material, greatly to the embarrassment of the church and the beneficiaries of the feudal system.

Among the earliest uses of the New Testament as a revolutionary document was that of the "Eternal Gospel" of the Italian monk, Joachim of Floris, and his followers. Joachim is said to have been the precursor of Saint Francis in the strict rules of poverty, purity of life and service which he gave to the order he founded. According to Beer's *Social Struggles in the Middle Ages*, he was an educated man. He had made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem during the Crusades, had become a monk and an abbot. He continuously devoted himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and enjoyed the reputation of a prophet. Beer has summarized Joachim's teaching as follows:

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

"The general condition of the world is corrupt, the mighty exercise power, their subjects are depraved. The priesthood has lost the perception of truth and rages against those who work for a revival."

It is easy to see what was understood by a revival. Joachim taught that the evils of society could "only be averted by a revival in the Church." The revivalists must be in orders which revert to apostolic poverty and renounce all possessions and worldly power. These orders shall send forth preachers to castigate not the subjects alone, but also the mighty and the rulers. Such a mission is urgently necessary, for a new age is dawning—"the age of the Holy Spirit." In proclaiming the new age of the Holy Spirit, Joachim's followers resorted to a kind of mystical pantheism which, however, served much the same purpose as does the theory of economic determinism for contemporary radicals. It dramatized history and made the revolution and the cooperative commonwealth appear both close at hand and inevitable. The age of the Holy Spirit "will be a state of freedom, of peace, of toleration, of communism—the age of the poor and meek, without classes and social distinction."

These ideas of Joachim spread widely and were elaborated by succeeding sectarian movements. The Amalricians taught that God is in nature, being Himself created in all things. Practically this doctrine led to a philosophy of "return to nature" not unlike that of Rousseau, "that whoever were partakers of the Holy Spirit were above the law; marriage and property were invalid in their eyes." Many of these new cultists were opposed to law and morality and the established order. The Pope was said to be anti-Christ, Rome was Babylon and the higher clergy were hated much as capitalists are today hated by Communists. Joachim himself, though he denounced the vices of the clergy, remained loyal to the church, but his doctrines were frequently imbedded in the propaganda of subsequent revolutionary movements. Among the ideas with which the preaching of New Testament Christianity was filling the minds of the people, were those of the denunciation of the existing system of society,

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

the prediction of the swift and violent end of the present world order, the communistic dream of a new age of the people.

Foremost among those who in the thirteenth century taught by precept and example the emulation of Christ was Francis of Assisi. Probably no character in Christian history has manifested the spirit of Christian piety and brotherly love as he did. Certainly he was no conscious revolutionist. He remained a loyal son of the church which later canonized him. Yet there is a sense in which Saint Francis bore the same relation to the revolutionary movement of the thirteenth century as that great disciple of simple Christianity of the nineteenth century, Tolstoy, bore to the Russian Revolution. There are certain striking psychological likenesses between Saint Francis and Tolstoy and Rousseau. All are on the side of inspiration rather than social order. All are champions of nature rather than civilization. Saint Francis was almost pantheistic in this respect, loving animals as his own brothers and preaching to the birds. All three championed the cause of the meek and lowly more than they seemed to have sympathized with those who had achieved cultural excellence. That is, all are essentially *un-Greek*.

Saint Francis on more than one occasion expressed contempt for the scholarship of the world; however, later Franciscans, notably Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus and William of Occam, achieved eminence as philosophers. It is interesting to note in passing that these three last-named philosophers—all of them British—did much, with their nominalist criticism of the scholastic system of Saint Thomas, to undermine the Dominican doctrines of Spiritual Oneness and prepare the way for the liberalism of the Renaissance and the scepticism of the eighteenth century. How the latter was associated with revolutionary doctrine we shall see later.

In 1206 Saint Francis sent out his followers to preach, to live in voluntary poverty, to beg: "They shall remain guests, pilgrims and strangers on the earth." Francis was anything but a preacher of strife, but the very voluntary poverty of the Franciscans was a protest against the rich and powerful Christians

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

of this world. The Franciscans rapidly increased in numbers. They had enormous influence over the so-called lower classes. Soon certain really heretical and revolutionary parties developed among the Franciscans—zealots, spiritualists, apostolic brethren. Near the middle of the thirteenth century John of Parma, then head of the Franciscan order, was deposed on charges of heresy and scores of his radical preachers died at the stake.

Within the century which was to follow, heretical radicalism had spread throughout Europe. Everywhere sectarian movements rose against the state and church and the existing order, all in the name of apostolic Christianity—The Poor of Lombardy, the Leonists, the Arnoldists, Cathari, Albigenses, Waldensians, Lollards, Hussites—scattered from Bulgaria to England. In the thirteenth century the most numerous of these sects were the Cathari (the Pure). This sect seems first to have appeared in the Balkans and to have spread rapidly into Germany, France and Italy. Its adherents appear to have held that the Sermon on the Mount was the only authoritative law of the land. Pacifists and non-resistants, they were opposed to all force. Many of them did, however, resort to civil war in self-defence when attacked by armed forces of the state and church. They carried out the logic of voluntary evangelical poverty into a philosophy of communism. In a sense they were pious, communist anarchists, rejecting every form of church and state and civil law. They were accused of attacking marriage, the family and property. Allied as this sect was with the Albigenses and disciples of Peter Waldo in France and Italy, the authorities recognized little difference among them. In 1237 the Holy Inquisition was established, in order to preserve the ecclesiastical and social structure of the Middle Ages. Conservative and propertied classes, educated Dominicans, robber knights, united with the scandalized rabble against the dangerous new doctrines.

At first, Dominican friars were sent among the Waldenses and Albigenses to persuade them of the evils of their ways. But these people had become accustomed to preaching and that of

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

the Dominicans had as little effect as denunciation of revolution in our newspapers has on Communists today. Persuasion having failed, the use of force was again put in operation. Hundreds of Cathari, Waldenses, etc., were hunted down, imprisoned, tortured, executed. Resistance to the Inquisition and other repressive measures led to civil war and open revolt in Bosnia and in parts of France, Italy and Germany. At one time a crusade was organized and three papal armies attempted to exterminate the radical sects with fire and sword. The villages and countryside of the Albigenses were laid waste and their inhabitants slain. Under Simon de Montforte an army of ten thousand soldiers, with severe fighting and general massacre throughout Southern France, was required to suppress the movement. Civil war and revolution were carried into Germany, Hungary and later Bohemia.

The radical movement spread to England. John Ball, in the fourteenth century, preached discontent in the following words:

"My good friends, things cannot go on well in England, nor ever will until every thing shall be in common; when there shall neither be vassal nor lord, and all distinctions levelled; when the lords shall be no more masters than ourselves. How ill have they used us! and for what reason do they thus hold us in bondage? Are we not all descended from the same parents, Adam and Eve? and what can they show, or what reasons give, why they should be more the masters than ourselves? except, perhaps, in making us labour and work, for them to spend. They are clothed in velvets and rich stuffs, ornamented with ermine and other furs, while we are forced to wear poor cloth. They have wines, spices, and fine bread, when we have only rye and the refuse of the straw; and, if we drink, it must be water. They have handsome seats and manors, when we must brave the wind and rain in our labours in the field; but it is from our labour they have wherewith to support their pomp. We are called slaves; and, if we do not perform our services, we are beaten, and we have not any sovereign to whom we can complain, or who wishes to hear us and do us justice. Let us go to the king, who is young, and remonstrate with him on our servitude, telling him we

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

must have it otherwise, or that we shall find a remedy for it ourselves." *

Wat Tyler's similar rebellion was crushed after much excitement in 1381. In the early fourteenth century, John Wyclif translated portions of the Bible into English and sent forth his "poor preachers"—evangelists who gathered the common people in conventicles, assembled in barns and the homes of peasants and poor artisans. The gospel of return to New Testament Christian living and social organization was proclaimed as it had been preached on the continent, and along with preaching the gospel there was denunciation of the Norman aristocracy and higher clergy of England. Here, as elsewhere in the Middle Ages, social unrest was rationalized in terms of religious propaganda. Dr. T. C. Hall says that by the time of Henry VIII, one-third of the population of England, chiefly in the middle and lower classes, was under the influence of the movement begun by Wyclif. Much of England was therefore Protestant long before the Reformation. It was Lollardism which made possible the Puritan party in the reign of James I and the Revolution in the reign of Charles II. It was the Lollard background of the early emigrants to the British Colonies of America which bequeathed to the republican tradition its mixture of puritanism, evangelism and democratic sentiment.

In 1415 the Council of Constance condemned John Huss, leader of the revolutionary movement in Bohemia, to be burned at the stake. His execution was soon followed by that of Jerome of Prague. The Hussites in Bohemia rose in revolt against church and empire, and in the bitter civil war which followed a large papal army was defeated. Then, as often happens in revolutions, dissension broke out between the more moderate faction and the extremists. While the divided Hussites were trying to destroy one another, it became comparatively easy for the imperial forces to crush both factions.

* Library of Original Sources.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

But even after all the defeats which radicals had suffered, social revolution continued on in continental Europe until after the Reformation. Beza, in his life of Calvin, tells us that this reformer came into bitter conflict with the antinomian cult of Anabaptists, who had survived the inquisitions and the crusades against the Cathari. Luther had much the same experience with the peasants' revolt in Saxony and Franconia. The very places in Germany where the early Reformation had received enthusiastic popular support, Rothenburg, among other towns, fell into the hands of lawless revolutionary mobs who demanded certain rights for their class and a social system based on the New Testament. It is said that Luther, in order to help the Protestant princes put down this insurrection, called upon the Catholics to aid them and that, in this abortive revolution, over one hundred thousand people lost their lives. The English reformers had also a struggle with the "Levellers," who insisted that, according to Christ's teaching, the rich could not enter the Kingdom of Heaven and that Communism was necessary to the practice of New Testament Christianity. Proof that the Reformation itself had its origin in the social revolutionary unrest which had troubled Europe for more than two centuries, is the fact that the reformers almost everywhere found it necessary to purge their movement of the elements of Communist anarchism.

The final revolutionary struggle of the Middle Ages which need engage our interest was that in Florence led by the Dominican friar, Savonarola. Dominicans were seldom revolutionary leaders. They had rather been the leaders of the Inquisition. Among them, Savonarola was quite the exception. A man possessed of fiery zeal, sincere desire to restore to Christendom the way of life of the early church, gifted with extraordinary power of evangelist appeal, exhortation and invective, Savonarola was one of the great popular orators of all time. And, as oratory was an art much encouraged in Renaissance Florence, he became preacher at the great cathedral church, the Duomo, in 1490. He later became prior of the monastery of San Marco,

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

where his memory is linked with that of Fra Angelico and Lorenzo de Medici. The Medici family had built this monastery and had given it to the Dominicans. Here Lorenzo retained for himself a modest cell and here the tolerant first citizen protected the friar when Savonarola's preaching against aristocratic luxury and the worldliness of the Renaissance had stirred the mob to violent hatred against the party of the Medici and against Lorenzo himself.

In 1499, Lorenzo, the magnificent, President of the Florentine Republic, died at the age of forty-three. With his death, there began a terrible revolution in Florence under the leadership of Savonarola which in the end destroyed the revolutionary leader along with the Republic, set back the Revival of Learning, drove out of the city the art and scholarship which had made Florence the centre of culture, and placed over the once free state the arbitrary rule of a grand duke and the Pope.

Since the twelfth century, civilization had slowly returned to Northern Italy with the gradual urbanization of the population. Medieval towns, under the artisan guilds, had grown into cities. These cities had prospered during the Crusades. They had grown strong enough to resist the Ghibelline nobility and had achieved a large measure of liberty and self-government. Here the bourgeoisie had developed an aristocracy of its own not unlike that of the patrician classes of Athens and Rome. For four generations the Medici—international bankers—had been the leading family in Florence in wealth, in culture and in statesmanship. Here had lived Dante and Petrarch, and Giotto and Ghiberti and Brunelleschi. Cosimo de Medici, father of Lorenzo, in order to assist in the unification of Christendom, had shortly before the fall of Constantinople invited to Florence John Paleologus and a delegation of Eastern prelates and Greek scholars. The ambition of Florentine youth turned to scholarship. Florence became almost the only city in Western Europe where the Greek language and literature were studied. The Medici led the Florentine nobles in the patronage of the liberal arts and philosophy. From the time of Botticelli to the death

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

of Galileo, a century and more later, almost every outstanding artist, philosopher and man of letters in Italy, and many from the North, like Erasmus, received aid and encouragement from the Medici. Palaces and churches and public squares were adorned with the genius of such men as Botticelli, Raphael, the Lippis, Perugino, Michelangelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Cellini. A Platonic Academy was founded in which the Medici gathered such scholars as Niccolo de Niccoli, Poggio, Poliziano, Pico della Mirandola and Machiavelli. Research scholars were commissioned to seek everywhere for manuscripts of ancient philosophers and poets. Authorship was encouraged. Hundreds of copyists were employed; the newly invented art of printing was utilized to scatter books all over Europe. Young, in *The Medici*, says that in the brief period of thirty years, chiefly through Lorenzo, this family spent a sum of three million pounds financing the Revival of Learning.

Lorenzo himself was a learned man. His poems in Italian were valuable contributions to the literature of Tuscany. He was everywhere honoured among learned men. His last words spoken to Poliziano and Mirandola were, "I wish that death might have spared me until I had completed your libraries." One has but to visit Florence today and become acquainted with his history to be convinced that a great cultural miracle was in process when Savonarola began preaching at the Duomo. Florence, even today, is different from all the world, for it was there that most which is best in modern civilization first gleamed through the mists of a half barbarous medievalism. Florence stands as a reminder that there is open another and better alternative to medievalism than futile attempts to return to the Apostolic Age. There is also the way of the civilized man of all times. I believe Florence made the cultural excellence of antiquity an inspiration to modern achievement and a challenge to the educated minority to shake off the last vestiges of the old Roman proletariat and the barbarism of the Middle Ages.

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

And Florence was free among the communities of the late Middle Ages. Free with that liberty which is tolerance and cultural achievement. The Republic whose sway had extended to all Tuscany and Pisa was independent. The government exercised authority by vote of all its citizens. Good workmanship and intelligence, not princely inheritance, were the paths to eminence and distinction and these paths were open to the youth of all ranks. Youth was happy and life was gay and full of song and pageantry and adventure. Citizen armies knew how to defend their liberty and more than once Florence had defied both prince and pope.

In 1478 the Pazzi conspirators, instigated, it is said, by papal intrigue, assassinated Guileano, Lorenzo's brother, in an attempt to kill the grandsons of Cosimo de Medici while they knelt at communion in the church. The conspirators were executed by the Senate and the Pope declared war on all Tuscany. Lorenzo, who barely escaped with his life, was excommunicated. The Florentines then repudiated the claims to papal authority and used their printing presses to publish throughout Europe an exposure of alleged forged documents on which the papacy based certain of its claims. The diplomatic skill of Lorenzo in gaining the friendship of Naples outmanœuvred the Pope. Lorenzo was elected to the highest honours in the state. The Florentines published a demand for the excommunication of the Pope and a call for a general council of the church.

But the new learning was not a gospel. It demanded of its devotees strenuous intellectual labour and discipline rather than mere conversion and penance. It was never popular with the masses. Charles VIII, King of France, invaded Italy and Lorenzo's son Pietro agreed to permit the armies of the French King to pass through Tuscany and attack the Pope and the King of Naples. Savonarola, from his pulpit, denounced the Medici and spoke of the French as "the scourge of God," sent to destroy Florence because of the worldliness of her rulers and the sins of her people. He urged immediate repentance and purification of the city. An infuriated mob drove the Medici into exile

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

and plundered their palace. Then, in the name of gospel religion, the populace turned its fury against the Revival of Learning. Savonarola ruled Florence, if government may be said to have existed at all, from the pulpit. The constitution of the Republic was changed to limit the power of the Senate and give supreme authority to an assembly of people.

The mob, when aroused, often becomes at once both licentious and puritanical. Savonarola's denunciation of luxury and worldly pleasure became, for the man in the street, a justification for hatred of the rich. Costly garments and jewels were torn from the bodies of wealthy persons. A huge "sin offering" of books, jewelry, wearing apparel, art treasures, paintings and statues, was heaped up in the Piazza della Signoria and burned. Outwardly in puritan garb, Florence within was in agony of spirit, with the excesses of a religious revival, partisan strife, lawlessness, and the usual quarrelling among the revolutionists themselves. For Savonarola, while denouncing the Medici and worldly scholarship and liberal arts, also thundered against the Pope, and well he might, for were not the sins of the Borgia the scandal of Christendom? Botticelli, in despair, burned many of his drawings. His later work, the "Madonna of the Pomegranate," need only be compared with his painting in the days of Lorenzo, to show what had happened to the soul of the painter. The joyful spirit had been killed. The picture shows the Christ child playing with the three nails and crown of thorns. The face of both child and mother show the pity and terror of world tragedy. Michelangelo's art lost its joy and became the portrayal of pain and struggle. Machiavelli, the political philosopher, left Florence in disgust.

But now the crowd discovered that Savonarola's reforms meant not only an attack on the nobility and higher clergy, but also restraint on popular liberty and self-indulgence. Savonarola's popularity declined. His enemies saw their opportunity. The Pope sent a delegation to Florence which was welcomed by the counter-revolutionary party. Certain Franciscans were induced to challenge the prophet Savonarola to an

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

ordeal by fire. The nature of such a challenge shows how close were the masses, even in Florence, to primitive barbarism fifteen centuries after civilized Romans had first built their villas on the Arno.

Savonarola, with some reluctance, accepted the challenge. Preparations were made for the ordeal and the whole populace became interested. Then the preacher declined the challenge and refused to submit to the ordeal. The crowds turned against him and attacked the monastery of San Marco. Savonarola was taken into custody and the government, once able to withstand papal interference in its affairs, now weakened by revolution, made ignominious submission to Rome. Savonarola was subjected to torture for sixteen days, convicted of heresy at a trial which was a mockery of justice, and hanged and burned, together with three other friars, in front of the Senate House near the spot where shortly before his followers had lighted the great bonfire of sin offering. The end of the revolution came thus on a May morning in 1498.

After the death of Savonarola, chaos continued, Florence came under the dictatorship of Soderini, there were the usual revolutionary tribunal, crime wave and despotism. A contemporary Florentine wrote: "It is difficult to imagine a city so thoroughly shattered and ill-regulated as ours," a typical description of the condition which has followed most revolutions in history. And what did all this bloodshed and terror accomplish? Nothing but the loss of culture and liberty and a temporary orgy of barbarism disguised as a religious revival.

Pope Julius II attacked the city with Spanish cavalry and conquered it. He restored the youthful Medici Giovanni and Guilio and the Florentine crowds gave them a joyful welcome. When the Medici came back they were different people. In their exile they had learned a bitter lesson. They had ceased to be republicans. Henceforth they placed their confidence, not in the will of the people, but in the papal armies. Giovanni and Guilio each in turn ascended the papal throne. Giovanni, as Leo X, was the pope of Luther's Reformation. Guilio, as

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

Clement VII, became involved in imperial political intrigue, quarrelled with his own city and sent an army to lay siege to it. Later he brought upon himself and Italy the wrath of Emperor Charles V whose army, composed of a rabble of Spanish Catholics and German Protestants, sacked and pillaged Rome in 1527. This event, together with the crowning of Cosimo de Medici, in 1537, as Grand Duke of Tuscany, under Austrian influence, put an end to both the Italian Renaissance and whatever remained of Florentine liberty. Already the fires of the Reformation had been lighted in the north countries where revolution and terror, fanaticism and war, kept Christianized barbarians occupied with mutual destruction for the following one hundred and twenty-five years.

I have not wished to give the impression that during the centuries of social unrest of the Middle Ages the great mass of European people became revolutionary at any time. They never do so in any revolution. All such movements are the work of determined minorities. The masses as such are essentially conservative. Revolution in the Middle Ages, like all revolution, was carried on with a propaganda which made it appear to be the revolt of the suppressed masses against the privileged classes. Revolt was first excited by the popes of Rome who appealed to the common people and often encouraged civil disobedience in the struggle of the papacy against secular rules. Popular unrest, once called into existence and rationalized by evangelistic preaching, became rationalized in terms of a longing to return to an imagined apostolic Christian communism. In the light of popular understanding of the gospels, both nobility and higher clergy were held up to popular scorn. Economic considerations had much less to do with such revolutionary movements than had certain fixed ideas. I believe this is always so in revolution. From medieval revolution that of modern times has derived much of its ideology. Modern revolutionists have also derived the habit of denouncing the evils of the existing social order and of condemning the system as a whole, the notion that the common masses are more righteous than their rulers, the

SOCIAL UNREST IN THE MIDDLE AGES

coupling of the will to power with moral indignation, the hostility to culture, the utopian dream of the Kingdom of Heaven as the age of the common man, the evangelistic belief that human habits and character may be transformed into perfection by mass action. The behaviour of the crowd in the Middle Ages would indicate that, while in rare instances the exception was the case, in general revolutionary crowds rapidly degenerated into barbarism, became divided among themselves and tended to extremes of fanaticism. Why did the rediscovery of the gospel of the meek and lowly Christ commonly fill men's hearts with hatred and defiance instead of Christian love? Had not the latent barbarism of Europe something to do with this paradox? I think it had—and still has.

Surely the experience of Christian history would indicate that the hope of human improvement lies along another path than that trodden by revolutionary crowds. These outbreaks of violence contributed nothing at all to the progress of the Middle Ages nor to the glory of Florence. They built no cathedrals, inspired no learning, painted no pictures, gained no liberties, righted no wrongs.

Several times in the history of civilization, mankind, through the teaching of the wise and the genius of the race, has risen to the condition in which Florence found itself at the close of the Middle Ages. Enough social capital has been accumulated to make possible a high standard of living and general culture. The peaceful arts of civilization and the general improvement of manners have begun to lend new grace and dignity to human living. The exercise of freedom has brought with it freedom of the mind and increase in wisdom. The evils and corruptions which in part have survived from a cruder age and in part inevitably appear in any social order are openly challenged, and it has seemed that with wisdom and courage such evils may be decreased and mankind take a long step forward.

But at that moment, it would seem that the cultural advance has asked too much of many men and women. Extravagant and impatient demands are made for a short cut to utopia. The

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

crowd, in its hostility to long-standing abuses, destroys both the advance of culture and many of the best men of the state along with certain social evils. In the chaos which follows the leaderless mass becomes divided against itself. New and often worse evils emerge and old ones return, the crowd loses faith in itself, turns to masters new or old. A dictatorship is established in which freedom is lost and tyranny and reaction and orthodoxy regain their hold on the human spirit. Is revolution the common man's reaction against the progress of culture? Perhaps it is in part, for the common man often bears most of the burdens of such advance and enjoys the smallest portions of the benefits. Does revival of popular religion then become for the common man a weapon in his resistance to a cultural advance which demands too much of him? Perhaps so. We shall see that revolution, even when it professes a propaganda of materialistic atheism, is a kind of religious revival gone wild. There is a quality of popular, half-mystical religious belief and hope in all revolution. It is just during those periods of rapid intellectual and cultural achievement, when the solution of social problems demands a maximum of intelligence and rational behaviour, that revolution is most likely to break loose and defy the orderly advance of progress. I am aware that these historical observations are somewhat at variance with the views of those moderns who hold that revolution is the last desperate resource of the progressive and enlightened masses in forcing necessary social advancement upon recalcitrant and backward rulers.

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

THE Reformation completed the cycle of revolution which began with Pope Gregory and the Cluny reform during the closing years of the eleventh century. Like the Russian Revolution in the twentieth century, the Reformation was the swift culmination of a long period of social unrest and radical propaganda. Like the Russian Revolution, it was hailed as a "World Revolution." It was to be the beginning of a new era in history, the age of the common man, the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. Furthermore, it attacked the very foundation of the existing social system. It spread throughout Europe; and to those who participated in it, it seemed to be a spontaneous uprising of the exploited masses of all nations, righteously determined to right the wrongs of mankind, overthrow once for all the forces of organized avarice, bring about the brotherhood of man, and enter the Kingdom of Heaven by violence. Each humble individual was to enjoy immediate access to his God, just as in Communist propaganda each is to enjoy immediate access to the material sources of his being, without paying tribute to the vested interests of "middle men." It was the wicked middle men and the system on which they fattened which were responsible for the miseries and vices of the people. The entire class of middle men must be liquidated with world-consuming wrath.

The differences between the Reformation and Sovietism—between the Reformation and all revolution—are quite superficial. They amount to little more than changing verbal fashions

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

and the accidents of industrial change. The spirit, the driving force, the behaviour of the crowd in such crises, the ultimate hopes and the disillusioning outcome, are strikingly akin. In fact, they are made out of the same psychological stuff. Like the Russian Revolution, the Reformation began with lofty professions of the emancipation of humanity and ended, after a period of terrorism, strife and compromise, in something quite different. Like the Russian Revolution also, it closed an entire cycle of revolutionary aspiration. It put an end to the hope of reviving the Apostolic Age by means of revolution, just as Russia put an end to the dream that universal liberty may be attained by such methods.

The conditions against which the early reformers made protest were serious, and those who led the forces of discontent were often men of responsibility and learning. Leo X had been preceded in the papal office by a succession of men like Julius II, Sextus IV, Clement VI, and Alexander VI—the unspeakable Borgia, whose behaviour differed little from that of the robber barons and unscrupulous secular princes of the time. The papal throne had long been the football of imperial and clerical politics and those who enjoyed the papal power often used it to enhance their family fortunes and further their personal, political ambitions. The Pope exercised the rule of a secular prince over the papal estates. He frequently misgoverned his subjects and sought, like other rulers, by fighting and intrigue, to enlarge the borders of his kingdom. We may have some idea of the esteem in which papal government was held by the Pope's immediate subjects, when we remember that in the middle of the nineteenth century, after all the reforms of the church, the people in portions of the papal estate, in a plebiscite, voted ten to one in favour of discontinuing the temporal power of the Pope.

At the close of the fifteenth century the papacy had fallen into disrepute among thousands of educated men all over Europe. People were disgusted at the sight of Julius II in armour, leading his soldiers against Christians over whom he

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

held the office of Vicar of Christ. Scandalous stories were current about the murderous intrigues of Clement VI, the poisoned wines served by the Borgia, and the worldly luxury and immoralities of the papal court. Erasmus expressed the widespread contempt and ridicule which men felt for Rome, in the story he published about the heathen gentleman who was converted to Christianity on the occasion of his visit to Rome, not by the preaching of the gospel, nor by Christian example of godly living, but because he had witnessed a miracle. It seemed miraculous to him that the Christian faith could continue to exist when the church was so abominably governed.

Moreover, by the end of the fifteenth century, scholasticism, the philosophical bulwark of Catholic theology, was on the wane. It had been challenged by the nominalist criticism of Abelard, Duns Scotus, Occam, Roger Bacon and others. The system of Saint Thomas was based largely on the Aristotelian logic and metaphysics. But Saint Thomas had known Aristotle only in Latin translation. When scholars began to study Aristotle in the original Greek, many became critical of certain doctrines of the church. The same results followed when they learned to read the New Testament in Greek.

The Renaissance, with its revival of classical learning and its beginnings of modern science, together with the discovery of America and the art of printing, tended to broaden men's minds and radically change their point of view. The monkish tales of miracles and the childish imaginings with which the preaching friars regaled the masses, became for many scholars a source of unrestrained amusement, as did also many of the subtle trivialities of prevailing schools of theology. To a man like Luther these monkish tales and disputations were no joke. He openly denounced the preaching of the friars and forced people to listen to him. With the spread of Renaissance learning there had also spread that temper of polite scepticism which is a mark of civilized intellectual maturity.

Humanists of the fifteenth century studied ancient poetry and philosophy. They began to see that there were other paths

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

to spiritual excellence besides those pointed out but not always walked in by the church. European scholarship was turning from theology to "human letters." Artists portrayed sacred themes in the fashions of the day, or in the classical manner, often confusing the pagan and Christian myths and even daring to depict, alongside holy subjects, the secular interests and personages of their own times. Educated Europe, under Italian inspiration, was leaving medieval Christianity behind and moving toward a reconstructed secular and liberal culture. The step might have been taken, should have been taken, without bloodshed. There is much reason to believe that Giovanni de Medici, Pope Leo X, very much desired this turn of events. Such had been the policy of the Medici at Florence for five generations. Christian faith might have been humanized, its spiritual values and trained leadership retained to prevent the materialism and vulgarization which would otherwise follow, and did follow, and the international fellowship of Christendom might have remained to further that very brotherhood of man for which the reformers and their predecessors strove, instead of being smashed to pieces in the nationalisms and class struggles which followed the Reformation.

But the papacy had surrendered too much of its spiritual leadership before Giovanni became Pope, and his cordial support of the alleged "paganism" of Renaissance culture did not help him at all in gaining the favour of the masses. There were many Renaissance scholars, even in the North, who, like Erasmus and Montaigne, always remained in the church, preferring its rich symbolism and catholicity of spirit to schism and what they considered the violent doctrinaire temper of the reformers. These men were painfully aware that something should be done to reform the abuses of the church. For more than a century decent people had been demanding a general council of Christendom to end the abuses of the medieval system. The council was finally called at Trent in the sixteenth century, when it was too late to avert the storm of revolution, and called

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

under conditions which made it impossible for any but a reactionary party to effect the much needed reform.

It is often said that the Renaissance was the forerunner of the Reformation. It was so only in so far as the new scholarship undermined medieval belief, brought educated men into conflict with obscurantist reactionaries, and made protest more articulate and effective.

From the standpoint of the history of culture, the Reformation was as truly a popular reaction against the Renaissance as it was an attack on the papacy. Both the Revival of Learning and the papacy were represented by the person of Leo X, against whom the Reformation directed its hostility. The Renaissance and the Reformation were really not on the same road. They moved in divergent directions, the former toward humanism and the guidance of life by philosophic reason and the wisdom of the ages, the latter toward the common man's utopia, his vision of the return of Pentecost and the apostolic Christian community. Protestantism was not humanism. Its adherents commonly manifested the same dogmatic temper and scholastic type of mind as other medievalists. Its propaganda was meant for the crowd, and doctrinaire creeds like the Augsburg and Westminster Confessions and the Institutes of Calvin were meant for minds accustomed to the disputation of the cloister rather than the rhythms of human letters or the sweet reasonableness of philosophy. The Reformation did gain the support of humanistic scholars like Melanchthon, Ecolampadius, Beza. But Calvin, John Knox, Gustavus Adolphus, had little in common with Bembo, Lorenzo Valla, Erasmus, or Pico della Mirandola.

The source of the Reformation really lay in the spirit that had produced the sectarian cults and revolutionary outbreaks of the Middle Ages, which we discussed in the preceding chapter. These heresies had been crushed in Spain by the Inquisition, where, had the Reformist movement been originally part of the Revival of Learning, heresy should have been firmly

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

established through the classical and cultural influence of Mohammedans and Jews. In fact it was among those communities and classes where the Renaissance seems to have scandalized the man on the street, that the Reformation had strongest popular support. In the England of Henry VIII and the France of Catherine de Medici, the influence of the Renaissance was chiefly confined to the aristocracy, and the principles of the Reformation championed by Puritans and Huguenots tended to give the Reformation in those countries the aspect of a class struggle. This was less so in France where Condè, Coligny, and Henry of Navarre and other noblemen were in deadly conflict with the party of the dukes of Guise, and the unshakable Catholicism of the peasants caused Henry to give up his Protestantism on becoming King of France.

In England, as we have seen, the Lollard movement had spread widely throughout the lower and middle classes under the influence of Wyclif and his "poor preachers." So strong was this movement in England that Henry VIII, during his quarrel with Pope Clement VII who had refused to grant the King a divorce from Catherine of Aragon, knew he could depend on a large measure of popular support in renouncing papal authority and making himself head of the Church of England. The Anglo-Saxons and British had been conquered in the eleventh century by William, the Norman. Norman supremacy was maintained over the native population for centuries. The aristocracy and higher clergy were almost all of Norman descent and their supremacy and all their ways were resented by a large section of the populace. When the lords and bishops, after the Renaissance spread to France and England, began to acquire the manners and interests of upper-class Frenchmen and Italians, there was violent protest in England. The middle classes were shocked. In their eyes the Catholic church had become pagan and the Pope anti-Christ. The social protest against the conquerors became a movement of religious evangelism and of puritanical hostility not only to Catholic

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

forms of worship, but also to "the worldly amusements" of the upper classes.

The longing for society's return to gospel religion and the primitive Christian community, which had been characteristic of the revolutionary sects of the Middle Ages, led these Englishmen to oppose to the authority of pope and bishop, the authority of the Bible. The English version of the Bible placed in the hands of the middle and artisan classes was regarded as a charter of English liberty. The English church of Henry VIII was little different from the Catholic church so far as the ordinary layman could see. Henry's daughter, Mary, remained Catholic and married the outstanding champion of Catholicism among European princes, the King of Spain. When, during the subsequent reign of Elizabeth, the Spanish monarch Philip attacked England with his great armada, Protestantism gained the tremendous support of an aroused patriotic sentiment. Meanwhile the Reformation in Scotland led by John Knox, pupil of Calvin, had become thoroughly Presbyterian and puritanical. What had been in England originally the social unrest and evangelism of the Lollard movement, became for James I and Charles II, by the amalgamation of the reform movements of England and Scotland, a powerful political party, determined to control Parliament and establish in Great Britain a Presbyterian hierocracy. Throughout the struggles which followed and down to the present time, the Protestant movement, both in England and America, has tended to retain its essentially middle-class characteristics and its "dissenters" and "fundamentalists" have remained traditionally suspicious of the liberalizing tendencies set in motion by the Renaissance. We will discuss the Puritan Revolution in England in a succeeding chapter.

It is commonly said that the fires of the Reformation were lighted in Germany. I have indicated that they were kindled by revolutionary sects all over medieval Europe. But it will hardly be denied that the conflagration was greatest in Germany. The German Reformation manifested all the salient

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

features of a great revolution. The strife, civil war and counter-revolution raged for more than a century, involved all Central Europe and in the end reduced the German people to a state of destitution from which they did not recover until the eighteenth century.

Before the Reformation the German states along with Austria, Spain and Italy, were part of the Holy Roman Empire. The feudal system, already greatly modified in England and Italy, remained intact. The Emperor chosen by the prince electors ruled with the aid of the Imperial Diet. The approval of the Diet was necessary before an imperial mandate could become effective. The mandate was thus something like the industrial codes drawn up by present day industries in America. It was the task of the Emperor's government to enforce these codes. Those who violated the mandate brought themselves under the "ban" and were not only liable to punishment but subjected to a kind of ostracism which operated in secular affairs somewhat as did the papal interdict in matters spiritual. Civil government was largely local and varied from one locality to another. It was in the states of the Empire that the struggle of the papacy and the secular power had tended to weaken the authority of the rulers. Government was not very efficient. Robber knights with their marauding bands roamed at will and did very much as they pleased. Security was possible only behind castle walls. Numerous cities had gained local independence, but their liberties were precarious and had to be protected with massive fortifications and stone walls. The highways were infested with robbers who often shared their loot with the local prince or baron and sometimes raided the territories of Italy. Many bishops and abbots had their private armies and sometimes came to clash with one another. Although universities had been established in Germany, the Italians in the sixteenth century still considered the Germans barbarians.

Many of the clergy were very ignorant. The country was overrun with monks and mendicant friars, with their wonder

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

stories and sacred relics. The education of the people, such as there was, was still in the control of the church. Humanist scholars often aroused the fanatical hatred of the monks and turned to the Pope for protection.

Literary men sometimes heaped ridicule upon the ignorance of the clergy, but it is doubtful if their sarcasms made much impression on the laity. Such anti-clerical feeling as there was among the masses was doubtless a survival of the Catharist and other heresies. At about the end of the fifteenth century, Sebastian Brandt wrote an anti-clerical poem entitled *The Ship of Fools*. This poem was widely read. In it the author complains of priests who were consecrated without education, and says—

“Priests no more than monkeys know
Of saving souls from realms below.”

Erasmus's satire *In Praise of Folly* was also popular in Germany. An edition of it was illustrated by Holbein and printed in Germany. In it the ironic mockery of the most brilliant writer in Christendom spared nothing of the entire existing system. Erasmus referred to monkish tales as “ghost stories.” He spoke of the “fools who beguile themselves into believing that if they look on a picture of St. Christopher, that huge Polyphemus, they will not die that day.” He said of indulgence that it was “imaginary pardon for sin,” and ridiculed the theologians with their arguments as “pious impostors.” This book, however, was written from the humanist point of view rather than from that of the reformer. Erasmus's humorous comments on certain passages of the Bible shocked the monk Luther.

Criticism of the existing order was, however, becoming the intellectualist fashion. But no one seems to have openly advocated a general revolt against papal authority. In fact the reformers for some time behaved very much like all revolutionary propagandists down to the nineteenth century. Even after Luther had posted his theses, he protested his loyalty to the church and admitted the authority of the Pope, just as the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

French revolutionists at first professed loyalty and affection for the King. Revolutions have a way of drifting rapidly to the left once they begin, and the Reformation was no exception. Moreover, had the Reformation been a spontaneous popular uprising against the scandals of Rome, it ought logically to have occurred during the pontificate of one of the predecessors of Leo X. For Leo, with all his luxury, his classical philosophy and interest in art, was a liberal-minded man and was innocent of the intrigues and scandalous crimes of the Borgia family. But revolutions often make their appearance after the abuses against which their leaders protest are in process of remedy. Abuses evidently retain their value as propaganda after they have ceased to exist. I doubt if many people in Germany in 1517 could have foreseen the world-shaking events and century of bloodshed into which their country was about to be plunged.

Even so bitter a controversy as that of the Humanists, Reuchlin and von Hutton, with the reactionary monks and theologians, made little impression on the multitude. Reuchlin was a linguist who had published a Hebrew text of the Old Testament. Certain monks were aroused to fury by the publication of this document in Germany. They demanded of the public authorities that Reuchlin be punished and all books of the Jews be destroyed. von Hutton and other Humanists came to the support of Reuchlin and prevented the carrying out of this act of folly. During the controversy a volume of letters was collected by the Humanists and published. This volume, called *Letterae Obscurorum*, was composed of letters alleged to have been written by unknown opponents of Reuchlin. The book raised a laugh all over Germany. Typical of these letters is one in which the writer is perturbed because he has on Friday eaten embryonic chicken in an egg and suggests to his confessor that it can be no greater sin than that of eating worms in cheese, "and may the devil take that John Reuchlin." Another begins by denouncing Erasmus for writing the Pope on Reuchlin's behalf. The writer is pleased to learn that our pious master has been employed to translate Reuchlin's plea of defence and has

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

agreed on payment of one hundred ducats to falsify the document.

It is one of the symptoms of approaching revolution when intellectuals openly proclaim their disbelief in the existing system while the champions of conservatism proceed to make themselves and their cause ridiculous, apparently having no more effective weapons at hand than hypocrisy, stupidity and violent suppression of freedom of speech. This was the situation in France during the lifetime of Voltaire, also in the Russia of Tolstoy and Kropotkin. This was what happened before the Reformation. There is, however, little historical evidence to indicate that such expression of critical sentiment has much effect on the masses. It is confined chiefly to the circles of the intelligentsia and is too highbrow for the man in the street. When Latimer and Cranmer were burned at the stake, they believed their martyrdom would light the fires of revolt in England¹. I doubt whether their execution had much effect. The slogan "no taxation without representation" was later much more effective in arousing popular indignation to the pitch of revolution. There was little popular protest in France when Voltaire was driven into exile. Nor would there have been barricades in the streets of Germany had Reuchlin been burned at the stake.

The pre-revolutionary propaganda of intellectuals is for the people a matter chiefly of academic interest, and its contributions to revolution are usually indirect. It is only after the crowd has successfully defied authority and become conscious of its power that it is likely to show much sympathy for intellectual radicalism, and this chiefly in order to justify its own behavior. Already, by that time, the course of events is far to the left of the original exponents of reform, and the crowd not infrequently considers their liberalism "counter-revolutionary" and proceeds to destroy them. Certain reformers would have burned Erasmus had he fallen into their power, just as Calvin burned Servitus. The Jacobins would have sent Voltaire to the guillotine had he been alive in 1793. The beliefs of the crowd

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

are more often fixed by and after acts of violence than before, and the violence is more often inspired by a sudden discovery of the weakness of government than by conviction. It is when the party of reaction, in the effort to stifle criticism, makes a fool of itself, and government, becoming the partisan instrument of reaction, tries in vain to crush freedom of speech, that the inability of the existing system to defend itself is revealed to the masses. It is the defencelessness of a social system rather than its iniquities which breeds popular revolution. Thus it is that apparently trivial incidents are frequently the occasion for mass revolt.

The weakness of government in Germany was in part the result of civil disobedience long encouraged by Rome; in part, it was a result of the loose organization of the Empire which gave a large measure of autonomy to feudal princes and local rulers; in part it was the result of the failure and embarrassment of the medieval church in meeting the challenge to those heretical sects which demanded return to New Testament religion and the early Christian community. All that was required for revolution was that some official blunderer commit the public authorities to a policy which neither church nor state could defend. In 1515 the blunderer did his work and the policy, certainly a most ill advised one at that time, was that of the public distribution and sale of indulgences in Germany, a portion of the proceeds of which was to be sent to Rome to defray the expense of the completion of the church of Peter. This Renaissance edifice, on which Julius II had expended the revenues of the papacy, the completion of which was regarded as part of the policy of the Medici to restore the Augustan Age, was not a great object of popular enthusiasm in Germany. The Archbishop of Mayence made arrangements with Pope Leo X, according to which funds secured by a well-promoted campaign of distribution of indulgences was to be divided: one-half the money to be kept by the Archbishop as his commission and the remainder to be placed at the disposal of the Pope.

This enterprise of high finance in the distribution of spiritual

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

blessing appears to moderns a more cynical proceeding than it really was. There was a long tradition in the church to justify it, and it could be defended, as von Eck later did defend it, with excellent logic. Protestants today easily misunderstand what was meant by papal indulgence. There are those who seem to think that if a man were tempted to commit a crime yet feared punishment in a future world, he could, by the purchase of indulgence, evade fear of punishment and then go ahead and "indulge" in sin with a clear conscience. But the church was not selling licence to commit sin. It did not dispense with the necessity of repentance. The indulgence was in a sense a prayer for the dead, a priestly blessing or sign of divine grace intended to help souls sincerely struggling for perfection both in this life and in purgatory. Indulgences were sought usually by surviving relatives of deceased persons as expressions of affection and devotion for the departed.

From our modern point of view, the entire subject of indulgences appears to be a survival of primitive magic. We no longer hold many of the presuppositions on which such belief and behaviour rested. But grant that people once believed implicitly in the immortality of the soul, in the commandments of revealed religion, in the attainment of sainthood, here or hereafter, as the aim of human existence and requirement for Heavenly Bliss, grant further that people believed in the efficacy of prayer and of the sacraments and other means of grace which Christ had officially committed to the custody of his church, and the belief in indulgences is quite understandable. Christians had always believed in the value of prayers for the dead and in the special efficacy of the prayers of the heads of the church. I have seen in one of the catacombs of Rome which, according to tradition, dates from the beginning of the second century A. D., innumerable pieces of broken tile on each of which was scrawled in Latin, "O Peter and Paul pray for us." Why then should not Pope Leo issue tokens of indulgence and why should not Christians, in gratitude to the church, contribute something toward its support? Luther, in attacking the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

validity of papal indulgences in his debates with von Eck, soon discovered he was attacking the very foundations of Catholic Christianity. Doubtless it was the very foundations which the Reformation wanted unconsciously to attack. But the implications of such an attack were in the beginning too bold and terrifying. The Reformers at first declared that they had no intention of destroying the church, they only wanted to eradicate certain glaring abuses. An issue had presented itself which was concrete. Even loyal Catholics felt justified in protesting against an ill advised money-raising campaign without realizing to what lengths such protest would lead.

Have we not here, then, an economic interpretation of the cause of the Reformation which ought to delight those contemporary dogmatists who insist upon the materialist interpretation of history? I do not think so. This protest against the sale of indulgences was a disguise for more profound issues which were only half-consciously felt. And even this was a moral issue rather than an economic one. Germany was not being impoverished by the sums sent to Rome. There are those who see in the Reformation a conflict between rising capitalism and the declining feudal system. But capitalism did not appear in Germany for more than two hundred years after Luther. As Luther and his contemporaries saw it, the distribution of papal indulgences presented them with a moral issue. The campaign was carried on in a manner bound to bring to focus the moral indignation of those classes who were already disgusted by the "abominations of Rome."

The letter of instructions with which the campaign opened said:

"The first grace is the complete remission of all sins; and nothing greater than this can be named, since man, who lives in sin and forfeits the favour of God, obtains complete remission by these means and once more enjoys God's favour; moreover, through this remission of sins the punishment which one is obliged to undergo in purgatory on account of the affront to the Divine Majesty is all remitted, and the pains of purgatory completely blotted out. And

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

although nothing is precious enough to be given in exchange for such a grace—since it is a free gift of God and a grace beyond price—yet in order that Christian believers may be the more easily induced to procure the same, we establish the following rules, to wit:

“In the first place, every one who is contrite in heart, and has made oral confession—or at all events has the intention of confessing at a suitable time—shall visit at least the seven churches indicated for this purpose, to wit, those in which the papal arms are displayed, and in each church shall say five paternosters and five Ave Marias in honour of the five wounds of our Lord Jesus Christ, whereby our salvation is won, or one Miserere, which psalm is particularly well adapted for obtaining forgiveness of sins.” . . .*

Penitents seeking forgiveness for all sins were permitted to choose any confessor, not necessarily their parish priest. The confessor so chosen should have power to absolve those who had bought papal indulgences.

The purchase price of the indulgence was credited to the buyer as a contribution toward the Cathedral of St. Peter and all their deceased relatives who departed in a state of grace were declared to be “from now on and for eternity, partakers in all petitions, intercessions, alms, fastings, prayers, in each and every privilege of the church”—even that of those who had journeyed to the Holy Land. Preachers and confessors were instructed to insist, with great perseverance, upon these advantages. The Pope promised to forgive those in purgatory and grant “complete remission of all sins by virtue of his papal letter.” It was further stipulated that those who place their contributions in the box for the dead be themselves contrite of heart. Finally the amount of the contribution required to secure the blessings of the papal letter were allotted differently to persons of different classes, according to their various abilities to pay.

“Kings and queens and their offspring, archbishops and bishops, and other great rulers, provided they seek the places where the cross is raised, or otherwise present themselves, shall pay at least

* James Harvey Robinson, *Readings in European History*.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

five and twenty Rhenish guilders in gold. Abbots and the great prelates of cathedral churches, counts, barons, and others of the higher nobility, together with their consorts, shall pay for each letter of indulgence ten such guilders. Other lesser prelates and nobles, as also the rectors of celebrated places, and all others who, either from permanent incomes or merchandise, or otherwise, enjoy a total yearly revenue of five hundred gold guilders, shall pay six such guilders. Other citizens and tradespeople and artisans, who have individual incomes and families of their own, shall pay one such guilder; those of less means, only a half. . . ."

Authorized by such instructions, one Johannes Tetzel, a sort of medieval Billy Sunday, moved about Germany preaching forgiveness of sin, conducting a succession of sensational revival meetings, creating tremendous excitement throughout the nation, much to the disgust of certain of the educated clergy and the more independent secular rulers. To thousands of sincere spirits, the incompatibility between gospel religion and official religion became a matter of first importance. Even so, it did not follow that mass revolution was necessary. The purchase of indulgences was not a compulsory requirement of anyone. In all ages, men and women have personally adhered to the principles of simple faith and piety, without forming revolutionary committees or appealing to the passions of the crowd. As a result of the Revival of Learning, educational forces were already released in Christian Europe, which promised to mitigate medieval credulity and superstition. And, after the strife was over, these educational forces, unfortunately set back for a century, were all that well-meaning men, either Protestant or Catholic, had to turn to for the advancement of civilization.

How far Martin Luther intended to travel on the course of revolution when he first publicly challenged the sale of indulgences in Germany is a question. Born in 1483, Luther was still a young university professor when, in 1517, he startled Germany by his open attack on the sale of indulgences. Luther was a born leader of men, a man of great physical force, personal charm, daring, singleness of purpose and simplicity and

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

sweetness of spirit, mingled with a violent disposition, dreadful power of invective and high scholarly attainment. A German through and through, he was of humble ancestry, had spent his early years in a struggle for education, was emotionally religious, with a deep sense of sin and capacity for love. He had been an Augustinian monk, had taken his doctorate with honour, had been to some extent influenced by the Humanists of his age. He had an unusual gift for music, a childish sense of fun, was rather sensual, and had great ability as orator and writer. With all his scholarship he was lacking in the subtlety and wit of Erasmus and he remained to the end somewhat superstitious. He had visited Rome where he had gone as a pious pilgrim and from which place he had returned believing that Rome was "the sink of every abomination."

There was something direct and elemental in the nature of Luther. His outlook on life was essentially that of the common man. Even though he began his work as reformer by publishing a set of theses drawn up for academic discussion, he soon found himself appealing to the crowd with such "intemperance" of word and manner that Erasmus and others at first sought to lead him to moderation and, failing, abandoned him to his headlong career. In 1517, Luther posted at the University of Wittenberg ninety-five theses, or subjects of debate, which he challenged scholars to discuss with him. Academic disputation of all sorts of subjects was habitual among school men, but Luther's very statement of some of these theses would indicate that the propagandist in him was stronger than the philosopher.

"In the desire and with the purpose of elucidating the truth, a disputation will be held on the underwritten propositions at Wittenberg, under the presidency of the Reverend Father Martin Luther, monk of the order of St. Augustine, Master of Arts and of Sacred Theology, and ordinary lecturer in the same at that place. He therefore asks those who cannot be present and discuss the subject with us orally to do so by letter in their absence. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

"1. Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ in saying 'Repent ye'

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

(*poenitentiam agite*), etc., intended that the whole life of believers should be penitence (*poenitentia*).

"2. This word cannot be understood as sacramental penance, that is, the confession and satisfaction which are performed under the ministry of priests.

"4. The penalty (for sin) must thus continue as long as the hatred of self—that is, true inward penitence; namely, till our entrance into the kingdom of heaven.

"5. The pope has neither the will nor the power to remit any penalties except those which he has imposed by his own authority, or by that of the canons.

"6. The pope has no power to remit any guilt, except by declaring and warranting it to have been remitted by God; or at most by remitting cases reserved for himself; in which cases, if his power were despised, guilt would certainly remain.

"7. Certainly God remits no man's guilt without at the same time subjecting him, humbled in all things, to the authority of his representative, the priest.

"20. Therefore the pope, when he speaks of the plenary remission of all penalties, does not mean really of all, but only of those imposed by himself.

"23. If any entire remission of all penalties can be granted to any one, it is certain that it is granted to none but the most perfect,—that is, to very few.

"27. They preach man (rather than God) who say that the soul flies out of purgatory as soon as the money rattles in the chest.

"28. It is certain that, when the money rattles in the chest, avarice and gain may be increased, but the effect of the intercession of the Church depends on the will of God alone.

"50. Christians should be taught that, if the pope were acquainted with the exactions of the preachers of pardons, he would prefer that the basilica of St. Peter should be burnt to ashes rather than that it should be built up with the skin, flesh, and bones of his sheep.

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

"51. Christians should be taught that as it would be the duty, so it would be the wish of the pope even to sell, if necessary, the basilica of St. Peter, as well as to give of his own money to very many of those from whom the preachers of pardons extract money.

"82. As, for instance: Why does not the pope empty purgatory for the sake of his most holy charity of the supreme necessity of souls,—this being the most just of all reasons,—if he redeems an infinite number of souls for the sake of that most fatal thing, money, to be spent on building a basilica,—this being a very slight reason?

"86. Again: Why does not the pope, whose riches are at this day more ample than those of Croesus, build the basilica of St. Peter with his own money rather than with that of poor believers?

"90. To repress these scruples and arguments of the laity by force alone, and not to solve them by giving reasons, is to expose the Church and the pope to the ridicule of their enemies, and to make Christian men unhappy." *

There was something of the politician's appeal to the crowd in Luther's suggestion, "Let the Pope build St. Peter's with his own money." As a matter of fact, the Medici had spent enormous sums on public improvements of all kinds. Probably no family in history was ever so generous with its property. But Luther chose to make popular use of reference to this very fact to remind his hearers that the Pope was a rich man, and to gain the approval of those who, in all times, hate and envy the rich. What had the Pope's personal financial status to do with the question of his right to issue letters of indulgence?

In the debate with von Eck, Luther was forced to admit the heretical and schismatic implications of his logic. Then he lost his temper and the bold defiance and indefensible exaggerations of his utterances compromised and terrified many of his followers.

Erasmus says in his letters written at the time:

* The Library of Original Sources, Vol. V.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

"Luther wrote me a right Christian letter (he continued), at least to my way of thinking, and I answered, incidentally warning the man not to write anything seditious or insolent to the Roman pontiff, nor anything arrogant or fierce, but to preach the evangelical doctrine with sincere mind and with all gentleness. This I did civilly in order to make my advice more effective. I argued that he could thus best conciliate the opinion of his favourers, from which some have gathered that I favour him, although no one except myself had ever admonished him.

"With what odium Luther burdens the cause of learning and that of Christianity! As far as he can he involves all men in his business. Everyone confessed that the Church suffered under the tyranny of certain men, and many were taking counsel to remedy this state of affairs. Now this man has arisen to treat the matter in such a way that he fastens the yoke on us more firmly, and that no one dares to defend even what he has said well. Six months ago I warned him to beware of hatred. *The Babylonian Captivity* has alienated many from him, and he daily puts forth more atrocious things.

"Would that some *deus ex machina* might make a happy ending for this drama so inauspiciously begun by Luther! He himself gives his enemies the dart by which they transfix him, and acts as if he did not wish to be saved, though frequently warned by me and by his friends to tone down the sharpness of his style. . . . I cannot sufficiently wonder at the spirit in which he has written. Certainly he has loaded the cultivators of literature with heavy odium. Many of his teachings and admonitions were splendid, but would that he had not vitiated these good things by mixing intolerable evils! If he had written all things piously, yet I should not have courage to risk my life for the truth. All men have not strength for martyrdom. I fear lest, if any tumult should arise, I should imitate Peter (in denying the Lord). . . ." *

An excellent example of Luther's temper is seen in his famous address on the Catholic Theology.

"The chief cause that I fell out with the pope was this: the pope boasted that he was the head of the church, and condemned all

* Preserved Smith, *Erasmus*.

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

that would not be under his power and authority; for he said, although Christ be the head of the church, yet, notwithstanding, there must be a corporal head of the church upon earth. With this I could have been content, had he but taught the gospel pure and clear, and not introduced human inventions and lies in its stead. . . .

"If this sin of antichrist be not a sin against the Holy Ghost, then I do not know how to define and distinguish sins. They sin herein wilfully against the revealed truth of God's Word, in a most stubborn and stiff-necked manner. I pray, who would not, in this case, resist these devilish and shameless lying lips? . . .

"Henry VIII, king of England, is now also an enemy to the pope's person, but not to his essence and substance; he would only kill the body of the pope, but suffer his soul, that is, his false doctrine, to live; the pope can well endure such an enemy; he hopes within the space of twenty years to recover his rule and government again. But I fall upon the pope's soul, his doctrine, with God's word, not regarding his body, that is, his wicked person and life. I not only plucked out his feathers as the king of England and prince George of Saxony do, but I set the knife to his throat, and cut his windpipe asunder. We put the goose on the spit; did we but pluck her, the feathers would soon grow again. Therefore is Satan so bitter an enemy unto us, because we cut the pope's throat, as does also the king of Denmark, who aims at the essence of popery.

"'Tis wonderful how, in this our time, the majesty of the pope is fallen. Heretofore, all monarchs, emperors, kings, and princes feared the pope's power, who held them all at his nod; none durst so much as mutter a word against him. This great god is now fallen. . . .

"There are many that think I am too fierce against popedom; on the contrary, I complain that I am, alas! too mild; I wish I could breathe out lightning against pope and popedom, and that every word were a thunderbolt. . . .

"It is no marvel that the papists hate me so vehemently, for I have well deserved it at their hands. Christ more mildly reproved the Jews than I the papists, yet they killed him. These, therefore, think they justly persecute me, but, according to God's laws and will, they shall find their mistake. In the day of the last judgment

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

I will denounce the pope and his tyrants, who scorn and assail the Word of God, and his sacraments." *

The discussion had quite abandoned the civilities of the trained scholar and all attempt at a meeting of minds. It had become revolutionary propaganda and mob appeal. In this appeal it is not surprising to find Luther making use of the naturalistic sentiment.

Had Giovanni de Medici possessed the statesmanlike qualities of his father Lorenzo, or had the German Reformation impressed him as having any sympathy with the Revival of Learning, he might wisely have averted the crisis in Germany. Had he not himself protected Erasmus whose books had been burned by the orthodox zealots of the University of Paris and against whom charges of heresy were brought? But it was different when German crowds cried "Death to the Roman curia." What was the entire disorder in Germany but discord among half-barbarous people? The Papal Bull was issued, excommunicating the monk Martin Luther. Luther with characteristic gesture burned the papal document, pronounced anathema upon the Pope and predicted the shedding of blood. Throughout the Empire there were anticlerical riots, attacks on churches and monasteries, secret meetings, raidings of heretical organizations. Princes and feudal lords resorted to armed combat. Disorder and mutual suspicion increased. Heretical preachers harangued the crowds. Towns and villages were besieged by rival parties. There were acts of retaliation on both sides with torture and persecution.

The Emperor Charles V, a devout Catholic, tried to restore order. He would have been glad to aid in remedying the abuses of the church within his realm if agreement could be reached among the disputants. Luther was summoned before the Imperial Diet at Worms. The admirable courage which Luther showed in facing his enemies in their very stronghold won for him increased popular support. He entered Worms in a sort

* Library of Original Sources.

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

of triumphal procession surrounded by his enthusiastic followers. Before the Diet he admitted that he had been over-violent, but he refused to retract and challenged the authorities with the statement, "Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise. God help me!"

Luther was declared an outlaw by the Diet of Worms, and the Reformation became an unrestrained civil war with all the savagery of human nature let loose. He was taken into friendly custody by the Elector of Saxony and established in the great Castle of Wartburg, south of the river Mainz. From this stronghold and later from Wittenberg he continued to direct the forces of the Reformation. He translated the Bible into German and inspired revolutionary armies with the battle hymn of the Reformation—

A mighty Fortress is our God,
A Bulwark never failing;
Our Helper He amid the flood
Of Mortal ills prevailing;
For still our ancient Foe,
Doth seek to work us woe;
His craft and power are great,
And, armed with cruel hate,
On earth is not his equal.

Did we in our own strength confide,
Our striving would be losing;
Were not the right Man on our side,
The Man of God's own choosing;
Dost ask who that may be?
Christ Jesus, it is He;
Lord Sabaoth His Name,
From age to age the same,
And He must win the battle.

Europe knew no peace for more than a century. In 1522 the Archbishop of Treves began a military campaign against the princes who had taken sides with the Reformers. The latter

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

flew to the defence of "evangelical liberty." The gospel was preached in armed camps and its precepts vindicated by the force of armed men. The Council of Regensburg voted the separation of Germany from the church and Empire. The Council of Trent was finally called to effect the reforms of the church, but the Reformers now refused to participate in it and the battle waged on with no compromise on either side. The brief peace of Augsburg in 1535 granted to each local ruler the right to determine the religion of his subjects. But the mobs still attacked the monks in Bavaria. Catholic armies under Wallenstein laid waste German cities and put their inhabitants to the sword, slaughtering captives as the vandals once did in the sack of Rome.

The conflict had raged westward. The Reformation in Switzerland was initiated by Ulrich Zwingli, a humanist. Later a revolutionary dictatorship was established at Geneva under John Calvin. In Paris, in 1572, the counter-revolutionary forces shocked the Christian world—except at Rome, where church bells were rung and a holiday declared to celebrate the event—by the brutal massacre on St. Bartholomew's day. The Scandinavian countries became involved and the Protestant King Gustavus Adolphus, with the assistance of the French Catholic statesman Cardinal Richelieu, spread devastation among German Catholics on his march across to the Polish frontier. Before the fighting ceased, the original aim of the Reformation, the re-establishment of the early Christian community, had become a matter of quite secondary importance. Diplomatic intrigues and the struggle for nationalist expansion, military leadership and partisan advantage, took the place of the older revolutionary enthusiasms.

Little, if anything, had been accomplished of increase in evangelical piety. Many of the ecclesiastical abuses against which Luther thundered his denunciations in time returned slightly disguised to take up their abode in Protestant households of faith. The rule of the bishops gave way to that of doctrinaire divines. Church lands had been confiscated for the enrichment of

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

Protestant princes. The masses of the people, impoverished by a century of warfare, with many of their once free cities in ruins, their countryside laid waste by invading armies, their social life disorganized by civil strife, found themselves in a condition far worse than they would have suffered had a hundred Pope Leos taxed Germany to build a hundred cathedral churches in Rome. When peace was finally reached in the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, it became evident that what the Reformation had put in the place of the Catholic church was not the revival of the Apostolic Age, but the modern nationalist state. The entire cycle of revolutionary struggle for gospel religion was finished. The civil disobedience once encouraged by the papacy in its struggle with the secular princes had ended in the decline of the Empire and in the complete independence and supremacy of the secular powers. The revolution of the masses, which throughout the late Middle Ages had been inspired by the dream of free Christian brotherhood, ended in the destruction of a great international fellowship. From that day until the present, the peoples of Europe have been unable to establish a lasting peace or free themselves from national rivalry and the curse of war.

It is sometimes the fate of revolutions to have to crush with their own hands those very enthusiasms which first won them popular support. Luther had appealed to the common masses for support. He had placed the German version of the Bible in their hands. For centuries evangelical preaching and various heretical movements had filled men's heads with visions of the Kingdom of Christ on Earth. Men believed that the historical model of that kingdom was presented in the early Christian community with its communal ownership of property, its lack of class distinctions, its freedom in Christ which raised the human spirit above the law. There were to be no more masters and servants, no more rents or taxes or arrogant official persons. The earth was the Lord's and was intended to be freely used and enjoyed by all his children. Had not Christ ordered the rich young man to sell his property and distribute

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

his goods among the poor? Had he not said that hardly shall the rich enter the Kingdom of Heaven? Had not all followers of Christ been commanded to resist not evil, to refrain from judging one another and from swearing oaths of allegiance? Had not the Lord said "give unto him that asketh"? And should not the leaders of Christendom set the example in these respects? Had not Luther himself pointed in derision to the riches of Pope Leo X? Did not all reformist preachers, like their sectarian and heretical predecessors, demand literal obedience to the law of Christ?

What was more inevitable than that thousands of Luther's followers should welcome the Reformation in the belief that it was the beginning of the Social Revolution? Communistic and anarchistic sects were revived and multiplied much to the embarrassment of Reformers who needed the armed protection of the princes, and the princes, whether Protestant or Catholic, had no sympathy for social revolution in their dominions. They were practical men and saw clearly that no social order could be maintained on the basis of such subversive doctrines, even though they were derived from the New Testament. Naturally the Reformers fell in with the growing nationalist sentiment. They were at war with Rome and one war was enough for them. They made it clear that their movement had nothing in common with those who, in the name of Christ, would destroy all law and order and property. Undoubtedly they were correct, but none the less often embarrassed. For had not pagan Roman statesmen once felt exactly the same about the early Christians? Embarrassed people often protest too violently. Protestant leaders were very harsh in purging their following of its more extreme radical elements. In this, too, their hands were often forced, for the radicals, with the words of the Sermon on the Mount on their lips, would resort to mob violence, plunder and every kind of lawless extravagance.

There was a general uprising of Saxon peasants whose demands for redress and redistribution of wealth were all said to have been based on the commandments and precedents of

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

the Holy Gospels. Catholic and Protestant princes alike suppressed the peasant revolts in Germany. At Rothenburg, the social revolutionists, composed mostly of idle soldiers, servants, artisans, apprentices and farm labourers, laid siege to the beautiful old brick-walled town, captured it, and looted the homes of the burghers, drank their wine and committed acts of riot and outrage until they were ruthlessly suppressed. This happened in 1525, not long after the crowds had given Luther a triumphal entry at Worms. He wrote: "Before I can turn around, they go out and appeal to force . . . they rob, pillage, act like mad dogs. . . . Therefore whosoever can should smite, strangle and stab, secretly or publicly—just as one would slay a mad dog." With the abandonment of the Social Revolution, the Reformation became chiefly a revolt of Northern Europe against the continued medieval authority of the Holy Roman Empire and the Pope. It should not astonish us that the Reformation thus changed horses in the midst of the stream; all revolutions are in some manner obliged to do so; for the ideals of the Social Revolution are not solutions of the problems of human relationships, they are a religious dream of Heaven on Earth, romanticism, wish-fancy and escape from reality.

When we compare, for standards of culture and liberty and the joy of living, the Protestant nations today with modern Catholic France or Austria of the later nineteenth century, or search for spiritual advantages of the Protestant states of Germany over the Catholic states, there is little to be said for any gains which may have been achieved by the Reformation. Certainly Protestant England is more advanced than is, or was, Catholic Spain. But here the comparison is unfair. The advantages are largely material and are the result of the Industrial Revolution which had its beginnings in England with the rise of the wool industry before the time of Henry VIII. We of the English-speaking world are justly proud of our civil liberty, our scientific and academic freedom, and personal independence. But it can be shown that we have derived these advantages, along with Frenchmen and Italians before the Fascist

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

régime, from the Renaissance and the age of Voltaire rather than directly from the Reformation. No doubt we are indebted in large measure to Protestantism for the exercise of the right of private judgment, which, in part, was derived from the insistence by the early Reformers on the right of the private interpretation of the Bible. The insistence upon personal faith, rather than the virtue of the sacraments, had also been a step in the advancement of civilization. But we must not yield to too hasty generalization on this point. The right of the private interpretation of the Bible has also resulted in all sorts of fantastic sects, in the dissemination of error by ignorant evangelistic preachers, in the common man's delusion of infallibility if he can support his convictions by reading them into the language of Biblical text.

Our independence of judgment may still be challenged by such movements as the Ku Klux Klan, Fundamentalism, censorship, and quixotic reform, movements which have their following chiefly among Protestants. Perhaps the chief gain of Protestantism has been indirect and derives from the breakdown of dogma and the relaxation of religious authority over the arts, scholarship, scientific research, literature and philosophy. Just as in ancient times, these cultured pursuits may now be followed without priestly interference. But priceless as is this cultured independence, it demands its price of us. The weakening of religious authority tends also to the popular degradation of the values of civilization and to the substitution of many material self-interests for the voice of the spirit.

Certainly the emergence of nationalism during the Reformation has not been an unmixed good. The present religion of the state may easily become the self-idolatry of organized mob and faction. In contrast with the church, the state as it is now developing may be vastly more tyrannical than Rome ever was, and those who look to the state for salvation may yet discover they are worshipping a machine which will grind its votaries to pieces in its indifference to individual welfare. Consider Lutheran Germany today!

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

I have tried to show that the Reformation began as a revolutionary movement; that it brought about civil war, like all revolutions; that it made typically revolutionary appeal for the support of mob enthusiasm; that in it the crowds behaved in truly revolutionary manner with the usual acts of destruction, terrorism and homicide; that it became necessary to place a violent check on the lawlessness of the crowd; that the original hopes of social revolution were not realized, and that such benefits as seem to have come from the Reformation would doubtless have come anyway; that in substituting the modern nation for the church Catholic, the Reformation dealt human brotherhood a serious blow, and that such substitution promises yet to give us new tyranny for old.

·REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND — LIBERTY CHALLENGES THE PRINCIPLE OF MONARCHY

A NEW cycle in the history of revolution was begun in England in the seventeenth century. The struggle of the Puritan party against the Stuart kings provided the models for revolutionary propaganda of nearly all popular uprisings from the days of James I to the fall of the Kerensky government in Russia when Communism again revealed the true nature of revolutionary conspiracy. For nearly three centuries, thanks to English ideas and enthusiasms, revolutionists could honestly believe they were engaged in the revolt of the masses against tyranny, that their struggle for power was really a struggle for "liberty," that the overthrow of monarchy, aristocracy, plutocracy, necessarily meant government of "the people," that partisan dictatorship and the revolutionary tribunal were proper agencies for the restoration of the "rights of man."

Among the sentiments which after the English Revolution were accepted as "self-evident truths" were various doctrines that reappeared in the writings of Locke, Paine, Jefferson, Rousseau, Mazzini, and even Marx. Man, in the state of nature, is endowed with certain inalienable rights. Men are born free and equal. Just government derives its powers from the consent of the governed. Kings and master classes are impostors. Political organization exists by virtue of a social contract entered into by all the people for purposes of securing life, liberty and happiness. It is the right and duty of the people to abolish such governments as in their judgment fail to achieve these ends.

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

Let the people rule. The voice of the people is the voice of God. The masses know best what is good for them and *Salus populi est suprema lex*. Taxation without representation is tyranny. The legislative power is representative of the best judgment of the electorate and will serve as a check upon the extravagances and despotism of the executive. The exercise of the franchise will educate the public. "*A bas les aristocrats. Vive la Nation.*"

The revolution in England, the first of the cycle of popular revolt for the sake of "liberty," was followed by the American Revolution, the French Revolution, the Democratic Crusade of 1848, the rise of the Republics of Latin America and of Central Europe following the World War. It was the first great popular uprising against the traditional master class and the secular powers which, during and before the Protestant Reformation, had opposed the papacy. In this respect it is interesting to note that the English revolutionists revived the Great Charter of English liberty which had been wrested from King John centuries earlier when the interdict of Pope Innocent III had aroused the King's subjects to civil disobedience. It was the first to proclaim itself an uprising of "the people," that is, of the nation against its monarch, and in this respect the growing national consciousness which had emerged from the wars of the Reformation was undoubtedly a contributing factor. It was the first to combine consciously the religious motive with the economic interests and material aspirations of the lower and middle classes. And in doing this, it may be said to have carried to its logical conclusion the medieval spirit of social unrest which had found expression among the followers of Wyclif and the Lollards.

The English Puritan party was the first modern revolution to dramatize the homicidal wish of the crowd and its passion for revenge by killing a king. The British example was later followed by French Jacobins and Russian Bolsheviks. Almost three hundred years before Lenin and Trotsky, revolutionists in England had established, temporarily, a dictatorial govern-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

ment in the name of the people. Like the Russians later, they had also burned churches and demolished cathedrals and had discovered the technique of "liquidating" entire classes of the population. Moreover, like the Russian Communists, the Puritans were a minority group held together by a rigid system of doctrine, who tried through the power of a revolutionary government to compel general conformity to their own partisan convictions and to change by decree the traditional habits of a whole nation. The Communists, and some American Puritans, have not yet discovered that this cannot be done.

In the English Revolution, as in all others, we observe those same stereotyped forms of crowd behaviour which differ only superficially from age to age, according to the accidents of history. There was the same slowly developing pre-revolutionary situation, with the increasing demands of the power gaining crowd and the growing weakness of the government. There was the usual lack of foresight, accompanied by irritating political stupidity of the ruling conservative party—so pathetically right in the wrong way—grudgingly making each new concession to fanaticism only an occasion for added grievances. As always, the revolution, as it approached, transformed intelligent men, along with the rabble, into the typical crowd with its fixed ideas, its egomania and its homicidal wish. It was as if a deadly logic had taken hold of the minds of men and was leading them, blind to all things except its own vindication, to practical conclusions which were beyond human endurance. Then, as always, the revolutionary party broke up into factions. The revolution repudiated its democratic propaganda and established itself under a dictatorship of the army—until the inevitable reaction came and the monarchy was restored, greatly to the relief of the nation.

Finally, the threads of civilization had again to be taken up and again men turned to the progress of culture and liberty and the ordinary pursuits of life, very much as they had done before the violent interruption. If this sequence of events had happened only once or twice, reason might still justify resort

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

to revolution, but when the same drama, with its identical sort of actors, repeating the same lines in the same situations, curse and fight their way through to the same disillusioning closing scene, it might be expected that even so uncomprehending a being as man in the mass could by this time have learned the lesson of revolutionary experience and be able to guess the last line before the play begins.

Neither Henry VIII nor Elizabeth was the kind of monarch who need fear a revolution. Revolution is the fate of puppet rulers like Louis XVI, and Kaiser William II and the late Czar of Russia, or of pedantic rulers like James and Charles Stuart and George III. But revolution can never look a born leader of men in the face. In an earlier chapter I said that it is in periods of rapid cultural change that certain elements in the population are most likely to lose their heads and resort to open violence and revolt. Sedition is especially dangerous to that state whose ruler does not comprehend the changes which are in progress, or who hesitates, or permits himself to be made the tool of any faction, or tries to disguise weakness of will by an empty show of authority.

Under both the Tudor and Stuart kings, England was rapidly changing from a medieval to a modern nation. But the Tudors knew their England and they knew how to govern. Henry with all his vices and Elizabeth with her tendency to favouritism never lacked courage nor power of decision. They could lead the progress of the nation when progress was real, encourage it to go ahead as rapidly as the nation could adjust itself, and check it when it tended to lose its direction. They could show both firmness and leniency in a manner which made friends and not enemies. Throughout the bitter struggle of this sixteenth-century reformation they kept the respect and loyalty of their subjects. Henry, in spite of his many sins, was the luckiest prince who ever defied a pope and the reign of Elizabeth, Protestant that she was, held Calvinism in check and made possible the flowering of the Renaissance in England.

Neither James I nor Charles I enjoyed a large measure of

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

public confidence. They were suspected of secret Catholic leanings. After the long reign of Elizabeth, Englishmen were psychologically in a stage of transition from subjects to citizens. This transition the Stuarts could not understand. They tried to stop it with extravagant and unconvincing claims of the divine right of kings—a precarious doctrinal position in a Protestant country, where theological discussion of the condition of Adam before the fall of man led to radical speculation concerning men in the state of nature. Everything these unfortunate monarchs did, either in resisting Parliament or in half heartedly yielding to popular sentiment for the persecution of Catholics or the continuing war with Spain and Austria, whether in snubbing puritanical reformers or in authorizing the English version of the Bible, seemed only to add both to the arrogance of the Puritan party and to their own growing unpopularity.

The question arises, how far was the revolution which followed the result of economic forces and the industrial class struggle? This hackneyed explanation of all revolution in terms of the materialistic interpretation of history will hardly account for what happened in seventeenth-century England. To be sure, much of the Puritan sentiment had its origin in the class antagonism of the Middle Ages and had survived in the Lollard movement. But much of it was of Calvinist Scottish origin and came into England from that country along with James I. Scotch Calvinism was largely the work of John Knox and one can hardly speak of it as a philosophy of the working class.

The middle classes, master artisans, merchants, landed gentry, had increased in power and wealth. It was they, the Roundheads, who made up the bulk of the Puritan party and the armies of Cromwell. But in spite of their outcry about "taxation without representation" we must not be misled into over-emphasizing the economic motive. Parliament had long possessed the power of voting taxes. It was understood to be a recognized check on any possible tyranny by the king. The attempt of Charles I to abolish this popular restraint upon royal

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

authority was rightly regarded as a move in the direction of absolute monarchy and a serious blow at traditional English liberty. The middle classes were not really exploited. The centre of world commerce had shifted from the Mediterranean countries to those about the North Sea. Spain, the great rival of England, was already on the decline. With the influx of Spanish gold from the New World, the capture of many prizes of war and the general improvements of trade, England was on the whole more prosperous than it had been for centuries. The growing middle class demanded more power and a form of religious worship according to its liking; but these demands were not essentially of an economic nature.

There was, however, or had been, great poverty in the slums of London and other English cities. Thomas Moore tells us that the enclosure of large tracts of land for sheep grazing at the time of Henry VIII had deprived many farm labourers of employment, causing them to leave the countryside and swell the ranks of unskilled labourers in the cities. Many of these destitute people later migrated to America. The majority of the early emigrants to the American colonies were desperately poor. A good many, however, were doubtless victims of the civil war, of the Revolution itself, and the later suppression of dissenters in England after the Restoration of Charles II. However, we must remember that the great majority of these so-called "lower classes" did not participate in the Revolution. They remained loyal to the King and the established church and are so even today. Had the Revolution in England then been an uprising of the exploited and starving masses, the situation would have been quite different. The evidence shows that this was not the case. And I doubt if any revolution was ever a spontaneous mass protest against exploitation and misery.

The direct cause of the Revolution in England was the quarrel between Parliament and the King, Parliament daily becoming more radical through the increasing triumph in it of members of the Puritan party. Parliament, which had long exercised certain rights, sought to increase its power at the very

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

time the King sought to limit it. In earlier reigns, Parliament had been made conscious of its importance. It had given its approval when Henry VIII married Anne Boleyn without papal sanction after he had divorced Catherine of Aragon. It had legalized the succession of Elizabeth to the throne. It had authorized and accumulated a body of legislation and precedents, and in the deliberations of Parliament the House of Commons had come to play an increasing part. It was becoming a truly legislative assembly and it is worthy of note that constitutional and representative government would have existed in England whether or not there had been a revolution.

The Revolution was forty years in preparation. The witches' broth which boiled over in 1642 was set on the fire when James of Scotland, after the death of Elizabeth in 1603, ascended the throne of England. The new king was not a Tudor and he was not an Englishman. He soon made it clear that he had "ideas." He loved to make pedantic display of his scholastic learning. He entered into theological disputes with his clergy, wrote treatises on the legality of punishing persons suspected of witchcraft, and proceeded to instruct his subjects in political science according to his own theories. He informed the English that the King could make or unmake any law he pleased without consulting Parliament, that a king by right held power of life and death over his subjects, that a royal person could not be subject to any law except his own sovereign will, that a king was not accountable to the judgment of mankind but was responsible to God alone, that anyone who should deny this doctrine was guilty of "atheism and blasphemy." He gained for himself the reputation of being "the wisest fool in Christendom."

The task of ruling England at that time was one which would have taxed the wisdom and patience of the wisest of mankind. The Reformation had torn the country with partisan strife. The Thirty Years' War was raging on the continent and everywhere the bitterness over religious difference was beyond anything we moderns can imagine. In Britain the Protestants

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

were in control. They were quite as intolerant and suspicious as their Catholic enemies. The persecution of Catholics was never severe enough to satisfy the extreme "left wing" of the growing revolutionary Puritan party. It was not forgotten that although James was a Protestant, his mother had been a Catholic. He was accused of being himself a Catholic at heart. Let him make the slightest attempt to be fair to his Catholic subjects, let him make any gesture of tolerance, let him show his dislike of Puritan narrowness and bigotry, let him even permit village peasants to continue their traditional Sunday amusements, and the rumour was at once circulated that the King had before his coronation secretly promised the Jesuits he would grant religious liberty to Catholics.

Meanwhile, as the King's days were troubled by the Puritan faction, ceaselessly goading him to more extreme measures against Catholics, a conspiracy of the latter faction threatened his very life. It was as if the nation, once divided into rival homicidal groups, was driven on to every excess of madness. We see evidences of this same madness on the part of certain Communist and Nazi enthusiasts today, who stop at nothing in their determination to seize power and destroy their rivals. The spread of this spirit, with its lack of consideration for the common decencies of civilization, is always a symptom of the formation of revolutionary crowds.

Shortly after James became king, and at the very time when he was becoming involved in the controversy with the Puritans, a group of Catholic conspirators attempted to overthrow the government by means of a thoroughly despicable plot—"Putsch," the Nazis would have called it. An attempt was made to blow up the royal family and all the dignitaries of the state on the occasion of the opening of Parliament. This "Gunpowder Conspiracy," so barbarous and insane in its conception, could never have been attempted except by men who had been driven beyond all reason by partisan hatred. The incident shows how easily homicidal mania may take possession of the minds of men on both sides of revolutionary conflict once the infection

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

of revolution begins to work in a community. Even had the "Gunpowder Conspiracy" succeeded, it could only have aroused the Protestant faction to murderous revenge and have lined up the more radical Puritans in the party of the assassinated King. As it was, this ill-advised attempt made it henceforth impossible that the partisan conflict reach peaceable settlement. One or the other of the extremist parties was bound to exterminate its rival along with those moderates who strove to preserve the peace. This also is a recurrent revolutionary phenomenon. In a revolution, the position of the reasonable man becomes untenable.

Hume speaks of the "Gunpowder Conspiracy" as a colossal piece of fanaticism. He says:

"We are now to relate an event, one of the most memorable that history has conveyed to posterity, and containing at once a singular proof both of the strength and weakness of the human mind; its widest departure from morals, and most steady attachment to religious prejudices. It is the 'gunpowder treason' of which I speak; a fact as certain as it appears incredible.

"The Roman Catholics had expected great favour and indulgence on the accession of James, both as he was descended from Mary, whose life they believed to have been sacrificed to their cause, and as he himself, in his early youth, was imagined to have shown some partiality towards them, which nothing, they thought, but interest and necessity had since retained. It is pretended, that he had even entered into positive engagements to tolerate their religion as soon as he should mount the throne of England; whether their credulity had interpreted in this sense some obliging expressions of the king's, or that he had employed such an artifice in order to render them favourable in his title. Very soon they discovered their mistake; and were at once surprised and enraged to find James on all occasions express his intention of strictly executing the laws enacted against them, and of persevering in all the rigorous measures of Elizabeth. Catesby, a gentleman of good parts and of an ancient family, first thought of a most extraordinary method of revenge; and he opened his intention to Piercy, a descendant of the illustrious house of Northumberland. In one of their conversations

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

with regard to the distressed condition of the Catholics, Piercy having broken into a sally of passion, and mentioned assassinating the king, Catesby took the opportunity of revealing to him a nobler and more extensive plan of treason, which not only included a sure execution of vengeance, but afforded some hopes of restoring the Catholic religion in England. . . . To serve any good purpose, we must destroy, at one blow, the king, the royal family, the lords, the commons; and bury all our enemies in one common ruin."

The conspirators were all devout churchmen, the leaders members of the upper class. The aim was to destroy at one blow the royal family and Parliament, seize the kingdom by violence and place a Catholic niece of King James on the throne. Among the conspirators was a Catholic Jesuit named Garnet. During the seventeenth century the Jesuits were very active in European politics. They were determined to undo by every possible means the work of the Reformation and to this end they employed whatever tactics they could command, open or secret, scholarship, statesmanship, appeal to the masses, craft. Probably no such persistent and well-equipped counter-revolutionary party ever existed before or since. Members of this order were outlawed in England, but they carried on an underground propaganda; entering the country by stealth, conducting Catholic worship in unexpected places, outwitting sheriffs and the police, organizing conspiracies. Whenever they were discovered, they were immediately hanged.

Months before the opening of Parliament, one of the conspirators, Piercy, rented a building adjoining the House of Parliament. A secret tunnel was dug through the walls under the building into a vault beneath the House. The vault was filled with sixty barrels of gunpowder and covered with wood and straw, and one Guy Fawkes was chosen to light the fuse as soon as the victims of the plot were all assembled to hear the speech of the King. Unfortunately, on so great an occasion, a number of unsuspecting Catholics whom it was impossible to forewarn would be killed along with the Protestants; but religious advisors of the conspirators easily found ways to still

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

their consciences and justify the massacre. However, there are always a few people for whom human affection may outweigh devotion to a cause. On the day before that set for the explosion, the son of Lord Morley received a letter warning him to stay away from Parliament for a brief time. Search was made of the basement of the House, the powder discovered and the conspirators tried and executed, among them Garnet, who for his part in the affair was by many regarded as a Christian martyr.

The plot resulted most unfortunately, not only for the Jesuits but for the entire Catholic party. English Protestants never forgave the "Gunpowder Conspiracy." To this day the "beef eaters" march from the Tower of London and habitually search the basement of the House before Parliament opens and, to this day, the very word Jesuit arouses indignation among many of the common people of England and their descendants in America.

In the propaganda of the American Protective Association during the last decade of the nineteenth century and later in that of the Ku Klux Klan, one might still hear distorted versions of the gunpowder plot, worked over to make it appear that the death of Abraham Lincoln was the result of a Catholic conspiracy and that the Jesuits were plotting similar future outrages in America. Such are the hatreds bred by revolution.

The "Gunpowder Conspiracy" worked to the partisan advantage of the Puritans very much as the burning, centuries later, of a parliamentary edifice in Berlin worked to the advantage of the Nazis. Nothing could now stop the arrogant demands of the left wing reformers. Think over the great revolutions of the past and present, and you will discover that usually revolutionary parties have become irresistible only after they have enlisted the patriotic enthusiasm of the man on the street. The extreme Puritans could now believe they were the defenders of the nation. They sought revenge on all Catholics, guilty and innocent alike. When the King advised reason and justice and tried to save the innocent Catholics from popular

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

fury, it was said that he was in league with his would-be murderers. Puritan propagandists began to preach republican doctrines. The personal habits of the King were openly denounced. It seems that he had an interest in the theatre and music. He was severely criticized because of his edict forbidding the punishment of those who had participated in games on Sunday and in public amusements. An increasing number of censorious Puritans were added to the ranks of the opposition party in the House of Commons.

I doubt if the Puritans were psychologically much different from other revolutionists who have lived before and since their time. Their procedure on the whole followed the usual course of revolution. Any potentially revolutionary party tends to draw into its ranks a large number of very unpleasant people. It attracts the neurotic and the disgruntled, the unadjusted and the irresponsible, those merely seeking excitement and the ambitious, the lawless along with the sincere devotee and man with social vision. Hume says of the Puritans during the reign of James I that they were "mostly persons of low birth and mean education." The King naturally resented "their lofty pretensions and their familiar addresses to the Deity, of whom they believed themselves special favorites." "They disputed his Commandments to his face and before the people censured his behaviour."

We know there were many splendid men and women among the Puritans, people of character and education, able to take great responsibilities, and to meet difficulty with courage and face life with dignity and honour. Many such persons came out of Puritan England to the American colonies. Many more remained at home during the troublous times of the seventeenth century. In general the humbler members of the party also were God-fearing men, and though often bigoted and stubborn and uncharitable, they were singularly free from the vices and corruptions of ordinary humanity. But the spirit of the times was harsh and cruel. Few Puritans had, like John Milton, Thomas Hooker and Roger Williams, grasped the liberalizing

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

spirit of the Revival of Learning, few of them were men of gentle manners or broad sympathies. They specialized rather in the firmness of their convictions. The spirit of coming revolution certainly never makes for graciousness or toleration among men, and the Reformation had, by the beginning of the seventeenth century, made personal faith and conduct matters of public concern. It is not surprising, therefore, that men of the stamp of Prynne, Pride and Barebones, cranks, zealots, haters of liberty and of peace and joy, could command a hearing and rise to positions of party leadership.

There is a certain type of puritan who is always with us. I have long noticed that people are much more ready to follow one who denounces than one who praises, one who says that something we all thought was right is wrong, rather than one who says that what we thought wrong is really right. It is to the advantage of us all to induce our neighbours to conform to established codes of conduct. In such manner does their conduct become more predictable. We can more easily adjust ourselves to well-regulated persons. We feel more safe and comfortable in their company. Hence we all make profession of morality and preach its precepts to our neighbours. No society could possibly exist without this pressure of all upon each.

But there are people who tend to overdo the task, to transform this watchfulness of ourselves and of one another into a kind of mutual ownership, to invade civilized privacy and make public issues of personal matters which have nothing to do with the necessities of social adjustment. There is an enormous amount of secret shame in the world which causes men and women to enjoy scandal and to seek protection against their own untamed impulses. This desire for protection against our own peculiar temptations is often disguised as concern for the moral welfare of society. Hence the public is prone to make of almost any conflict of interests, however trivial and material, a great moral issue. When moral issues are not ready at hand, there are always those to invent them. For many people the moral interest differs little from that nervous disorder

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

known as compulsion neurosis. Certain gestures must be made and certain ceremonies performed, not for any good they may do, but for their own sakes. There is another symptom common among psychopathic persons which is known as "projection." Projection is the term used for the habit of nervously unstable individuals of ascribing their own inner conflicts to other people. Much "puritanical" reform is the result of this habit of projection.

The crowd often makes use of moral ideas as weapons of the mediocre and instruments of the protest against the feeling of inferiority. Revolutionary crowds, therefore, commonly seek to justify their will to power by bringing forth terrible moral indictments against those more fortunate persons whose positions the revolutionists wish to occupy for themselves. Most people wish to be important and are consoled for failure if they can believe they are better than someone else. Hence those suffering with a feeling of inferiority can, by defining goodness in terms of their own dilemmas and group interests, say to all the world "we are the good." Merely by keeping the most commonplace commandments, observing the obvious decencies, meeting the simplest moral necessities, shouting for general conformity to the tribal tabus, we become superior, we are better than the wise, for the wise are often sceptics and often in error. We are better than the gifted and the great, for the great are often non-conformists and "loose livers."

Crowd morality, therefore, always tends to lay chief emphasis on the commonplace, the obvious, the necessary, the keeping up of appearances lest one of the least of these our brethren might be caused to stumble. Many people who are lacking in imagination and sympathy and are incapable of profound intellectual interests or spiritual adventure, find in puritanical moral crusades a form of escape from inner boredom. Righteousness, which among men of good will is mankind's greatest blessing, becomes among men of ill will the occasion for meddlesomeness, coercion, controversy and hatred. Certain moral crusades show many of the psychological characteristics of the revolu-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

tionary crowd and every revolution, in its protest against the feeling of inferiority and because of its need of finding justification for the homicidal wish, becomes something of a moral crusade.

The English Revolution was no exception. It had a genius for justifying partisan arrogance, class interest and traditional hatreds by a solemn show of piety and an invective of moral censoriousness. Hume and Hobbes and Butler seem to have regarded the Puritans as a group of hypocrites. But these older writers were unacquainted with modern social psychology. What they thought was hypocrisy was simply the psychology of revolution expressing itself in the verbal fashion of the day.

Before the death of James I, the House of Commons forced the King against his will to persecute the Catholics with increased severity and to declare war, contrary to his better judgment, against Spain and Austria. It was their unwillingness to assist Charles I in financing this war of their own making which later led to civil war between Parliament and the King and the downfall of the monarchy.

James died before the war could be more than begun and in 1625 his son Charles became King of England and Scotland. The young king was at first very popular. Parliament greeted him with loyal enthusiasm. His personal habits and daily life were all that even Puritans could desire. His education, like that of his father, had been more theoretical than practical and, if there was any defect in his character, it was that of a certain meticulousness and inability to compromise, which he shared with the Puritans, added to a certain aloofness and shyness of disposition which were easily misunderstood—or misrepresented—as indifference to the sentiments of his subjects. Perhaps he expected too much political decency in the public affairs of the nation and was unable wisely to deal with its opposite. He is said to have been at first so modest that he refrained from requesting of Parliament the necessary funds for the prosecution of the war with Spain and Austria.

Parliament, it will be remembered, had forced James I into

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

this continental conflict, partly because of partisan wish to aid the Protestant cause on the continent and partly for the sake of certain advantages to English commerce. Parliament had previously declined to grant King James the money for the war, and its negligence in this matter had caused much delay. It had also made it necessary for the King to borrow money and spend large sums out of his personal income. When James died, he had contracted debts amounting to three hundred thousand pounds. It was this emptiness of the royal treasury, the questionable methods used to balance the budget, and the consequent disadvantageous position in which this placed the King, which weakened the government and made it possible for the revolutionary party, growing ever more bold, to strike it down. It is interesting to note how frequently an unbalanced national budget has contributed to a revolutionary situation. This condition existed in the Roman Empire after Constantine. It had much to do with the Revolution in Germany in 1848, and as all know was the crisis which led directly to the French Revolution of 1789.

Had revolutionary politicians and propagandists deliberately planned to manœuvre the crown into the embarrassing position in which Charles I found himself, they could hardly have created a situation more difficult for the King or more advantageous to themselves. The army and navy were unpaid and becoming restless, the patriotic masses were growing dissatisfied over the delay in carrying on the war. Was King Charles secretly in sympathy with the Catholic princes on the continent? The relations between King and Parliament became increasingly unfriendly. Finally a sum of six hundred thousand pounds was grudgingly voted, an amount insufficient to pay the King's debts and meet the necessary administrative expenses of the monarchy. Still there were no funds to pay the expenses of the war. This situation continued into 1633 with frequent exhibitions of ill will between the King and the dominant party in the House of Commons.

It was not that England was too poor to pay for the war

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

which the House had voted. England was fairly prosperous at that time. It was not that a designing monarch had led an unwilling nation into war for his own selfish or dynastic ends. This was Parliament's own war, a war which had the support of the Protestant element in the population. Money was withheld by Parliament in order to demonstrate its own right to grant or withhold tax money to the King. A constitutional principle of government was thus being stubbornly maintained. Did not English liberty depend upon the maintenance of parliamentary restraint upon the power of the sovereign? Englishmen had long ago made the discovery that the refusal to vote taxes was a very effective and wholly constitutional method of keeping a check on the exercise of sovereignty. Let Parliament surrender this check and the rights and liberties of Englishmen would be placed at the pleasure of a despotic ruler. The King in now demanding that Parliament grant him money was, in effect, asking freeborn Englishmen to voluntarily surrender their inherited liberties.

In principle Parliament was right, but in practice it had placed itself in the wrong. For it was in honour bound either to pay for its own war or discontinue it. But to pay for the war seemed to be to yield to the King, and to discontinue it would be to compromise with the Catholics. So Parliament did neither. Parliament could, of course, maintain its constitutional rights as truly by voluntarily exercising its right to grant money as in withholding it. But it refused to yield under pressure and the Puritan party was determined to use the situation to force upon the King and the nation certain of their demands for reform.

They demanded a general reorganization of the Church of England, with its form of government and its form of worship. Many demanded so-called moral reforms, such as the abolition by governmental decree of public amusements like dancing and the theatre and the revocation of the royal edict against the infliction of punishment for breaking the Puritan sabbath—in other words, they insisted upon putting all England under a system of "blue laws" like those of Calvin at Geneva and those

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

which later were written on the statute books of the New England colonies. They made these demands knowing they would be utterly abhorrent to vast numbers of decent English people who were regular communicants of the Church of England and had accepted the Episcopalian type of Protestantism.

They further demanded the still more rigorous suppression of all persons suspected of Catholic inclinations. Such is often the way of dictatorial revolutionary factions. In our own day, we have seen measures quite as unreasonable imposed upon entire peoples by Fascists, Communists and Nazis. It seems to add to the feeling of self-importance of the mediocre man if he can compel his neighbours to conform to unpopular and arbitrary regulations. It should be remembered that men engaged in desperate social conflict easily lose their sense of proportion and few revolutionists are endowed by nature with much humour or tolerance.

King Charles, in disgust, dismissed Parliament and entered upon the dangerous course of governing England in his own way. He was obliged to raise money as best he could and the methods he employed did not add to his popularity. He attempted to revive a number of the ancient prerogatives of the English kings. England was still at war and war is often a justification for the exercise of dictatorial executive power. Charles forced certain towns to build ships and contribute them and their equipment to the royal navy. From numerous wealthy citizens he compelled contributions of "ship money" and resorted to "forced loans." The burden he imposed upon his subjects was not great. But he had not reckoned on the temper of the English people. His efforts to raise money were met with every conceivable resistance. "Taxation without representation" was tyranny. The King failed to secure the necessary funds. Parliament was recalled.

Meanwhile, disorder had been widespread. Typical is the case of John Hampton, squire of Buckinghamshire, who refused to pay a small tax of twenty-five shillings and was convicted in the King's Court by a bare majority. Those who were

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

arrested for defiance of the authority of the bishops, or for resisting the King's tax collectors and officers of the law, could count on the sympathetic support of their neighbours. It was difficult to secure convictions of offenders when tried by jury. Hence the star chamber court had recourse to more rigorous and inquisitorial methods of procedure. Riots had to be put down and soldiers were quartered in various communities at the expense of the civilian population.

Parliament, during the brief time it was in session, busied itself, not with the King's financial problems, but with preparing and presenting to Charles, and for general publication, a "Petition of Right." Attention was called to the alleged illegal acts of the King's agents. The petition demanded that no one again be forced to yield any "gift, loan, tax, or benevolence, without consent of Parliament." Also that no free man be imprisoned, or made to suffer any punishment except according to the laws of the realm, and that soldiers be not quartered upon the people. Parliament was again dismissed and did not meet again for eleven years.

A panic of fear seized English Protestants. The Thirty Years War seemed to be going badly for the Protestant cause. Denmark had been conquered by Wallenstein. Richelieu had reduced the Huguenots of France to submission. England was at war with the Catholic princes and was doing nothing effective about it. And Charles had married a French Catholic princess. He was suspected of considering favorably a secret agreement with France and Spain for the protection of Catholics in England. There was general fear of a Catholic revival. William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, tried to preserve peace by means of a compromise between the extremes of Calvinism and Catholicism. The consciences of the clergy were to remain free, but outwardly they were required to conform to the ceremonial requirements and other regulations of the Church of England. For many of the Puritan divines this requirement was impossible, and the obstinate clergy was brought to trial before the ecclesiastical court of High Commission and severely pun-

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

ished. Many of the Puritans openly rebelled against the authority of the church and joined the ranks of the Separatists, Brownists, Congregationalists.

It frequently happens that a government menaced with growing sedition and on the brink of revolution has no understanding of the seriousness of the situation, and appears to make unnecessary effort in order to hasten its destruction. As if Charles I had not trouble enough in England, he went out of his way to involve himself in a quarrel with his own countrymen, the Scots. The loyal support of his Scottish subjects would have been of great advantage to the King in his struggle with the English Parliament. But Charles chose this critical moment to try to compel Scottish Presbyterians to modify their prayer book. Charles was immediately faced by a rebellious army of Scottish Covenanters who solemnly swore "never to submit to such blasphemous papistry," and English soldiers refused to fight the Scots on the ground that they were all fellow religionists.

Parliament had at last to be summoned. This was the "Long Parliament" at whose hands the King met his death. This new House of Commons was more violently Puritan than ever. It proceeded to order the arrest of Archbishop Laud, held him prisoner in the Tower of London, declared him guilty of high treason and, in spite of all the King's efforts to save the life of his friend and prelate, Laud was executed. The execution of the Archbishop of Canterbury was a revolutionary gesture quite like that of the attack on the Bastille by the French mobs in 1789. Others of the King's friends and counsellors followed Laud to the scaffold. A bill was passed providing that Parliament should meet every three years, whether or not the King should choose to call it into session. Parliament then prepared a document for presentation to the King known as the "Great Remonstrance," in which there was a long list of grievances and a demand that the King's ministers be henceforth responsible to Parliament. This demand for a "responsible ministry" was often made again in subsequent revolutions in other lands and

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

the document deserves special attention as a revolutionary "manifesto." Certain of the grievances mentioned in it are later to be found in the American Declaration of Independence. Revolutionists are not always original. In the Great Remonstrance it was alleged—

"The commons in this present Parliament assembled having, with much earnestness and faithfulness of affection and zeal to the public good of this kingdom and his Majesty's honour and service, for the space of twelve months, wrestled with great dangers and fears, the pressing miseries and calamities, the various distempers and disorders which had not only assaulted but even overwhelmed and extinguished the liberty, peace, and prosperity of this kingdom, the comfort and hopes of all his Majesty's good subjects, and exceedingly weakened and undermined the foundation and strength of his own royal throne, do yet find an abounding malignity and opposition in those parties and factions who have been the cause of those evils and do still labour to cast aspersions upon that which hath been done, and to raise many difficulties for the hindrance of that which remains yet undone, and to foment jealousies between the king and Parliament, that so they may deprive him and his people of the fruit of his own gracious intentions, and their humble desires of procuring the public peace, safety, and happiness of this realm.

"For the preventing of those miserable effects, which such malicious endeavours may produce, we have thought good to declare the root and the growth of these mischievous designs; the maturity and ripeness to which they have attained before the beginning of the Parliament; the effectual means which have been used for the extirpation of those dangerous evils, and the progress which hath therein been made by his Majesty's goodness and the wisdom of the Parliament; the ways of obstruction and opposition by which that progress hath been interrupted; the courses to be taken for the removing of those obstacles, and for the accomplishing of our most dutiful and faithful intentions and endeavours of restoring and establishing the ancient honour, greatness, and security of this crown and nation.

"The root of all this mischief we find to be a malignant and pernicious design of subverting the fundamental laws and prin-

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

ciples of government, upon which the religion and justice of this kingdom are firmly established."

The King ordered the arrest of five of the Puritan leaders of the House of Commons, on charges of treason. But the prosecution failed of conviction and the released prisoners, now popular heroes, returned from London to Westminster in triumph. It is fatal for a government, in a time of crisis, to attempt repressive measures which it cannot carry through. The self-revealed weakness of civil authority is an invitation to open rebellion. The situation between the King and the commoners became very like that which arose a century and a half later in France between Louis XVI and the Third Estate and for similar psychological reasons. The monarchy was weak where it should have been firm and it made an irritating show of firmness over matters concerning which it could well have afforded to compromise.

Charles was like those inefficient parents of our own day who, having failed to gain parental authority and filial respect, lose their tempers over trifles, punish their children unnecessarily and to no purpose and have nothing left to concede when concession is the better part of wisdom. The intelligent minority will not remain loyal to a government which fails to deserve its respect and the multitude will attack any government which is not strong enough to command its obedience. The King of England sulked and assumed a haughty manner. The House of Commons, gaining increased popular approval with each successive act of defiance, became still more defiant in the conviction that Parliament alone represented the nation.

Both King and Parliament began to arm in self-defence. Civil war followed, ruthless, devastating civil war, in which the greater part of England became a battlefield. The aristocracy and Catholic party and a number of commoners who were more afraid of the Puritans than of regal despotism rushed to the support of the King. Cromwell, who had planned to depart for America, became commander of the Parliamentary army and

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

organized it with rigorous Puritan discipline. His soldiers entered battle singing psalms and fought to their death, convinced that God was with them. At Marston Moor, in 1644, the royalist forces were destroyed. The King took refuge with the Scots who, after holding him prisoner for two years, concluded a satisfactory bargain with the English and surrendered him to Parliament.

After the battle of Marston Moor, some letters of the King were captured which were said to show that Charles had endeavoured to secure the aid of the Irish and the French. Rumour had it that he had been a party to the Irish Massacre of Protestants. Revolutionary dictatorship always begins with the dictatorship of one party in the nation. This party, in destroying its rivals and by temporarily crushing differences of opinion within its own ranks, inevitably destroys the "rule of the people" in whose name the revolution was started. This has been the history of Jacobin dictatorship in France and of that of the Fascists, Communists and Nazis of our generation. It was the same in England.

Parliament was no sooner victorious over the King than it proceeded to the practical destruction of parliamentary government and English liberty. Just as the Jacobins gained control of France by destroying the Girondists in the Assembly, so the Puritan party became master of England, not by the free vote of an elected parliament, but by a *coup d'état*, known as "Pride's Purge." Under the leadership of Colonel Pride, the army drove out of the House of Commons all members except those who belonged to the militant group of the Puritan party. The remaining members, with the help of the army, declared themselves to be the Parliament of England and this "Rump Parliament" proceeded to abolish the monarchy and House of Lords. It proclaimed itself the government of the nation and declared England to be a "commonwealth" or republic.

Charles was brought to trial before a court appointed by this "Rump Parliament," condemned to death January 30, 1649, and was beheaded on a scaffold erected in front of Whitehall

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

Palace. The execution of the King caused a chill of horror in the nation. Subsequent events proved that the masses were still loyal to the monarchy and that the regicide act had been the work of an extremist minority. Many even of those who gave silent approval to the execution of Charles Stuart, later "came to" and welcomed the Stuart kings back to the throne of England. This ought not surprise us; such is the usual course of revolution.

The role of the army has received insufficient emphasis by historians who regard revolution as a triumph of the people and a glorious victory of freedom. A revolution is usually possible only because of the disloyalty of the army or through the formation of a new civilian army of republican guards or a "red" army or one of "shirts" of one colour or another. A revolution is, moreover, a civil war and its victory "for the people," usually achieved by a revolutionary army, has commonly to be defended by the same army against counter-revolution. Warfare leads to military dictatorship, open or disguised. Hence the rise of the Napoleons, Stalins, Mussolinis, Hitlers. In revolutionary England, the government inevitably passed over to the rule of the army under command of Oliver Cromwell.

Parliament, in spite of its profession of piety and posing as the champion of liberty, soon became intensely unpopular. Its illiberal policy of censorship aroused the indignation of no less a Puritan than John Milton, who openly challenged its right to limit the freedom of speech and the press with his tract, the *Areopagitica*. He compared the British censorship with that of the Inquisition, pointed out its hostility to liberty and its menace to the progress of culture and said that "Presbyter is just old Priest writ large." Members of Parliament were accused by many Englishmen of taking bribes, a vice not unknown to revolutionary assemblies, and parliamentary rule became so bigoted that even Cromwell warned the Puritans. "I beseech ye brethern, bethink ye in the bowels of Christ, that ye may be wrong." Finally Cromwell, along with a large portion of the population, quite lost patience with the black-gowned, psalm

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

singing, politicians of Westminster. "Come now," he cried, "we have had enough of this. I'll put an end to it." He drove out the members of the long Parliament, locked the door of the House and put the key in his pocket. Thus he had accomplished precisely what Charles I had failed to do. And the general public was glad.

A new Parliament, like those of Italy and Germany today, came into being simply to ratify the acts of the dictator. This assembly is referred to by historians as the "Barebones Parliament." It did little more than grant to Cromwell the title of Lord Protector, a title similar to that of *Il Duce*, *der Fuehrer*, and other subsequent revolutionary dictators. Oliver Cromwell was in his day considered the most powerful ruler in Europe. Hume says, "It seemed to many persons he was quite as despotic as James I or Charles I." The dream of republican government and of parliamentary supremacy had been obliterated by the revolution itself in the passion for compelling all the nation to conform to the Puritan way of life and faith. Every crowd loves liberty only so long as it is not yet victorious in the struggle for power.

No one, however, could accuse Cromwell of compromising the principles of the Reformation. England was now Presbyterian, its religious doctrine officially stated in the Westminster Confession of Faith. The Catholic party was liquidated. A counter-revolution in Ireland was crushed, town after town ravished and two thousand of "the barbarian wretches" of that island massacred. Ireland never really recovered. The confiscated lands of the Irish rebels were given over to British Protestants. Cromwell also made war against Calvinistic Holland for the sake of the commercial supremacy of England, and ruthlessly put down a movement in Scotland for the return of the exiled son of Charles I.

But the cause of Charles II, although crushed to earth, revived. Not only in Scotland, but all over England, an increasing number of people looked back on the reign of the Stuarts with fond memories. Those had been the days of Merrie England,

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

days of freedom and joyousness. A new generation had grown up since civil war broke out in 1642 and with the passing of the old there passed much of the bitterness of Puritanism and the fanaticism of revolution. Here, as on many historical occasions, events proved the fallacy of those reformers who believe that if a generation of youth can be brought up under new conditions and with new ideas and habits, however compulsory at first, human nature will be changed, the new ways will become habitual and there will be no general longing to return to the old. Certainly the ways of the Puritan were not uniformly effective in changing the characters of Englishmen, and much of the social change attempted by any revolution vanishes along with the swift waning of the original enthusiasm.

Cromwell died in 1658 and not long after his death Charles Stuart, Charles II, was brought back to England. There was wild celebration and popular rejoicing. In the violence of the reaction against Puritanism, even John Milton was driven into hiding by the mobs in the streets. Human nature long restrained by revolutionary dictatorship, now released, often went to the opposite extremes in its antipathy toward Puritanism. Puritans, because of their refusal to receive communion in the Church of England, were declared to be ineligible to hold office. Every clergyman who refused to accept the Book of Common Prayer was expelled from his parish. Two thousand resigned. The Conventicle Act was passed abolishing the new king's edict of religious toleration and both Catholics and Puritan "dissenters" and "non-conformists" were subjected to more or less mild forms of persecution. Thousands of the "dissenters" migrated to America.

Yet liberty advanced in spite of religious repression. The Habeas Corpus Act was put in force along with other forms of traditional English liberty, civil and personal. The Revival of Learning which had been interrupted by religious strife and civil war again appeared in England. The theatre was revived, along with a secular literary awakening. If there were licence during the reign of Charles II, there were also the beginnings

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

of a truly modern scholarship which was to give the world such names as Locke and Newton. The spirit of cultural freedom, once again alive, led toward that enlightened liberalism of the early eighteenth century which the young Voltaire, inspired by English example, carried back to France. "The Age of Reason" during the eighteenth century, both in its weaknesses and its strength, was largely the result of the spread in continental Europe of the English liberalism which followed the overthrow of Puritanism.

By 1688 a new and reasoned liberalism entered the spirit of the English people, and when the last of this unhappy House of Stuart, James II, himself an avowed Catholic, attempted, under what was said to be Jesuitical influence, a return to the medieval monarchy and church, the enlightened English put him off the throne with very little struggle and invited William III of Orange to come to England to be their king. James's soldiers refused to fight for him and William and Mary became rulers of England by the free choice of the people. Before their accession to the throne, the signatures of the new rulers were obtained to a "Declaration of Right," a document containing a Bill of Rights and guaranteeing the preservation of the traditional liberty of Englishmen. Thus liberty became not a natural right as it was to be by the French Revolution, but a definite, clearly understood limitation to the power of the sovereign, with certain rights of the individual citizens specified in a body of law.

What did the violent Revolution of 1642 and the dictatorship of the Puritans contribute to the liberalism of the eighteenth century? I think it contributed less than is generally supposed. The two were wholly different in spirit. The first was characterized by the passions of the Reformation, the other by the Revival of Learning. Could not the liberalism of the eighteenth century have come into existence without the revolution of the early Puritans? There is no answer to questions like this, but I believe it could, if James I and Charles I had been monarchs of the type of Queen Elizabeth. There is a sense in

REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

which Voltaire's observation is true. He said that revolution in England had been caused by reactionary kings. But these kings were responsible only in part. A spirit of faction was abroad in the land which was bound to rule or ruin. The Puritans and the Stuarts together set back the progress of liberty and enlightenment for a century. Revolution frequently forces mankind to take sides when both sides are wrong and both hostile to the orderly advancement of civilization—which is the only real advancement of civilization. The right course, at such times, is not a middle of the road policy. It does not lie on that road at all. What has the civilized man to do with contending factions, both of which are bent upon establishing tyranny?

The Revolution of 1642 was not a spontaneous uprising of the English common people. It is interesting to note that Cromwell gained his victories and maintained his dictatorship with a small army of fifty thousand men. The English public expressed its true sentiment in its joy over the restoration of Charles II. That public demonstration at least seems to have been spontaneous and genuine.

It is doubtful if, as many seem to think, the Revolution in England made possible the supremacy of the middle classes. Those classes were already rising to wealth and influence in the time of Elizabeth. The revolutionary House of Commons was largely recruited from the middle class. But it is doubtful if it represented, even in its Puritanism, the real convictions of that class as a whole. And the Revolutionary Parliament soon lost its power after the execution of Charles I. In fact, it was not until the nineteenth century that the "capitalist" class in England really came into its own. And even then, it emerged only to influence British industrial policies and to share social prestige along with the surviving older landed aristocracy.

No, it was not, strictly speaking, the emergence of class which brought about revolution in England. This theory is advanced chiefly by propagandists who affect to see in the alleged revolution of the "bourgeois" a precedent for an equally imaginary working-class revolution in the present. The emergence of a new

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

class to a position of social leadership is a slow process and is the result of certain cultural forces—not of violence and revolution. Revolution is the work, not of classes, but of desperate factions. Revolution is not the flowering of historical tendencies. It is something imposed upon the public at times when the government is powerless to preserve order.

An important and unexpected result of the seventeenth-century English Revolution—and its subsequent failure—was the great migration of Puritans and dissenters to America, among them some of the ablest men of the movement. It was from such early colonists that America derived its English speech, its common law, and many of the traditional liberties of Englishmen. Also its inherited resistance to monarchy which later broke forth in the War of Independence. To this source we can trace the American evangelical tradition, susceptibility to crusades of moral reform, and fondness for preaching and political oratory. Public sentiment in America, even today, is in no small measure the result of those historical accidents which caused the early Calvinists to bring to these shores the spirit and temper not of Erasmus, but of Wyclif and John Calvin.

WAS THE AMERICAN STRUGGLE
FOR INDEPENDENCE A REVOLUTION?

WHEN anyone in the United States inquires into the justification and wisdom of revolutionary movements in general, someone is sure to say, "But think of the American Revolution! You dare not deny the justice of that heroic struggle for liberty. Do you want England still to rule this country? Our Revolution gave us our National Independence." But our study of the revolutions of history need involve us in no quarrel with either American liberty or national independence. We are justly proud of both and are deeply grateful to those early Americans who have left us this political inheritance. I could only wish that contemporary Americans were as courageous and wise and unselfish in their professed love of liberty as were Benjamin Franklin, Washington and the author of the Declaration of Independence. But was it the American Revolution which gave us our civil liberties, or were most of them already in evidence before 1776? And was this a revolution in the true sense or was it primarily a war for national independence? The idea of independent nationality is not necessarily a revolutionary idea.

The fact is that much of the democratic ideology in America is the result, not of the War for Independence, but of the bloodless revolution led by Andrew Jackson in 1828. The American people enjoyed almost as many civil rights and personal liberties before the "revolution" as afterward. The colonists possessed all the rights of free English subjects and had a larger measure of self-government than did the English at

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

home. The right of universal manhood suffrage made substantial gains just before and during the revolt against the English King. But suffrage did not become wholly free from property restrictions until shortly before Andrew Jackson's time—at about the same time the right to vote became universal in England. The Bill of Rights, also in our national Constitution, did not have its origin in the revolt of the colonies. Nearly all its provisions were incorporated in the English constitution and many of them were restated in the "Petition of Right" and the "Declaration of Right," which date from the time of Charles I and the coronation of William and Mary.

America's Bill of Rights, incidentally, was added to the Constitution of the United States as a sort of after-thought, in the form of the first ten amendments, in order to commit the federal government to the preservation of those civil liberties which various states had enjoyed since Colonial times. American common law, as is well known, is of old British origin. Representative government existed long before the revolution both in England and in the colonies. A number of the colonies had very liberal charters, that of Carolina having been written by the great liberal, John Locke. Some of the colonies had royal governors appointed by the crown, like those of Canada. In some colonies, all public offices were elective, including not only both houses of the legislature, but the governor.

The Revolution, moreover, did not greatly change the social status or the economic condition of the poor, and there were those who believed that it had left quite unfinished the "emancipators of the masses." Shays's Rebellion in revolutionary Massachusetts as late as 1786 was evidence of this sentiment. This rebellion, several years after the independence of the colonies had been won, was characterized by a propaganda strikingly like that with which Samuel Adams, a generation earlier, had aroused the crowds in Boston to revolt against the royal governor. Why should there have been a Shays's Rebellion or a party of Jacksonian democracy if the struggle for inde-

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

pendence had been a real and successful revolution of "three million people armed in the holy cause of liberty"?

Most of the restrictions against which the Revolutionary War was fought grew out of the mismanagement of the Imperial Colonial Office and were abuses contingent upon America's membership in the rising British Empire. But the resistance to such abuse, even the dismemberment of the Empire, was not necessarily revolution. In fact there were two distinct elements in the revolt of the colonies—first, an abortive social revolution aimed primarily at the governing classes in the colonies themselves, and second, a justifiable and successful secession from the British Empire. The first element which expressed the discontent of the poorer classes did much to bring on the second before the colonies were really prepared for the struggle. It almost defeated the cause of national independence through faction and lack of discipline in the long struggle, and in the end it caused such confusion that those who wisely cherished the sentiment of nationality were obliged to formulate the Constitution of the United States to maintain order, achieve national unity and preserve the inherited constitutional liberties of the English-speaking peoples.

There was much talk of liberty at the time of the revolt of the colonies. But the idea of liberty meant different things to different kinds of men. Sometimes, as when James Otis argued in the court of Massachusetts against the issuing of "Writs of Assistance," liberty meant the freedom from search and seizure without warrant of law. That is, liberty was the exercise of specific rights under the Constitution of England. Again "liberty" appeared as a principle invoked to justify civil strife and lawlessness in the outbreaks of mob violence against officers of the law and the wealthy classes. Sometimes liberty was thought of as Colonial independence and sometimes it was held to be a gift of nature granted in equal measure to all men.

Social unrest and civil strife existed in New England before the merchants and wealthier classes became involved in a series

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

of quarrels with the Colonial Office over the question of taxation. Already there existed bitter conflict between a growing revolutionary faction and the officers of the law, both British and Colonial, and between the advocates of the cause of the poor man and the governing classes. The leaders of the populace took up an imperial issue which did not directly concern the masses, often greatly to the embarrassment of the "classes." Conditions, especially in New England, were ripe for some sort of social revolutionary struggle. What really happened was that the revolutionary movement became diverted into the struggle for independence. National independence was not the original aim of the conflict and was not taken seriously until after revolutionary mobs had taken the leadership of the American cause out of the hands of the old New England aristocracy and social strife had thrown the colonies into such a state of disorder that the imperial forces intervened in a vain effort to restore the public peace. The military intervention of the British government served only to add to the flames of revolt throughout the colonies and the struggle for Colonial independence became inevitable.

We will make a brief survey of the causes which gave rise to this revolutionary movement and of those causes which later operated to drain off the original revolutionary enthusiasm into the long-drawn-out War for Independence. A change of interest is not an unusual phenomenon of crowd psychology. The French Revolution is a splendid example of this. In that instance the crowd's enthusiasm for the "Rights of Man" finally became exhausted in the Napoleonic wars of conquest.

There were numerous factors in the life of the colonies which tended toward social revolution. There was first the unsatisfactory economic situation which grew out of the manner in which most of the early settlements were organized and financed. Certain British trading companies had secured land grants and permits from the King. These enterprises were joint stock companies, primarily commercial ventures for the exploitation of the New World. Many of the governing boards and

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

owners remained in England and hoped to share in the profits of the settlements. Thus were sown the seeds of subsequent conflict between the rich and the poor. Many of those who migrated to the New World had placed themselves in debt to the trading companies in order to pay their passage. They became a servant class, often propertyless and bound to years of labour, and without the right to vote. Others who settled on farm lands and in new towns found themselves in debt to the land-owning companies. Most of these people were not peasants but were artisans and members of the servant classes and many were drawn from the unemployed classes of English cities.

Living conditions in New England and other colonies were hard, and the struggle to gain a livelihood in the wilderness would have been very difficult even for a peasant population accustomed to dig in the ground. There was much poverty and hardship, and no little exploitation of the poor by the wealthy and of new arrivals by those who had seized upon the easiest opportunities. Thus there emerged quite early in the colonies a discontented "debtor class." There arose a demand for cheap money and an antagonism to the "money power" which survive in American politics to this day.

The traditional economic struggle in America, even in spite of our industrial development, has not been that between labour and capital, but rather a conflict between little business and agrarian interests and "big business." It has been a demand for an opportunity for the independent farmer and local tradesman. It has been assumed that the worker, with thrift and industry and "a square deal," can in time improve his condition and become a member at least of the lower middle class. Hence "pass prosperity around." This was the type of discontent which was common in New England. It does not seem to be at all revolutionary now, but we shall see that it became so in the colonies, when class distinctions were more sharply drawn and the standard of living of the masses was lower than it is today.

There was also a religious element among the causes of the Revolution. Most of the colonists, those of Maryland excepted,

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

were extreme Protestants. The great migration to the colonies came here out of an England torn with religious conflict. The new settlers brought with them their religious enthusiasms and prejudices. Even in Virginia, where the Episcopal church was the established form of religion and penalties were inflicted for nonattendance at divine services, there was much Calvinist sentiment among the masses and a general fear of bishops. The Scotch-Irish of the Carolinas and New Hampshire were intensely Calvinistic; so also were the Dutch settlers of the middle colonies, except Pennsylvania and parts of New Jersey which were predominantly Quaker with a sprinkling of German pietistic minorities and other evangelical sects. Among all these people the habit of non-conformism was strong. They insisted upon the right of private judgment and their convictions supported by passages of Scripture easily led them to delusions of infallibility. Most of them were ignorant men and the ignorant are often opinionated and intolerant. Here on the American frontier, with almost no cultural ties with the Old World except the Bible and preaching, and surrounded by hostile natives, they gained the reputation long before the Revolution of being a "stiff-necked people" and difficult to govern.

The New England Theocracy, founded on utopian ideas derived from the Old and New Testaments and the fact that life on the new continent was in many respects a "new start" for humanity, gave many a sense of escape from a sin-cursed Europe into God's country and caused a general belief in the moral superiority of American institutions over those of Europe and England, especially after the Restoration. In the narrow environment of the colonies, preoccupation with the salvation of the soul led to extravagant episodes of religious revivalism. James Truslow Adams says of the popular response to the evangelistic preaching of Whitefield, in 1741, that the example of this evangelist "was followed by a small host of other itinerants of every shade of conscientious zeal and ignorance. . . . Numbers of people continued the greatest part of the night in utmost disorder." A contemporary writer is quoted as saying,

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

"falling down, praying, exhorting, singing, laughing, congratulating one another. . . . Some had fits, some fainted. . . . For a while it seemed impossible for anyone to speak against the new doctrines and preaching. Those who opposed Whitefield were stigmatized as enemies of God and true religion, and were openly represented, both from the pulpit and the press, as in danger of committing the sin against the Holy Ghost if not actually guilty. . . . Very few ministers have dared to open their mouths in favour of reason, virtue or order or anything thought to be against their work."

This movement known as "The Great Awakening" swept over the common masses in its spread from Northampton, Massachusetts, throughout the colonies. Adams correctly sees in it an expression of popular discontent and an uprising against the established order. In an earlier chapter, I pointed out the relation in the Middle Ages between evangelistic preaching, the religious revival, and revolution. The psychology of the crowd is much the same in both. The revival in the colonies, even before the Revolution, divided the community on lines almost identical with the prevailing social class distinctions. In the religious awakening, the descendants of those people who centuries earlier in England had followed Wyclif and his "poor preachers," protested against the official Calvinism of the more educated Puritans and returned to something like the original social unrest of the Middle Ages, an unrest intensified now by the crowd enthusiasms of the camp meeting, the economic conditions of frontier life, and the revolutionary tradition of English Puritanism.

The revivalist spirit spread to non-religious interests and encouraged in the consideration of all public questions a class-conscious defiance of authority, an explosive intemperance of judgment and of crowd behaviour, a contempt for reason and scholarship. It gave rise to that propagandist method of encouraging the prejudices of the ignorant which is still evident in almost every aspect of American public interest. Even when a generation later than the Great Awakening people had to

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

some extent abandoned the faith of the revivalist preachers and many were influenced by the "Free Thought" and anti-clerical Deism of the revolutionary philosophies of John Locke and Samuel Adams and Thomas Paine, they still tended to approach the consideration of political issues in the temper of the religious revival. They retained much of its hortative and intolerant spirit, its crusade against "sin," its emotional intemperance, its methods of appeal to the crowd.

The revival tended to give over the leadership of the crowd, in matters both religious and secular, to men of little education and violent disposition. It encouraged prejudice of all sorts. It led men to regard differences of opinion or conflict of material interests as matters of eternal right and wrong. It gave sanction to the unwillingness of the self-righteous to yield or compromise. And when the attitude of "no compromise" becomes general, mutual adjustment to the life of the community is impossible, friction runs wild and the social peace is destroyed.

There were other psychological causes of the ungovernable disposition of many colonists during the third quarter of the eighteenth century. Seventeenth and eighteenth century writers had begun to discover "the people" and many flattering accounts had been written of man in the state of nature. Rousseau and others had idealized the noble savages of North America. Even Voltaire had located Eldorado on this continent. Franklin later extolled the humble virtues and exemplified the ambitions of the common man and, as Colonial representative, wearing his rustic fur cap, made a profound impression in capitals of the Old World where the sentiment of "the return to nature" had become a fad. Many of these complimentary ideas had become current among the masses.

A type of man who perhaps had never before enjoyed opportunity or the flattery of believing his sentiments much respected, was now for the first time becoming articulate. A flood

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

of popular journals, cheap pamphlets and newspapers appeared to feed the vanity of the multitude and to hold up the privileged, idle classes to contempt and ridicule. Many had migrated to America to improve their material conditions. Here was a new beginning in a land which originally had known no servants and no masters.

On the frontier, old cultural traditions tended to disintegrate and here authority was weak. The average man, crossing the ocean, felt a definite break with the past, he entertained extravagant notions of the possible riches which awaited him in the New World; in spite of hardship, poverty and debt, he still looked forward to the day when he could become a landed proprietor. Many former household servants and artisans' apprentices whose lot it had been to obey orders, bear humiliation in silence and show respect toward their "superiors" could, in America, become independent farmers. An entire class, which in crowded and exploited Europe could never dream of owning a square foot of the earth's surface, here saw a vast and unexplored continent at their disposal. We have all seen examples of what may happen when underlings, without social grace, self-discipline or breeding, are suddenly raised to positions of importance. Often in revolution men of low class and mean education are able to seize positions of authority and their bad manners and insolence are a characteristic feature of revolutionary dictatorship.

Crowds also tend toward arrogance in the degree that their sense of power increases. They tend to make ever-increasing demands on the community as a whole. So in America, the crowd before the Revolution began to regard itself as "The People." "The People" was by right supreme; it could do no wrong. Mob violence in defiance of authority of both king and commonwealth, was, as we shall see, not uncommon, and with such defiance the crowd's sense of self-importance increased.

Moreover, it must be remembered that the great migration to the colonies was composed largely of people who had experienced a revolution in England. Many of the emigrants were dissenters

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

and non-conformists who refused to submit to the legislation enacted after the restoration of the monarchy. Many had, or their immediate ancestors had, belonged to the revolutionary Puritan party. They had participated in civil war, they had seen a social and political order crumble, and could remember the time when the authority of both Parliament and King had been successfully challenged and rulers exposed to public criticism. Many had learned to place the word of the Bible—and their private interpretation of that word—above that of all earthly magistrates.

The population of the colonies, through immigration and national increase, grew in numbers with startling rapidity. In 1650, the colonies had a population along the Atlantic seaboard of 52,000; in 1700, 270,000; and in 1775, three million. In societies where there is such sudden influx of population, there is bound to be much social maladjustment, rapid change in the general conditions of living, much disorder, exploitation, dissension and a growing sense of the power and importance of numbers, that is, of man acting as mass.

Moreover, the great majority of this growing mass of people did not possess the right to vote. In general it is said that only about one adult male in four in the colonies enjoyed the franchise. Beginning about 1760, the property qualifications and other restrictions on voting were generally modified. But, as Adams says, "It was only as the Revolution approached that these unenfranchised elements, forming the overwhelming majority of the people, wrested political control of the colonial governments from the class of propertied free men, and this largely by illegal, violent and terroristic methods."

Gradually the town meeting, made up of ordinary townsmen, small tradesmen and men of the fields and the frontier settlers, came to dominate the political life of New England. And with the town meeting, there emerged the political machine, the agitator, and the professional politician. "The conservative classes," says Adams, "were closer in their sympathies to the views of the home government than they were to the radical

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

elements in the colony . . . they could not watch without foreboding the passing of power into the hands of more or less ignorant and irresponsible persons . . . tumult had procured concession. A weapon with the keenest of edges had been surrendered to the people, and the prestige of authority had been lowered."

It has been said that Americans have always been, by nature, a people prone to lawlessness. Certainly they have had their share of mob violence, lynchings, strikes and riots, Klansmen and gangsters. But be such an estimate of American national character true or false, it is evident that very early in their Colonial history the lowering of the prestige of authority increased the violence of inter-class antagonisms and bred in the populace a tendency to connive at law-breaking. Sometimes outbreaks of lawlessness were provoked by official acts. A recurrent cause of disturbance was the habit of ship commanders in port towns like Boston of seizing men and impressing them into the service of the Royal Navy. Often there was deliberate defiance of authority, as when the New England woodsmen persisted in cutting timber reserved by the crown for shipbuilding. The public usually sided with offenders in such cases and it became increasingly difficult for the government to secure their conviction. There was much smuggling by the colonies and, while the British Empire was at war with France, colonists continued to trade with the enemy and the crowd resisted all efforts of the government to stop such traffic.

Hostile demonstrations of the mob were not confined to attacks on the agents of the British government. There were riots over land titles. The attempt to enforce unpopular laws of any sort was not infrequently met by violence. Local officers of the law or citizens who had incurred popular displeasure were often tarred and feathered and their homes attacked and pillaged or burned. To this day there survives an old New England folk song which relates the story of the tarring and feathering and riding on a rail of a local skipper by the women of Marblehead for "his hard heart" and his failure to rescue

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

a number of shipwrecked seamen. In the demand for cheap money, some of the Colonial legislatures were intimidated into authorizing the printing of paper currency which was later redeemed at one-tenth its face value. In 1735, in a disturbance over the question of the legality of certain "land bank notes," a mob of more than four thousand men threatened to march to Boston.

In the matter of voting salaries to Colonial governors, legislative assemblies, remembering the behaviour of Parliament in withholding money from King Charles, resorted to a similar practice. Not only was the home government helpless, but the practice led to conflict between the executive and the legislative branches of Colonial government and to general disturbance in which the populace gained the sense of easy victory. Again, in 1733, an act of Parliament known as the Molasses Act caused violent popular resentment in the colonies and led to general and systematic law-breaking.

This Molasses Act was not a measure from which the English at home derived any direct benefit. It was passed in an attempt to equalize commercial advantage between two groups of colonies in the New World. For a long time, although there were British colonies in the West Indies, New Englanders preferred to trade with the French West Indies because they found prices in those colonies lower. A large item in this trade was the importation into New England of sugar and molasses, much of it used for making rum. I know a man who has worked out an ingenious theory about the historical importance of the Molasses Act. He maintains that had it not been for rum and rum runners, there might not have been any American Revolution at all. This impious theory, however, loses much of its interest now that Prohibition has been repealed and we may confine our attention to the facts. Parliament yielded to lobbyists from the British West Indies and placed a protective tariff on importations from those islands. New England colonists were furious. There were violent outbreaks against the authorities who vainly tried to enforce the duty on molasses. At one time the

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Governor of Massachusetts reported that Boston was completely in control of the mob and that the local militia had refused to restore order. All along the Colonial coast, this and similar tariff laws were continuously violated with repeated clashes between an inadequate force of officers of the law and an irate populace.

Before the Seven Years' War, there was widespread contempt for authority in the colonies and an emerging conflict between the so-called upper classes of the colonies and the growing power of the debtor classes and the poor. Meanwhile the spread of the population westward into territory over which France claimed sovereignty, although this claim was disputed and left unsettled by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748, also the fact that titles to land in this region had often been secured from the Indians by methods which, to say the least, were questionable, brought to a head the struggle between the British and the French for the mastery of North America. In this struggle the American colonists were obviously the most interested party. Yet their behaviour during the war with France on this continent and their subsequent refusal to bear any burden of imperial taxes to meet the cost of the war, together with the general stupidity of British Colonial policy, did much to change what had begun as a social revolution in the colonies into a rebellion against the British government.

This war, which continued from 1756 to 1763, need concern us only in so far as it contributed to the outbreak of hostilities between England and the colonies. The irregularities of the operations of the Susquehanna and Ohio companies in what was allegedly French territory aroused the Indian allies of the French to attacks on frontier settlements. The colony of Virginia, after an unsuccessful attempt to cooperate with neighbouring colonies, took matters very much into its own hands and sent a detachment of soldiers into the Alleghany Mountain region under the command of the young officer George Washington. At Great Meadows, Washington came into contact with a band of French

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

and Indian scouts, said by the French to have been sent from Fort Duquesne as emissaries. A number of Frenchmen were killed and scalped by Washington's Indian followers, and the rest of the band taken prisoners. Among the dead was Commander de Jumonville whom Washington was accused of assassinating while on a mission of peace. None in the colonies took this accusation seriously. Indian methods of warfare were well known here, but the Virginians had some difficulty in explaining not only to the French, but to the Colonial Office in London, this incident, together with Governor Dinwiddie's failure to keep certain promises Washington had made.

During the war with France which followed, the colonies seem to have had very little sense of unity either with the British Empire or with one another. The British were more or less justified in feeling that the colonies gave inadequate support in this conflict which seriously affected Colonial interests. Virginia exempted from military service "all citizens disqualified to vote for candidates for the Assembly." Governor Shirley of Massachusetts was made commander-in-chief of the American forces. Massachusetts, under Shirley's leadership, sent eight thousand troops, Connecticut sent one thousand, and an attempt was made to raise ten thousand in Pennsylvania. The government at London commended these efforts, promised to send troops from England, reimbursed the colonies with the sum of one hundred and fifteen thousand pounds, and urged them to agree upon some plan for united action. But Shirley's efforts were made ineffectual by a series of delays, by dishonest contractors, by the incompetence of military leaders, and by the jealousies of the politicians. He was finally accused of incompetence and even worse offences and was called back to England.

Although Braddock's humiliating defeat at the Monongahela caused a general feeling of consternation in the colonies—news-papers were forbidden to publish accounts of the battle—little had been done which was really effective. Many towns sent no

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

troops whatever and even refrained from sending representatives to their Colonial assemblies. At the end of the first year of the war, it is said that there were less than 3,500 Colonials in the British army and that when Wolf finally gained the victory at Quebec, the number of Colonials under his command had shrunk to a few hundred. Not only were there many deserters, but the discipline of the American soldiers was very bad. These free men resented "bringing themselves into a state of subjection." Washington complained of these soldiers as "loose idle persons." Colonial officers were elected by the companies which they were supposed to command—a policy which inevitably destroys order and discipline in an army. And there was jealousy between the Colonial and regular troops. The situation was made worse by a British ruling to the effect that no regular English officer should receive orders from a Colonial officer of any rank—and this in spite of the fact that many of the British, like Braddock, were incompetent, unacquainted with the country, and unaccustomed to fighting savages in the wilderness. Furthermore, the growing anti-British feeling in the colonies was increased by the efforts of London to suppress the widespread illicit trading with the enemy which continued throughout the war. As early as 1762, the British government in New England resorted to a policy of search and seizure of contraband goods—note Otis's legal arguments against this practice. The victory over France gave the English-speaking nations supremacy in North America, but it served also to concentrate the opposition of the colonies to the imperial policies of England.

After the war, Franklin, American agent in London, argued that the contest had been waged in the interests not of the colonies, but of England! The war left both England and America in a state of economic depression which easily led to misunderstanding and acrimony. The war with France had cost the English eighty-two million pounds and the conditions in the colonies were anything but prosperous. The value of farm lands declined, trade was at a standstill, there were bankruptcies and failures of commercial houses, and many foreclosures of

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

mortgages on farms and homes, with evictions and all the attendant bitterness of such procedure.

However, it is not surprising, since a similar situation existed in England, that the government in London should attempt, itself, to force on the colonies some plan of better imperial order and even expect the colonists to pay a tax sufficient to garrison the western territory which had recently been wrested from the control of France. Nor is it surprising that the colonists, considering their temper of mind, should have resisted such a policy with all their might. The presumption of the imperial government to force upon the independent people of the colonies its measures of taxation was a revival of "taxation without representation." It was tyranny and the measures found necessary to enforce this tax upon a resisting people and to maintain order and the authority of the imperial government were considered an unwarranted interference with the American right of self-rule, and a reduction of free men to a state of slavery. Moreover, as is the case with tariff legislation generally, the government was not free from the suspicion of favoring certain vested interests and such suspicion only added to the violent indignation of the colonists.

The tariff on sugar and molasses was continued and those accused of the violation of this and other parliamentary laws were ordered to be tried by the Admiralty Court. Later there was an attempt to bring such accused persons to England for trial. In 1765, Parliament passed a bill authorizing a stamp tax. The burden of this tax was not great, but it was greatly exaggerated. Colonial merchants naturally opposed the tax, for it was felt that it might become the precedent for further and more extortional taxation. Radical propagandists, like Samuel Adams, aroused the masses to fury, took the leadership of the opposition out of the hands of the conservatives and complicated the situation by a series of lawless demonstrations against the "tyranny" of England. The Town Meeting of Boston was now a really democratic assembly. It was not difficult for the party of Adams, Hancock, Otis and other enemies of English

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

"hostility" to American liberty to dominate in the deliberations of this body. In time an active propaganda was carried on aimed at the separation of the colonies from the British Empire. Just as radical sentiment had earlier been directed against the privileges of the wealthy classes in the colonies, it now determined to beat England at all costs. Colonials declined service with the troops which were necessary to garrison the lands acquired from France and became resentful when British soldiers were assigned to perform this task. They refused not only to contribute to the support of such troops but declined to agree to a voluntary tax levied by their local governments if the stamp tax were repealed. Everywhere there were mass meetings, speeches, floods of inflammatory newspaper propaganda, threats of violence.

An organization was formed chiefly among the disfranchised and the more ignorant and lawless elements of the community. These persons, who called themselves "The Sons of Liberty," took leadership in much of the mob rule which followed the passage of the Stamp Act. Customs offices were attacked and pillaged, officers of the law were beaten and carried through the streets covered with tar and feathers. Colonial authorities who tried to maintain order were attacked, burned in effigy and their homes demolished by mobs. Private citizens who expressed disapproval of such terrorist actions became themselves objects of the vengeance of the mob. A group of the Sons of Liberty, marching on New Haven, when ordered by the Governor of Connecticut to disperse, replied "they represented people who did not take orders from anybody." Committees of the Sons of Liberty issued orders both to local authorities and citizens in the name of "the Sovereign Lord, the People." A boycott was set in operation against imported British goods; when it was not voluntarily accepted, its advocates resorted to intimidation. At Newport a mob defending smugglers of sugar seized the battery and fired on English ships.

The English government, in retaliation for such practices, raided numerous ports along the coast where it was alleged

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

there had been defiance of authority. Then the London government committed the blunder of the Townsend Acts which levied duties on glass, lead, spirits, tea, paint, etc. The injustice of such legislation is the more evident when it is remembered that already British Colonial policy had discouraged the importation of articles manufactured in the colonies into England and had sought to force the colonists to buy products exclusively of English manufacture. Undoubtedly the time was approaching when the colonies would be bound to throw off the yoke of imperial English rule. But the justice of this principle of national independence did not require the mob terrorism which existed at the time in the colonies. Already the imperial tax imposed upon all the colonies was doing much to give them a common cause and a new national consciousness. The mob demonstrations carried on in the name of "patriotism" were often examples of the disorder which commonly results when government passes laws which it cannot enforce. The time for redress of grievances was passed. Men were seeking independence.

But on March 5th, 1770, the very day the Stamp Act was repealed, a demonstration of mob behaviour resulted in the so-called "Boston Massacre." Boston was so far at the mercy of terrorists that the Colonial government quartered royalist troops in and near the city to preserve life, property and some semblance of order. No sooner was the presence of the military in the city accomplished than radical agitators sought to provoke quarrels "between the inhabitants of the lower classes and the soldiers." On this fatal evening, a crowd which had been first attracted by a fire later surrounded the sentry at the customs house and began subjecting him to abuse. A squad of soldiers sent to protect the sentry found itself attacked with the usual missiles of the mob. The mob dared the soldiers to fire. Five men were killed, including a Negro who appears to have been the leader of the riot. The soldiers, including Captain Preston, were brought to trial, defended by John Adams and Josiah Quincy, Jr., and all except two acquitted. Yet the paper pub-

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

lished the story of the "Massacre" and lined the margins of the page with drawings of coffins; and Patrick Henry in his "Liberty or Death" speech before the House of Burgers in Virginia made mention of the clanking of the chains of slavery on the plains of Boston!

There was general uproar throughout New England and the government ordered the troops removed from Boston. The famous "Boston Tea Party" followed. A cargo of tea belonging to an English exporting company lay in the harbour. The radicals determined that the tax on tea imported from England should not be paid and decided that the cargo should not be landed. On November 30, 1772, a mass meeting was called at Old South Meeting House. This meeting resolved—here I again quote from James Truslow Adams's *Revolutionary New England*—that those who had been instrumental in the granting of permits for the landing of this "detestable commodity . . . must betray an inhuman thirst for blood and also in a great measure accelerate confusion and civil war. This is to assure such public enemies of this country that they will be considered and treated as wretches unworthy to live and will be made the first victims of our resentment." Those to whom the tea had been consigned were warned to leave town. The customs officer was seized by the mob and filth dipped up from outhouses was smeared on the doors and windows of his house. On December 16th, at the instigation of Samuel Adams, a mob dressed as Indians seized the tea-laden ship and dumped her cargo into the sea to the delight of a crowd of eight thousand people.

With each act of violence the mobs grew more arrogant and bold. A ship belonging to the popular leader, John Hancock, arrived laden with wine. When the customs officers attempted to inspect the ship, their boats were burned by the mob and their homes wrecked. Similar incidents occurred at the ports of Rhode Island where the mob seized ships, took them from the control of the customs officers, and brought them to Boston. An example of the lengths to which the mob went in forcing its illegal government upon the citizens of Boston is the follow-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

ing poster reprinted in Adams's book *Revolutionary New England*:

THE TRUE SONS OF LIBERTY

And Supporters of the Non-Importation Agreement,

Are determined to resent any the least Insult or Menace offer'd to any one or more of the federal Committees appointed by the Body at Faneuil-Hall, and chastise any one or more of them as they deserve; and will also support the Printers in any Thing the Committees shall desire them to print.

AS a Warning to any one that shall affront as aforesaid, upon sure Information given, one of these Advertisements will be posted up at the Door or Dwelling-House of the Offender.

Lord North closed the port of Boston in 1774. Radical papers clamoured for war with Great Britain. The Governor of Massachusetts again requested that Royalist troops be sent to Boston to maintain order. The first meeting of the Continental Congress took place in 1774, in Philadelphia. The radicals, afraid that this Congress might attempt a reconciliation with the government at London, secured the passage of the Suffolk Resolves. It declared that "Great Britain, 'which of old persecuted, scourged and exiled our fugitive parents,' now pursued their 'guiltless children with unrelenting severity.' The streets of Boston were said to be 'thronged with military executioners,' and the people were called upon to 'disarm the parricide which points the dagger to their bosoms.' " In April, 1775, a detachment of Royalist soldiers was sent out from Boston to seize a store of munitions. The townsmen refused to surrender their arms when commanded and were fired upon. Instantly the whole countryside flew to arms and there at Lexington and Concord "the embattled farmers stood and fired the shot heard round the world."

But even after the engagement at Lexington, the more conservative of the colonists protested to the King that the British regulars had been the first to fire, and sent professions of loyalty to His Majesty and to the principles of the English Constitution. But it was too late to turn back. The war for American inde-

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

pendence had begun. It was not until more than a year later that the Continental Congress proclaimed the end of British rule in the colonies and issued the Declaration of Independence.

We have tried to follow the psychology of the development of revolutionary crowd mentality in the colonies. We have seen that popular hostility toward the ruling classes in the colonies became in turn directed toward the King of England as the symbol of the oppression of the people. We have tried to see the situation in the colonies and to note the official stupidities on both sides of the Atlantic which provoked much of the hostility. The grievances of the colonies were real and exasperating. But while these could lead to general opposition, they were not in themselves, logically speaking, sufficient to account for the revolutionary ideas which found expression, nor for the continued series of acts of terrorism and mob violence. The former were derived largely from the Reformation and the revolution which had occurred in England. The latter had their origin in the conditions of Colonial life and society and in the general weakness of governmental authority in the New World.

The behaviour of the crowd until the outbreak of the war shows most of the typical phenomena of revolution—the same seizure of intense enthusiasm upon the popular mind, the same ideas of self-justification, the same utopian hopes, the same loss of sense of proportion, the same resort to irrelevant acts of lawlessness, the same tendency of revolutionary crowds to revert to barbaric acts of cruelty and destruction, the same growing dictatorial arrogance of the mob as its sense of power and impunity increases, the same busy and cleverly organized propaganda, the same disturbance of the peace of society by a determined minority of enthusiasts.

As the revolution became merged in the War for Independence, the behaviour of the mob became more and more differentiated from the military struggle for national liberty. Enough of it, however, remained to cause difficulty in maintaining discipline in the army, to breed faction and jealousy, to

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

inflict much unjustifiable suffering upon civilians whose sympathies remained with the King, and unnecessarily to prolong the war.

It would carry us beyond the scope of our present study to attempt to follow the military operations of the War for Independence which dragged on for six weary years. Obviously the colonies were unprepared for a major conflict with the British Empire. They lacked the necessary resources, training and national unity. It is easy for the crowd, in moments of passion, to defy authority. But it is a different matter for the crowd to discipline itself to endure the hardships of protracted warfare. It is doubtful whether those whose lawlessness and impatience plunged the colonies into the conflict ever pictured in advance the cost of the struggle. Ports were blockaded, cities were occupied and transformed into military barracks, highways were torn up, occupied regions were governed by military necessity, farm lands were over-run and turned into battlefields, homes were demolished, provisions requisitioned, property destroyed. Trade, except that of supplying the armies, was at a standstill and crops unharvested while men were drawn from the fields and shops for service in the army. Suspicion and fear, and disorder and destitution, spread throughout the colonies.

Alternating victory and defeat kept the population between hope and despair. At times it seemed that the war would never end and again it appeared that all was lost. There were dissension and rivalry among the leaders, and jealousies developed among the Colonial politicians. At times Congress was helpless. There was a shortage of money and the evils of an inflated and worthless currency made matters worse as the old demand of the debtor class for paper money came to dictate the policies of Congress and Colonial legislatures. The army, while it fought bravely, was after all composed of volunteers and led by amateur officers in conflict with British and Hessian regulars. Most of the Colonial soldiers were members of local military companies who had enlisted for short terms. Discipline was difficult and desertions many.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Moreover the conflict developed into civil strife and in many localities became a guerrilla warfare of neighbour against neighbour. The uprising of three million people armed in the holy cause of liberty never occurred. Sentiment was divided. Many people, even among those who opposed the policies of the British government and had been loud in their expression of grievances, remained loyal to Great Britain. Others, seeing the desperate and almost suicidal chances which the country had taken, became discouraged. Americans were not at all unanimous in accepting the radical principles of equality and natural rights of the new radical philosophy. Many resented the coercion and lawlessness of the revolutionary crowds. Others tried to remain neutral and improve their fortunes by selling provisions to either or both of the contending armies. The cities were full of "Tories" and the "upper classes," with certain notable and heroic exceptions, like Washington, Randolph, Jefferson, Rush and John Adams, who were on the whole conservative.

There was much personal antipathy. There were many informers and victims of intrigue and envy; and there was much confiscation of the property of persons accused of entertaining sympathy for the British cause. Thousands of prominent citizens left the country. It is said that only about one-third of the population of the colonies favoured American independence, one-third was indifferent and one-third was actively pro-British. James Truslow Adams says that "during the war more colonials fought in the ranks of the British army than joined the American one. Before the struggle was over, more than a hundred thousand had died or been exiled and the loss of so large a number of substantial citizens, comparable only to the expulsion of the Huguenots from France, was to be felt severely in the years following."

Two causes outside America greatly helped the cause of independence. First, there was much liberal sentiment in England and this sentiment operated to discourage the vigorous prosecutions of the war. Second, there was France. The French were

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

still revengeful over their defeat in the Seven Years' War, and from the beginning of the War for Independence French agents were at work secretly or openly in the colonies. The aid which the colonies received from France was incalculable and the presence of Lafayette, Rochambeau and the French forces at the end, when Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown, is a matter of greater significance than it usually receives at the hands of American historians. But with it all, the endurance and dogged determination of the American common people and the courage of their tried and true leaders, struggling always against forces greater than their own, not only won the victory for national independence, but gave to the struggle a tradition of heroism which has remained, ever since, the pride of our national inheritance and an inspiration to American idealism.

Had the achievement of national independence not been preceded by the movement for social revolution within the colonies, public affairs in America might have been conducted on a higher level of intelligence than that which has prevailed during the greater part of its history as a nation. The common man conceived of the revolt of the colonies as a revolt of the masses. He believed that national independence and liberty were the same. He thought that such freedom as existed in America had been gained by acts of mob violence rather than through the leadership of the enlightened minority and the progress of culture. The crowd thus regarded itself as the champion of liberty and was encouraged in this delusion by journalists, preachers and politicians who sought to gain public favour by the flattery of the multitude. The prejudices and material ambitions of the man on the street came to dominate public policy. The common man's idea of success became the general standard of the good life and his tastes and his longing for the sensational and the exciting tended to characterize everything that attempted to gain public interest. The public as a whole, the undifferentiated mass, took to itself credit for American nationality and identified its collective egotism with the virtue of patriotism. Wisdom and scholarship have in Amer-

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

ica been forced to apologize for their existence while the public has made heroes of advantage-takers and notoriety seekers. Many of the very liberties which are America's historical heritage are placed in jeopardy in the general scramble for personal preferment and the crowd's struggle for power.

American independence as a people and American national destiny have such just claim to devotion that Americans are often misled by those who make use of this sentiment of devotion for other than patriotic ends. The crowd tends to carry the sentiment of nationalism to extremes and to use it in extenuation of popular conceit. One sees many exhibitions of folly committed in the name of patriotism and much vulgarity solemnized by flag waving. Because you are a patriotic American, it doesn't necessarily follow that every fool in the country has claim on your esteem or that you must regard every American, because of the geographical accident of his birth, as superior thereby to the rest of mankind. I suspect that no small part of the narrow nationalist sentiment which today has taken possession of the masses the world over is the result of the American example.

The war for American independence broke the unity of the English-speaking world. Certainly it is not to urge that America again submit to the rule of Downing Street, to suggest that a more friendly spirit of cooperation between America and Great Britain would accomplish much for the preservation of individual liberty and constitutional government. In this respect these two nations and possibly France have common cause, and never so much as today. With most of continental Europe swinging toward mass revolution, factional dictatorship, and regulated thinking, it is well to remember that the strongholds of constitutional liberty and representative government are to be found in England and America. These achievements are peculiarly of Anglo-Saxon origin and are part of the contribution of our historical development to modern civilization. In a few years we may be the only peoples who retain them. Furthermore, it should be noted that the revolt of the colonies doubtless contributed something to the liberalization of Eng-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

land during the nineteenth century. English Colonial policy became greatly modified after the defeat of George III by the American colonies. The same liberal principles which found expression in the American Constitution also found expression in nineteenth-century England, and now that liberalism everywhere is being challenged by revolutionary propaganda and growing dictatorship, the time has come for us to note carefully how little of our liberty we owe to the mob either now or at any time in the past and how much we owe to the orderly advance of civilization.

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED
TO EMANCIPATE THE MASSES

A REVOLUTION will destroy the people who call it forth. It will make mockery of the idealisms in which it had its birth. Let it finish its course and it becomes a blinded and enraged Samson crushing itself together with its victims under the structures it pulls down upon its own head. Not all revolutions live to reach their end. Some are put down at the beginning. Some are crushed by counter-revolution. Some become distracted and abandon their original course as did the American Revolution in the War for Independence. Some are exhausted midway in their course and, like the Commune of Paris in 1871, reluctantly submit to restraint and moderation. But a full-rounded revolution drifts ever more rapidly to the "left," until it perishes in its own vortex.

The French Revolution succeeded for the time in turning society quite upside down—which is the true intent of mass revolt—and in releasing all the repressed impulses of crowd behaviour. It became the policy of its leaders to "have no enemies to the left," and no compromise with the right. Thus France gave mankind an example of what the rule of the crowd really is. All the symptoms of crowd behaviour were manifest, and in their extreme form. The obsessive system of ideas may be seen in the creed of the Jacobin party, "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity." The egomania of the crowd mind is revealed in the identification of the mob with the "Sovereign People." The homicidal wish is symbolized by the guillotine.

In almost any revolution in history the features of typical

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

mass revolt may be here and there slightly distorted by accident and one or more of the common phenomena of revolution may be wanting. But the French Revolution exhibited them all. There was the usual exposure of the stupidities and hypocrisies of the existing social order by professional writers and upper-class intellectuals. There was the spread of new philosophies, new political theories and utopian hopes among the enlightened minority. There were glaring abuses of privilege among the ruling classes and indignant demands for justice long denied and reforms long delayed. There was, during the eighteenth century, very rapid cultural progress bringing with it new beliefs and doubts, new manners and interests, new industrial processes, with new opportunities, hardships and desires, and the rise of new groups of the population to positions of wealth and influence. With this change there came a general feeling of uncertainty of the future which sometimes found expression in the feeling "After us the deluge." There were futile attempts of the authorities to restrain freedom of speech. There was the usual pre-revolutionary weakness and inefficiency of government, increased by a serious financial crisis.

There was, at first without much success, an organized dissemination of a propaganda of unrest among the masses. There were occasional bread riots and occasional local uprisings of peasants against their landlords, and mobs grew more daring and powerful with each successive act of violence. There emerged a professional class of small office-holders, politicians, pamphleteers and journalists, who demanded liberty for the people yet professed loyalty to the King.

There came a day when a crisis in government made it possible for these men openly to defy the authorities, to appeal to the masses for support, and finally to declare themselves the people's representatives and the real government of the nation.

The appeal to the crowd was answered by an uprising of the most lawless elements of the population, by destruction of life and property and the breakdown of all authority. There was or-

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

ganized a revolutionary army, or militia, a national guard recruited from among the suppressed elements of the community, which, instead of maintaining order, became itself the organized force of revolution. There was the "liquidation" of the older privileged classes and the general belief that with the seizure of power by the crowd and its representatives, the long-hoped-for age of freedom, justice and universal happiness had come into being. The new government, intimidated by the mob and pressed for money, resorted to the usual short-cut to create an appearance of affluence for all. A policy of monetary inflation was adopted which resulted in financial chaos, disorganized trade and industry, and brought a large portion of the population to the verge of starvation. There were the counter-revolutionary plots and appeals of emigrés and representatives of the old order for foreign intervention. There followed the "Reign of Terror," the progressive humiliation of the royal family and finally, at the demand of the mob, its execution. A citizens' army bravely defended the Republic against invasion.

Then revolutionary factions turned upon one another as they made bid for the support of the crowd. Sentiment became more and more radical. Suspicion and conspiracy became universal. Those who were yesterday in the dominant party of the Left, tomorrow would find themselves a hopeless minority of the Right and doomed to death. The popular assembly, after proclaiming "the Rights of Man," found itself and the nation at the mercy of a fanatical partisan dictatorship. The public, subjected to the tyrannical rule of utopian theorists, became accustomed to massacre and intrigue. Finally the dictatorship itself broke down in an epidemic of fear and jealousy of its members of one another. Disappointed crowds still filled the public squares with tumult. But the end of the course of revolution had been reached. There was no direction in which to turn but toward reaction. By this time the revolutionary armies had become disciplined and organized and had attained political importance. The situation required only that a popular military com-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

mander subdue the mob with republican cannon, enlist patriotic sentiment in a war of conquest, and make himself autocrat of the nation.

This course of events which I have outlined might, with slight modification, be also a description of the Revolution of 1848, the Russian Revolution of 1918, and the present revolution in Germany. It will be said, "Grant that such is the procedure of revolution in general, are you not begging the question? It is admitted that a revolution is a revolution and not a Sunday School picnic. You cannot condemn it for not being what it is not supposed to be. No one imagines that the manners of a revolution are those of a polite and academic college faculty meeting. Revolutions get things done and you cannot make an omelette without breaking a few eggs."

But I have not laid stress on the bad manners of revolutionary movements—though I can see no reason why such boorishness should be exempt from the criticism of civilized people—nor have I at any time stressed the horrors and atrocities which are commonly committed by revolutionists. Such horrors, like those of war, can be made to appear heroic and have a certain appeal for many people. What I would emphasize is the undeniable *futility* of revolution. The history of revolutions shows them to be the supreme examples of human folly. The dream of the regenerated society which inspires them has never been realized in a single one of them. Yes, revolutions get things done and it is precisely what they get done that should move the gods to ironic laughter. The liberties of the French people today are not the result of the three revolutions which have occurred in that country, but of the progress of modern civilization in that nation.

Radicals will be the first to admit the failure of the French Revolution; for their own propaganda makes frequent reference to the disappointing outcome of that struggle. They regard it merely as the rise to power of the bourgeoisie and in no sense "the emancipation of the masses." The "real" revolution is yet to be; hence their later efforts in France, as elsewhere, to bring

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

about their desired Communist revolution of the "class-conscious proletariat." In an earlier chapter I quoted a passage from Marx's *Communist Manifesto* to the effect that the bourgeoisie in the revolutions of the eighteenth century had merely advanced the economic interests of their own class and had substituted for feudalism their own system of "naked and shameless exploitation" of the workers.

Grant, then, that the French Revolution failed to establish liberty, equality and fraternity. Admit that it ended in new dictatorship and reaction; is the radical explanation of this failure historically correct, or is it rather an excuse devised to preserve the faith of those who still wish to believe in the future success of revolution notwithstanding all the failures of the revolutions in the past? Was the French Revolution essentially a revolt of the bourgeoisie? It is possible to argue that it was. The "Third Estate," which in 1789 constituted itself the revolutionary national assembly, was composed largely of middle-class notaries, journalists and politicians. But there were very few rich capitalists in that body, while, in fact, many of the leading capitalists of France were at the time members of the aristocracy. Moreover, the type of man who attained leadership is precisely the same type as that which made up the Bolshevik party in the Russian Revolution and now is, in overwhelming majority, in the bureaucracy which constitutes that country. This is the type of man who must inevitably come to position of leadership in any modern revolution, for any revolutionary movement must have its leaders, the majority of whom will not be common working men, but intellectuals sufficiently educated to edit radical journals, make speeches, organize their fellows, and hold office both in the revolutionary party and the succeeding government.

Russia, says Sorokin, has each year a smaller proportion of working men in positions of governmental responsibility. In a very real sense, there is not and cannot be a "dictatorship of the proletariat," but rather a dictatorship of a radical political party which rules in the name of the working classes. The dic-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

tatorship of Robespierre and Lenin were very much alike in this respect—except that the French dictatorship more nearly represented the great body of workers, for in both nations at the time of the revolution the number of industrial workers was very small, the great majority of workers being peasants. The French peasants were on the whole less sympathetic with the revolution than the Russian, but they had the vote and were much better represented in the revolutionary government of France than are the Russian peasants in the Communist party.

Again it can be said that the French Revolution was followed by the rise of nineteenth-century capitalism and that many of the "new rich" made their fortunes during the Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. But the spread of capitalism was not confined to France. And in other countries it does not seem to have been thought necessary to send the king and aristocrats to the guillotine in order to make way for the industrial revolution. Landed aristocrats elsewhere, and in France before the Revolution, found little difficulty in transferring a portion of their wealth to industrial capital and becoming themselves powerful shareholders. The lower bourgeoisie of France, small shopkeepers and artisans, had a great part in the Revolution, but they did not distinguish themselves from "the people" generally and fought side by side with peasants and industrial workers. They believed that the Revolution was not in the interest of any class, but of mankind in general—aristocrats excepted—and not because they were shopkeepers, but because they were men and women.

In fact there was much more Communism in the French Revolution than radicals today are inclined to admit. So much emphasis has been placed on the political aspects of this struggle, that the attempt to establish the Cooperative Commonwealth in 1793-4 often escapes attention. From the first, *Sansculottism* was a "war of the poor against the rich." Had not Marat, leader of the Popular party in Paris, raised the cry "Hang the grocers"? Hébert, Chaumette, Saint Just, Cuthon, and Robespierre, were very advanced Socialists considering the times in which they

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

lived. They were all temperamentally of the psychological stuff of which Bolsheviks are made and in much that they did they created the models for the Russian Revolution a century and more later. They were devotees of the Rousseauist doctrine of the Social Contract in much the same way as are modern Communists through their adherence to the teachings of Marx. They strove for a classless society through Jacobin leadership of a proletarian revolution against the propertied classes. Saint Just, whose philosophy was essentially communistic, declared that the wealth of France was largely in the hands of enemies of the people's revolution and that "those who make a revolution by halves are only digging their own graves"—sentiments later found in the writings of Marx and Lenin. As in Russia, an inquisition was established by the Jacobin party and a dictatorship of that party was set up to "purge the party" of its faithless members, and subject the individual with all his rights to the rule of the collective will, and this supreme will became not the general will, but that of the "pure," whose task it was to teach and direct the nation toward the realization of general happiness.

The Convention was coerced by the Jacobin party and its *sansculottist* allies into adopting measures for the socialization of wealth. The vast property of the church, consisting chiefly in land holdings, had already been confiscated by the state. Confiscation of other property followed, first that of the aristocrats and emigrés, then that of all persons who were suspected of being "enemies of liberty" and of all who sought to discourage the government or expressed criticism of those in authority. Opposition parties were crushed, their leaders executed and their property confiscated. The Jacobin clubs became the judges of republican orthodoxy for the entire nation. A general "tribute" was levied on property in the effort to bring about a redistribution of wealth. The government spent large sums in expenses of "vigilance committees," of semi-volunteer partisan organizations, and in payment for attendance on popular assemblies, and on relief to the unemployed "indigent patriots,"

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

and the juries of revolutionary tribunals. Party members were paid to draw up lists of suspects—and it is said that all who paid a tax assessed at more than fifty francs were placed under suspicion of being “counter-revolutionary.” To the list were added the names of those who “calumniate patriots” or “disseminate false news,” or “seek to hinder the supply of provisions,” and all who still persisted in the private banter and sale of such commodities as were demanded by the state. Those who made false returns of their business transactions were punished by death and their informers rewarded with a share in the goods confiscated. Supplies were requisitioned and commissars appointed to act as custodians of public property, expeditions were organized to visit villages and preside over the seizure of food-stuffs and other property. Laws were passed providing punishment of those who lived without doing useful labour and food cards were issued by the government, while long lines of men, women and children waited at the doors of government-regulated shops and depots.

In 1793 the government ordered a *levée en masse*. This order, originally a conscription for military service, was later used for the “conscription of wealth” and operated to place the entire population of the nation at the service of the government. Wages and prices were regulated and many workers subjected to forced labour. The resistance of the peasants was crushed by massacre and thousands were arrested and imprisoned. All over France the guillotine was busy. Gaxotte says that among twelve thousand persons condemned to death, whose professions and rank are known, there were over 7,500 farmers, artisans and tradesmen. Communism in France was not as thoroughgoing as it is in Russia. But it should not be forgotten that the dictatorship and reign of terror in 1794, the great Reign of Terror for which the French Revolution became notorious, were not directed primarily against the plottings of aristocrats and royalists, but were instituted in the interest of a planned economy and radical social legislation. The idea that the French Revolution was essentially bourgeois is simply one of the many histor-

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

ical fictions made current by contemporary radical propaganda. In a sense this idea is an alibi.

To be sure, a wave of capitalist expansion followed the downfall of Robespierre, but this was part of the general movement of reaction against the Revolution itself and capitalism flourished not only under the rule of Napoleon, but also later under the reactionary government of Louis XVIII. There is little historical evidence to justify the radical theory that revolutions are bound to come in an ordered sequence, first that of the bourgeoisie and then that of the proletariat. In the French Revolution, bourgeoisie and proletariat and peasant fought side by side for what they all regarded as "liberty"—until a group of radical theorists, using the technique of appeal to the mob, gained control of the nation. They then proceeded to abolish liberty and tried to set the various industrial classes in opposition to one another. But they did not succeed for long and doubtless because they never had a large measure of popular support, even among the working classes. Their support was chiefly among the idle and the unadjusted and was held in hand by an effectively organized party of doctrinaire radicals.

The French Revolution, like all revolutions, was from beginning to end the work of a small minority. The government in 1793 was really a minority government. Only a small number of qualified electors had voted for the candidates of the national assembly and the assembly itself was divided and was intimidated by the Jacobin party. The mobs in the streets who answered the calls of the leaders for popular demonstrations never consisted of more than a few thousand people and are said always, on all occasions, to have been on the whole the same people. This situation also existed in the Revolution of 1848 and it exists in Russia today. A revolution is not the work of a class at all, but of a well-ordered partisan conspiracy, supported by a good propagandist organization and by mobs made up of the kind of people who run to the place when there is a fire or street fight. There never was such a thing as the revolutionary uprising of a whole class of the population. Even the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

"class-conscious revolutionary proletariat" exists chiefly in the imagination of radical enthusiasts.

In America, certainly, the workers exhibit very little "class-consciousness." The great mass of working people still remains unorganized. Organized labour, while its demands on the community naturally tend to increase in proportion to the strength of its organization, has continuously resisted revolutionary propaganda. And even so, organization is often accepted involuntarily and as a result of pressure and intimidation. The notion that revolutions are spontaneous outbursts of class war has no more evidence to support it than has the further radical doctrine that liberalism is a bourgeois philosophy and has been elaborated in the interests of the capitalist class. It is difficult to see how such a theory can be reconciled with the radical contention that the Napoleonic régime was essentially bourgeois, since the Napoleonic dictatorship was anything but liberal. Liberalism is much older than the revolutionary movement in France. It is as old as the other decencies of civilization and such liberalism as existed in the French Revolution was destroyed when the Jacobins destroyed the Girondists. Hébert and Robespierre were not liberals. They were, like Marxists later, disciples of Rousseau and advocates of the dictatorship of the crowd.

Along with the idea that the French Revolution was but the necessary, bourgeois prelude to the revolution of the proletariat, there is one other theory which would lead us to believe that revolution is inevitable and justifiable. This is the theory of Carlyle and others, although Carlyle was painfully aware of the irony of the whole episode. It is held that the French Revolution was the righteous judgment of history upon a corrupt and incompetent ruling class, that the Old Régime had long outlived its usefulness, that it had sunk into immorality and had become nothing but a device for exploitation. There was much social injustice in France before the Revolution. Louis XIV had revoked the Edict of Nantes and Protestants and non-conformists were again persecuted. Incidents like the Callas case

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

at Toulouse, a scandalous instance of religious persecution and of official rascality, were used by Voltaire in his attack upon clerical stupidity and official tyranny. There was good reason why Voltaire, most brilliant champion of the Age of Reason, closed fifty thousand letters with the words "*Ecrasez l'Infame.*" As a result of the influence of the Jesuits in the seventeenth century, futile but exasperating efforts were made to check the spread of skeptical philosophy and restrict freedom of thought and speech. Able writers were thrown in prison and driven into exile. Louis XIV had encouraged the nobility to leave their estates, become absentee landlords attendant upon the court and dependent upon the crown. The presence of a succession of king's mistresses at the court had led to much palace intrigue, favouritism and dishonesty in governmental circles.

A commoner had every disadvantage in contending for his rights with members of the aristocracy. Courts of law there were, but judgeships were bought and sold. Legal procedure was pedantic and ineffectual. Noblemen could have men imprisoned without trial by "*lettre de cachet.*" Writers like Montesquieu and Voltaire had visited England and returned to awaken intelligent Frenchmen to the great contrast in liberty between the two countries. The clergy enjoyed many privileges which were burdensome to old France. The church was one of the greatest landowners in the realm and even during years of national bankruptcy and its consequent burden of taxation, enjoyed an annual income of over a hundred million livres. Official acts of cruel and unusual punishment continued in France long after such medieval practices had been discontinued in more advanced England. A fanatic who was convicted of an attempt to assassinate the King was publicly torn to pieces in Paris. Other men accused of blasphemy had their tongues torn out. One has but to read Voltaire's *Treatise on Toleration* and his history of France to note the contrast between an antiquated officialdom and an age of growing enlightenment.

Writers like Rousseau advocated return to nature and this sentiment became fashionable. In salons and among the intel-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

lectuals, the wit and brilliance of the younger literary set made the champions of the old order ridiculous, just as before the Humanists of the Renaissance had laughed in the face of obscurantism. And there were societies organized among the people to make protest against official injustice and abuse and spread propaganda for liberty.

But all this did not necessarily mean revolution nor need it have led to mob violence. This was primarily an intellectualist awakening and it was confined almost exclusively to the upper classes. Voltaire would have liked to see a liberal constitutional monarchy in France like that of England. But he was no flatterer of "The People." And there is no apparent reason why France could not have evolved into a liberal modern nation without bloodshed. In fact, many of the worst abuses were already on the way to remedy by the time of Louis XVI. The censorship, for instance, had been relaxed and Voltaire had returned from exile with such popular acclaim as few Frenchmen have ever received. Rousseau's teaching was definitely revolutionary and subversive, but until the breakdown of civil authority occurred, Rousseauism was a rather harmless literary pose.

Not everything in the old order was vicious. I doubt if human beings were on the whole more miserable in old France than elsewhere. Every social order has its victims and its abuses and doubtless will always have them. The evils to which human life is prone are not really abolished by violent changes in political and social systems, and in the places of those which may be so eradicated new and often worse evils appear. Hence our happiness is less dependent upon the external forms of social organization than upon the advancement of knowledge and the prevalence of the spirit of culture and good will among mankind. Almost any social system could be made to work satisfactorily by good men. None will bring general happiness under the leadership of ignorant, opinionated, grasping men. Reading of history almost convinces one who has any psychological insight that most of the fuss about social reconstruction is much ado about nothing. Where change is necessary and rem-

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

edy is apparent, modification of political and economic forms takes place gradually and with little resistance. But the idea that all social evils have but one neck which may be severed by one mighty blow of righteous popular indignation should long ago have been relegated to the realm of myth and fable.

It has always been the habit of propagandists of reform and revolution to exaggerate the evils of the system they would make over or have abolished. I have long learned to be on guard against such exaggeration by advocates of social change. The evils of present-day society are bad enough, but can you imagine the distorted picture of our age which will go down in history if the Communists should succeed in abolishing the capitalist system by revolution? It is a standard trick of crowd oratory to blacken and vilify the opposition. When the crowd is victorious, such oratory is taken seriously and becomes a tradition. So, just as I have come to suspect that the sins of ancient society were overstated by the early Christians and those of the church by Protestant Reformers, I find reason to believe that the France of Louis XVI was not quite so black as it has been painted. I imagine there were more smiles on people's faces in Paris when Voltaire came back from Ferney than have been seen in Moscow in recent years.

Surely there was no greater misery and exploitation in the France of Louis XVI than there had been during the two long and autocratic reigns of his predecessors. Louis XVI was a retiring and tolerant monarch. If tyranny and injustice were the causes of the French Revolution, why did not the mobs attack the Bastille during the reign of Louis XIV or Louis XV? And if English revolutionary example had anything to do with the situation, it would seem that such example would have been more effective when the spirit of revolution was ablaze only fifty miles away across the channel than after the storm had quieted and the throne of England was occupied by the successors of William of Orange.

The situation which led directly to the French Revolution was the financial crisis of the government following the unsuc-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

cessful war with England. In that crisis, the power of the government broke down and with the breakdown of authority, France was given over to faction and mob rule. What at first appeared as mere protest justified by idealistic sentiment rapidly changed into a reign of suspicion, terror and fanaticism and the emergence of desperate men and acts of madness, none of which could have been foreseen at the beginning.

It has been said that in 1789 the government of France was bankrupt, while the nation, though burdened with taxation, was fairly prosperous. Much has been written about the dreadful poverty of the common people during the reigns of Louis XV and Louis XVI. Undoubtedly France felt the depression which usually follows a war. We have seen that both England and America suffered materially after the Seven Years' War. It is not surprising that France, the defeated nation, also suffered. France had also contributed aid to the American colonies during the war with England, which fact had again brought her into conflict with that nation. But it is doubtful if the masses in France, on the verge of the great revolution, were in greater destitution than were the poor in victorious and independent America during the same years. Highways and the postal service had been greatly improved in France after the war. Employment was provided by public works and by the introduction of English industrial methods and manufacturing enterprises into the cities of France. French peasants, unlike the farmers of England, still owned a large share of the land of the realm. In general, their homes were neat and comfortable, though certainly lacking in luxury. There were many productive home industries, now largely absorbed in the factory system, which thus brought added income to peasants and villagers. The government, in an effort to increase the productivity of land and improve living conditions, had established schools and model farms.

But there was widespread dissatisfaction. Much of the old feudal system remained with feudal dues, rents and litigation between the peasants and an increasing number of bourgeois

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

agents of the titled proprietors. Agrarian riots were growing in number and in seriousness, often provoked by the harsh methods employed by these agents. The aristocracy, although there were notable exceptions, did not, as is generally supposed, live in riotous luxury on the exploitation of peasant labour. Many lived in "genteel poverty," their estates mortgaged and their rents collected by agents of money lenders. Others lived on pensions and favours granted by the crown. Others found employment in the army, the courts and higher branches of the civil service. It is doubtful if the aristocracy as a whole was as wealthy as the rising bourgeoisie.

All France was heavily burdened by taxes and the authority of the crown, even in the assessment and collection of taxes, was hampered by bad organization and by all sorts of local privileges, class distinctions, personal exemptions and devices of evasion. The situation was made worse by the levy of a tax on personal property which fell heavily on the peasants and caused them to try to hide away or disguise their possessions and to resist, in every manner, the efforts of the assessors and collectors. If there is a law of diminishing returns in the matter of taxation, the French government, by its antiquated and clumsy methods, had brought itself under the operation of such a law. It had become impossible to increase the revenues of the crown by additional taxation, and there was insistent public demand for reform, for a lightening of the burden of taxation, for equalizing the burden among the classes of the population, for the abolition of clerical and other exemptions, and for the formation of a centralized bureau which would take the whole matter of taxation out of the hands of local and semi-independent authorities.

It is interesting that, while the question of taxation became the occasion of mass revolt in France, just as it had been earlier in England, the psychology of the situation was different in the two countries. In France the cry "No taxation without representation" does not appear to have been raised, and this in spite of British influence on French intellectuals of the eighteenth cen-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

tury. It shows that English revolutionary ideas had not yet penetrated the mass mind. The French had not learned to withhold taxes as a method of limiting the power of the sovereign. On the contrary, the masses still looked to the King as their protector against local exploiters. In France, the subjects of Louis XVI demanded that the King assert himself and come to the rescue of his overburdened subjects.

The King was powerless, both by temperament and because of the situation in which he found himself. The demand for reform aroused the violent opposition of all those whose privileges, under the old system, were threatened. The controversy divided the public into hostile camps and led to much disorder. The parliaments which in France were not really legislative assemblies, but rather local courts entrusted with the administration of public affairs and the enforcement of royal decrees, denied the right of the King to invade their jurisdiction, rebelled and threatened reprisals. They were attacked by mobs and there was bloodshed.

Meanwhile, the financial crisis of the government grew rapidly more serious. Turgot, as Minister of Finance, failed to balance the budget and Turgot was succeeded by the Genevese banker, Necker. This financial wizard resorted to a money-raising policy not wholly unlike that of the recent notorious Mr. Ponzi of Boston. Small loans were floated with paper money bearing a high rate of interest, and negotiable annuities were sold without good actuarial advice. This policy produced a temporary delusion of prosperity and affluence. But the day of reckoning soon came. Soon over half the national revenue was required to pay the interest on the national debt, there was the war with England yet to pay for and the annuities to settle as they reached maturity. Thirty-four million livres were required annually to maintain the royal establishment, a like sum was designated for royal favours and pensions, and nearly one hundred and fifty million livres had to be spent each year on national defense. It was impossible to secure additional loans or increase taxes, and with the loss of national credit the author-

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

ity of government also declined. The King had no policy and no solution of the difficulty. There were indignant outcries against extravagance, and, when the actual situation was revealed to the public, accusations of theft and corruption. Belated efforts to reduce expenses by gestures of economy and by cutting down pensions and dismissing unnecessary public servants failed to relieve the situation and served only to increase opposition to the government.

The King was persuaded by opponents of the parliaments to call together, according to ancient custom, a general assembly of representatives of all classes of the nation, called the Estates General. This meeting was to be held the first of May, 1789, and it was to be composed of representatives of the nobility, the clergy, and the commoners, or "Third Estate." As a concession to the people, the number of delegates of the Third Estate was to equal that of the other two classes, and the public generally was invited to submit to the assembly all grievances and whatever programs for remedy anyone might be able to think of. It was hoped that so splendid an exhibition of generosity and of "community thinking" would peaceably resolve all conflicts and creatively solve all problems in a great new experience of round table discussion and creative response.

But before the elections were completed, there were riots all over France. The assembly was deluged by a flood of grievances and of panaceas and propaganda of all sorts. The radical clubs, determined to rule or ruin, got busy at once. Delegates entered the assembly with their minds made up, supported by crowds of uncompromising followers. The multitudes were regaled by orators on street corners and in public squares. The head of a notorious reactionary was carried through the streets on a pike raised above a swarming, yelling crowd. Naked bodies of other "enemies of the people" were dragged along the banks of the Seine amid tumult and cries of "Liberty" mingled with those of "Long live the King." The government of the city of Paris fell into the hands of the Jacobin clubs. A national guard was organized among the newly awakened patriots. It did not

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

preserve the public peace or maintain order. The meeting of the Estates-General broke up in a quarrel over the question whether voting should be based on one member having one vote, or on the classes represented, each class in caucus having one vote. This plan would have given the old master classes a power of veto over the representatives of the people. The Third Estate withdrew to a tennis court and declared itself alone to be the National Assembly. The King hesitated and when royal officers visited the tennis court, more in a spirit of protest than that of determination to enforce authority, Mirabeau defied them with the words "Go tell your king we are here by the authority of the French people." The hour of "The People" had come.

While the Assembly, which had sworn never to adjourn until a constitution had been put into effect, was busy defining the Rights of Man, the Jacobins made use of tactics similar to those used later by the Communists of Russia when a constitutional convention was about to meet in that country. Secret meetings were held at the house of the revolutionary leader, the Duke of Orleans, and in numerous revolutionary society headquarters. There were outbreaks of lawlessness all over France. In July, Necker was dismissed by the King. This was made the occasion for a demonstration of protest by the radicals. The streets of Paris were filled with disorderly mobs. Merchants barricaded the doors and windows of their houses. There was much looting and more noise. At the gate of the Tuileries there were fights between the royal guards and bands of the new national militia. On July 14th, a great crowd gathered before the walls of the Bastille, an historic relic which had about the same significance for eighteenth-century France as the Tower for present-day London. After firing at the walls most of the day and attempting to set fire to the place, the chains to the drawbridge were cut and the mob entered and killed the guard, which had not fired on the mob, and released some prisoners who had been confined in the fortress. Four of the prisoners were forgers and two were insane. None of the prisoners was a person of any political importance whatever. Radical politicians extolled the attack on

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

the Bastille as an act of patriotic heroism. The mob, encouraged in its new freedom, proceeded to murder prominent judges, administrators and police officers both in Paris and in the provinces. Toward the end of July, a rumour was spread in Paris that bandits were ravishing the countryside and were moving on the capital. The citizens demanded arms for self-defence and those in charge of government arsenals freely distributed to the public thousands of firearms and stores of ammunition. This incident is worth remembering when, in a later chapter, we shall have occasion to note Trotsky's cleverness in somewhat similar circumstances in securing arms for the Bolsheviki. The revolution, to be effective, must of course be armed.

In August the Assembly, amid applause and with mutual embraces and eyes filled with tears, voted to abolish all special privileges, dues and immunities. It was a moment of passionate self-sacrifice. Aristocrats placed the tricolour in their hats, took the names of commoners, renounced their titles, and wept with fraternal sentiment, while the King was toasted as the restorer of the liberties of the people.

After this exhibition of good will to man, the Assembly was divided in a violent dispute between the moderates, who desired a constitutional monarchy with an hereditary House of Lords like that of England, and the more radical party which demanded a legislating assembly of one chamber and objected to the royal veto. It is interesting that in this constitutional assembly there was little republican sentiment. The subsequent drift of the Revolution into the dictatorship of Hébert and Robespierre was accompanied at each step by the same legislative procedure. The Left destroyed the Right, then the victorious party of the Left developed its own more moderate and radical factions, and the moderates who wished to check the course of revolution with the victory over the preceding moderates soon found themselves the victims of a minority still farther to the left. Each succeeding group of extremists, in turn, made use of the Jacobin clubs and of appeal to the mob to overpower and terrorize the Assembly. First, as we have seen, the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

Third Estate declared itself the National Assembly. This had no sooner happened than the deputies on the Right found themselves attacked by the party of the Left and insulted and threatened by the crowds in the galleries and in the streets. In the succeeding assemblies, the party of Constitutional Monarchy was crushed, along with the Constitution, by the Republican Girondists. These moderate Republicans were, in turn, sent to the scaffold by the Radical Democrats and they, in quick succession, by the Communist group of Hébert, Robespierre, Saint Just and Couthon.

Meanwhile, the radicals decided it would be well to move the government to Paris where the crowd could more effectively keep an eye on it and thus guard the liberties of the people. The King, after having made all sorts of concessions to the Popular party, became uneasy, and a regiment of regular soldiers was moved from Douai to Versailles. Someone cried "Down with the Assembly." This treasonable utterance, together with the shortage of provisions in Paris, caused by the disorder of the Revolution, provided the opportunity of making the royal family and the government the virtual prisoners of the crowd in the city. Early in October the multitude, headed by hungry women who had heard that food was stored at Versailles, marched out in wind and rain from Paris to the royal palace to beg the King for bread. This motley throng, followed by the national guard with Lafayette in command, invaded the assembly hall and the gardens of Versailles and spent the night in tumult outside the King's bedchamber. The King showed himself on the balcony, agreed to the Declaration of Rights which he had just vetoed, and it was further conceded that the royal body-guard should be displaced by members of the national guard. By morning the palace was unguarded. The mob broke into the apartment of the Queen, and killed a number of the disarmed members of the royal guard. The riot was quelled only by the intervention of Lafayette and a few disciplined companies of the national militia. The King and his family were brought back to Paris in a long procession led by a

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

rabble carrying high on pikes the heads of slain members of the royal guard.

With the King and Queen made hostages of the Revolution in the Tuileries, and the Assembly led by the masterly Mirabeau, France enjoyed a brief period of quiet. It seemed to many that the Revolution was accomplished. The new constitution had declared the rights of man, established a government of the people, and had left Louis XVI nominally, at least, King of France. A great celebration of the triumph of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity was arranged. Orators told the assembled public that the great age of man had arrived and that the entire course of history, since the beginning, had been moving inevitably to the great culmination of human emancipation in the Revolution.

But the real revolution had hardly begun. Nearly all the leaders who participated in the festival of the first anniversary of the fall of the Bastille died within three years on the scaffold, victims of the revolutionary forces they had set in motion. The Revolution had done much for liberty, but there was still unsolved the financial problem which had led, in the beginning, to the calling of the Estates General. The government adopted the financial policy of printing paper money. Revolutionists evidently have great fondness for an inflated currency. A similar policy was adopted by the American colonies and by the Germans after the Revolution of 1918. The French seized the lands of the church and made them security for "assignats" or the new government notes of one thousand franc value. The first issue of four hundred million francs was quickly absorbed, and this was followed by another issue of eight hundred millions. Once inflation of currency is begun, it becomes a kind of drunkenness very difficult to stop. In 1791 there was an additional issue of paper money amounting to twelve hundred million francs, and later the same year there were issued notes for six thousand million francs; and the following April an additional three hundred millions of paper money. By 1796, forty-five billions of franc notes had been put into circulation.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

There resulted the inevitable depreciation of money. Soon a loaf of bread was to cost fifty francs and a pair of boots four thousand. The increased business resulting from inflation was only temporary and declined as money values lost all stability. There was great destitution in the land and merchants and tradespeople were blamed for the high cost of living. Radicals made use of growing want and discontent to bring increased crowd pressure on the Assembly and to compel it to enact even more radical measures, until finally the government resorted to dictatorship and terror in its effort to solve the economic problem.

The confiscation of church lands and the quarrel with the higher clergy led to a further outbreak of hatred in revolutionary France. The role of the church in this revolution is not often emphasized. In my account of this phase of the revolution I draw upon Gaxotte's book, *The French Revolution*. The book is obviously written from the Catholic point of view. In the closing years of the reign of Louis XIV, the clergy had great influence in France. Jesuit advisors of the King were able to keep the nation officially reactionary long after the Reformation and humanistic education and seventeenth-century science had produced changes of thought in neighbouring lands, and even after "The Enlightenment" had in France itself made scepticism fashionable among the intellectuals. Doubt and worldliness were not unknown even among the higher clergy. Had not a Cardinal Bishop Rohan been implicated in the scandal of the "diamond necklace"? Clergy frequented the salons, abbots shared in the gallantries, witticisms and philosophical interests of the social circles in which they mingled and, as Gaxotte says, "the lower clergy had shown themselves, from the outset, very favourable to the Revolution." Many of the outstanding revolutionists were men who bore clerical titles.

At the beginning of the Revolution, the church was still powerful. It was one of the wealthiest landowners in the kingdom and, including members of the religious orders, it possessed a huge clerical army of one hundred and twenty-five

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

thousand persons. In 1790 the Constituent Assembly passed a law prohibiting the taking of monastic vows, and later the same year the Assembly drew up and presented to the King for his signature a civil constitution of the clergy which was aimed to bring the church under submission to the secular government. The number of bishops was to be greatly reduced and salaries of all priests regulated by the state. Parish priests were to be chosen by majority vote of secular district councils and bishops were to receive canonical investiture no longer from the Pope. This legislation added to the general confiscation of church property, and the rapid spread of "free thinking" among the masses aroused the opposition of Rome. The Pope sent "a highly confidential" letter to Louis XVI and in March, 1790, the anti-clerical laws of the French government were condemned in Rome "in a secret consistory," "but this allocation was not published, the newspapers received orders to say nothing about it, and the Sacred College unanimously approved this attitude." The papal nuncio at Paris kept the Pope informed of the progress of events. A programme of passive resistance was organized among the clergy who were loyal to Rome, and there is no doubt that the King had a secret understanding with the Pope. Louis thus "conceived the idea of ratifying and publishing the constitution, while at the same time asking the Pope to recognize it as a temporary measure."

At the time Louis signed the Constitution, he had again become a popular monarch. The crowds in the streets received him with respect and affection. Had he not placed himself in the position where he could be suspected of being a party to a secret conspiracy against the Revolution, he might conceivably have retained his throne and France have been spared the atrocities which followed upon his downfall. There is reason to suspect that Catholic counter-revolutionary conspiracy was in part responsible for stirring up the crowd to the excesses of the later years of the Revolution.

In fairness to the church, it should be said that its attitude during the Revolution was a continuance of its long resistance

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

to the attempts of the secular power to dominate the spiritual interests of mankind. We can see today, in countries like Germany and Russia, the disastrous effects on freedom and culture when an absolutist state, ruled by a faction, presumes to exercise dictatorship over the spirit and conscience and thinking of a nation. There is a sense in which Catholic opposition to the Jacobins was not unlike its present resistance to the Nazis of Germany. But the church itself has often been compromised by political alliance. It has, moreover, in the past, striven by inquisitorial methods to establish its own dictatorship over the thought and conscience of mankind, and there are many people who remain unconvinced when the church becomes the champion of freedom. Many in France were unconvinced in 1790. Revolutionary parties are naturally suspicious. They have good reason to be so, since their attempts to change by force the habits and interests of a nation meet with every kind of resistance, open and secret.

The "counter-revolutionary" correspondence between Rome and certain French prelates soon became known to the Assembly. That body of legislators in November, 1790, "decreed that all ecclesiastics continuing to exercise their functions should take an oath to maintain the civil constitution" and "a month later Louis XVI gave his assent to the decree—on the advice of Archbishop Boisgelin, who told him that consent extorted by force was not binding on his conscience." In other words, the King of France was advised to play the hypocrite. No more suicidal policy could have been adopted. As Gaxotte says, "religious conflict was to enter upon its acute stage at once." Nearly half the clergy refused to take the oath. "Priests who had taken the oath found themselves everywhere shunned by pious souls." "The non-juring priests on the other hand, conducting their services in barns, chapels, or unoccupied churches which they had hired, attracted such large congregations that the clubs became alarmed." The religious issue brought the conflict of revolution into every home, divided neighbour against neighbour and again aroused the mobs to fury.

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

The King tried to maintain the old worship inside the Tuileries, and the royal family was believed to be surrounded with every sort of secret agent, the centre of counter-revolutionary conspiracy, real or imaginary. Louis quite lost the confidence of the revolutionary party and of a large portion of the nation. He was never again able to clear himself of suspicion. Heretofore he had been permitted at will to leave the Tuileries and visit St. Cloud. Now, when the court attempted to depart to this place of retreat, its way was blocked by an angry multitude led by Danton. Louis was forced to dismiss immediately his royal chaplains, to appear in person before the Assembly and publicly take the oath to maintain the civil constitution. Gaxotte says "From this day, he considered himself freed from all his promises of fidelity to the Revolution." And I may add, from this day also, his doom was sealed and with it that of many thousands of innocent people who, in spite of its many exhibitions of mob violence, welcomed the Revolution as the triumph of liberty and fraternity.

The royal family, shut up in the Tuileries, surrounded by the watchful eyes of the Revolution, humiliated by rebellious subjects, terrified by spies and compromised by conspirators and its own perfidy, attempted secretly to flee to Metz and raise the standard of counter-revolution. The flight was a miserable fiasco. The royal equipage was arrested at Varennes and its occupants brought back in despair. Radical sentiment burst all bounds. The cordeliers, "friends of the Rights of Man," organized general strikes and under the leadership of Danton and Marat demanded the deposition of the King. An attempt was made by moderates to stem the tide of radical democratic enthusiasm. The Constitution was finally completed, depriving the King of the right to issue orders to the national guard and limiting the power of veto.

A new general election was authorized. In the campaign which followed, the extreme Left attacked the Constitution because it still retained some property qualification for voting. In the election—proof again that revolutions are minority move-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

ments—it is said that only about one-eighth of the qualified electors voted and the new Assembly was composed largely of opinionated young men quite lacking in political experience, members of the lower middle classes, the poor nobility and lawyers. Even so, the Right was pledged to the maintenance of the Constitution and the Left, out of seven hundred and forty-five deputies, numbered only one hundred and forty.

The meetings of the Legislative Assembly were, however, turbulent from the start. The galleries were crowded with spectators who hurled insults at the moderates, and "gangs of men and women were allowed to pass through the hall shouting and uttering threats." The harvests in the fall of 1791 were bad. There was again a shortage of food and the mobs attacked the grocers. Louis and his wife decided to appeal to the sovereigns of Europe for help. Gaxotte suggests that this appeal was instigated by the clergy. If so, it met with little response abroad. The Assembly proclaimed to all the world—an attitude later imitated by the Russian revolutionists—that the French nation would never use its forces for conquest or "against the liberation of any people." The reign of universal peace was declared. "Once let the nations be as free as we are, and there will be no more war."

However, exiles like the Count of Artois and relatives of Marie Antoinette were busy in Germany plotting counter-revolution. In August, 1791, their efforts produced some result. The King of Prussia and the Elector of Saxony issued from Pillnitz a manifesto against the Revolution and invited other sovereigns to join them. Patriotic sentiment flamed up in France and the Girondists demanded war. The patriotism of the crowd reinforced the radical party. The Right was overpowered and the Republican Left ruled the Assembly. The French Minister of Foreign Affairs was tried for treason. In the King's name an ultimatum was sent to Vienna and war was declared in an outburst of popular enthusiasm April 7, 1792.

With the war, the Revolution assumed a new phase. Popular suspicion of the King and Queen became intensified. An army

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

of twenty thousand patriots was encamped near Paris. The King tried to veto this manoeuvre and again there were anti-Royalist riots. A rabble army with pikes rushed into the Tuileries and thronged into the apartment of the King. Louis was surrounded and compelled for two hours to witness a popular demonstration, a red cap of "Liberty" was placed on his head, and to the shouts and jeers of the crowd he was made to drink the health of "The Nation." Decent people in France were outraged by this spectacle and the Girondists, already struggling to maintain their supremacy, attempted with the help of Lafayette to restore order. Royalist supporters distributed bribes among the radical leaders, a number of whom took the money but did not change their attitude. Late in July, a band of armed revolutionist patriots arrived in Paris from the South, singing the *Marseillaise*, and the efforts of the Jacobins to seize power were greatly encouraged.

While France was thus preparing for war in the midst of popular disorder and partisan conflict, the command of the allied German and Austrian armies, joined by counter-revolutionary exiles, was given to the popular military hero, the Duke of Brunswick. This commander began the invasion of French territory by issuing a manifesto to the revolutionists. The French national guard was threatened and all who should try to defend themselves were to be punished. Further, the Duke declared that if the King of France was made to suffer injury, the city of Paris would be given over to destruction by German soldiers. This bit of reactionary folly not only roused the French to strenuous efforts for national defence, but greatly strengthened the force of the extreme radical faction.

The King, believing the invaders would soon be in Paris to restore his royal authority, stubbornly persisted in his refusal to sanction the exile of non-juring priests. The Girondists who had been the original war party, now tried in vain to gather forces adequate for the protection of the royal family. The Jacobins and their allies openly made plans for a mob attack on the royal palace. On a memorable morning in August,

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

armed crowds assembled at the gates of the Tuileries. The palace was inadequately garrisoned. The King and Queen, in panic, fled to the Assembly for protection. An order was given to the defending forces to cease firing and the mob entered and put to death the servants of the royal household. The palace was looted and parts of it set on fire, and all over Paris mobs pulled down statues of the kings of France. Louis and his family were, by the terrified Assembly, given into the custody of the radical Commune of Paris and were imprisoned in the Temple. The Commune of Paris, insurrectionary from the first, set up a tribunal for the suppression of "counter-revolutionary crimes." Rioters, who had been previously arrested by the Assembly, were released from prison. A house to house search was made for suspects. The Girondists became terrified. Lafayette fled to Holland. Danton, leader of the radicals, became Minister of Justice, then commander of the army of defence, and for a time master of the nation.

The invading German armies captured Verdun and moved toward Paris. Panic seized the city. Marat, in his journal, urged the crowd to massacre the rich in their homes and in the streets, and to visit the prisons and finish off suspected aristocrats who were held for trial. A list of persons proscribed for death was published, including the names of Rolland and other Girondist leaders. There was a general massacre of prisoners which lasted four days and in which eleven hundred suspects were cut to pieces by the mob. Everyone had become either a patriot or a traitor. The Commune of Paris sent a letter to the provinces justifying the terror and stating that "ferocious conspirators" had been put to death "by the People." This revolutionary behaviour appeared to be vindicated in the victory of the citizen defenders of Paris which checked the advance of the invaders at Valmy.

A new National Assembly, elected in the fall of 1792, declared France a republic. In the elections, voters had been subjected to much intimidation and only a fraction of the electorate cast their votes. As it was, the Girondists, though still a majority

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

outside Paris, were greatly weakened. The Girondists opened an attack on the leaders of the Paris Commune in the city who had kept the names of Girondist candidates off the national ballot. The Assembly sought to protect itself from Marat's mobs by a military force brought in from the provinces, but Jacobin propagandists soon won this force over to "the cause of the People." They determined to out-manceuvre the Girondists and "put an end to the bourgeois republic" by placing the King on trial for treason. Moderates, who maintained that according to the Constitution the person of the King was inviolate, were routed by the publication of the royal correspondence in which it appeared that efforts had been made to bribe certain of the earlier leaders of the Revolution. The King was brought to trial in the Assembly. Each deputy was required to step forward to the tribunal and publicly cast his vote for death or clemency in the presence of galleries crowded with patriotic citizens who hooted and jeered at each one in turn. Thomas Paine, notorious enemy of kings, was a member of this Assembly and displayed no little courage in standing alone in the presence of that mob and voting against the execution of Louis XVI. Paine knew that his vote would result in his own political ruin—as it did. It was while he was in prison, awaiting the execution which he was spared only by the downfall of Robespierre, that he wrote the *Age of Reason*.

With the condemnation and execution of the King and later of the Queen, the party of the Moderate Republicans fell. One after another of the Girondists followed Louis to the scaffold, as did most of those who voted for the acquittal of the King. The Revolutionists, like the Russians of our time, regarded themselves as the first among the emancipators of the nations. Efforts were made to spread the Revolution to the suffering peoples of neighbouring lands. The armies of Republican France became crusaders for Liberty. England, in fear of the French conquest of Europe, joined the forces of the allies opposed to the Revolution. And the French, surrounded by enemies and in dread of counter-revolutionary conspiracy within the Republic,

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

resorted to even more extreme measures in the completion of the people's revolution. All Frenchmen of military age were conscripted for military service by a *Levee en Masse*. Dictatorial powers were given to the Committees of Public Safety and General Security. The revolutionary tribunals sought out and condemned suspected persons and executed them on the slightest pretext.

After the treason of the military commander, Dumouriez, the defalcations of Danton and the activities of counter-revolutionary clergy in arousing the Vendee to insurrection, the Revolution lost all restraint. The organized "enragés" seized the newspapers of the Girondists and cast their editors into prison. The Assembly was surrounded and the hall invaded. Deputies were driven before the crowd by blows of muskets and obliged to surrender to the populace a score or more of their more conservative members. The city of Lyons, which had given aid to the moderates, was attacked with devastating fury, the homes of the wealthy and the notable citizens destroyed and a sign was erected stating "Lyons made war on Liberty, Lyons is no more." Conservatives were hunted down like wild beasts and executed in droves. Madame Rolland mounted the scaffold crying, "Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" The experiments in Communism mentioned earlier in this chapter were initiated, and those who resisted the dictatorship of the Jacobin faction which was set up in the name of the proletariat, together with those whose status or wealth aroused the envy or greed of revolutionary leaders, were destroyed without mercy.

The Revolution which began with the demand for representative government, ended like revolutions generally in the destruction of the power of the popular assembly itself. Liberty which was throughout the battle cry of popular revolt, was crushed to a blood-stained earth. Censorship was put in operation, criticism of revolutionary mob leaders was punished as treason, civil rights were suspended, property confiscated, and men and women imprisoned on the suspicion of unnamed in-

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

formants and often sent to the scaffold without trial. Republican armies laid waste provinces which resisted dictatorship and France was reduced to the status of a people living in conquered territory under the heel of a tyrant.

Let no one imagine that a nation conquered by a faction within its population fares better than one reduced to submission by a foreign invader. For revolution is civil war, war of extermination, war of neighbour against neighbour, with a degree of bitterness and a disregard for the decencies of civilization far in excess of that which is manifest in a war between nations.

It remained now only for the victorious Jacobin party to become itself divided for the homicide to reach its culmination. In the "purging of the party" the Revolution reached its end. The crowd had seen enough executions. It was satisfied and eager for other diversions. In July, 1794, Robespierre who had exterminated his rival Jacobin leaders fell a victim of his own fanaticism. Swift reaction set in. The crowd cheered as scores of Robespierre's former accomplices were carried through the streets to their execution. The Commune of Paris was outlawed. The censorship was ended, and all the sordid details of the revolutionary dictatorship were disclosed. Jacobins fled before the storm of popular reaction. Restrictions on trade were removed and the Convention of Thermidor voted the protection of commerce and property. The Bourse was reopened. The deliberations of the Convention were protected by gendarmes. A new army of small tradesmen emerged and dispersed the crowds which had hitherto provided Paris with popular demonstrations.

War and revolution had about exhausted the economic resources of the nation. The currency was worthless and there was again shortage of bread, for the peasants, harassed by revolution and counter-revolution, and their numbers reduced by service in the Republican Army, had left much of the land of France untilled. But the armies still fighting the coalition against the "regicide" Republic had to be maintained. There were bread riots, but the mobs were now leaderless and reduced

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

in numbers. If hunger were the cause of popular revolt, the French Revolution would have continued in full force. In the midst of general destitution, a newly rich class of plebeian origin was rapidly raising itself by "profiteering" methods to the position of wealth and leadership once enjoyed by the nobles.

The time had come for the army of the Republic to restore order. The transportation of foodstuffs had to be protected by armed guards from half-starved patriots. Strikers were driven from the Tuileries at the point of the bayonet. Thousands of arrests were made and arms and munitions in the hands of insurgents were seized. A procession of rioters at the Quai Voltaire was met by a volley of grapeshot, six hundred people were killed or wounded, and the young officer who gave the command to fire was promoted to the office of General of the Division of the Army operating in the Alps. The government of France passed into the rule of the Directorate and, with the astounding victories of Napoleon, into a Consulate.

On the 18th Brumaire, the 9th of November, 1799, the Council voted to place itself under the protection of Napoleon; on the following day the army drove the Council out of the hall and abolished the Directorate, and Napoleon became Commander of the French nation. Throughout the years which followed, years of conquest and imperial glory, the Republican armies of France continued to sing the *Marseillaise* while Napoleon made a marriage alliance with the royal house of Austria and placed his friends and relatives, with regal honours, on the conquered thrones of Europe. The Revolution had changed into a war of imperial conquest and, with the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, the Bourbon Kings returned to the throne of France and the Congress of Vienna and the Holy Alliance held revolution in the grip of reactionary suppression until the uprising of 1848.

We may now make a brief summary of some of the facts we have observed in the French Revolution. These observations apply to revolutions quite generally. A revolution usually oc-

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

curs not as a result of the exploitation of the masses, but when the government is too weak to maintain order and the ruling classes, largely because of intellectual inertia, have lost their leadership. A revolution is usually preceded by loss of faith in the existing order and criticism of the beneficiaries of that order on the part of the "intellectuals." Reactionary attempts to suppress the criticism only make those in authority ridiculous, tend to reveal to the populace the incapacity of the rulers and lead to popular demonstrations of revolt.

A revolution begins with a series of riotous popular protests against alleged abuses and those who participate in these demonstrations at first profess their loyalty to established authority. All they want is remedy of certain glaring evils. The crowd grows in violence and in the audacity of its demands in the measure that its sense of power increases and with each governmental concession to lawlessness.

The early leaders of a revolution are, as a rule, idealists and men of principle, whose humanitarian enthusiasms lead them to champion, at personal risk and sacrifice, what they believe to be the cause of the suppressed classes. These leaders are usually exterminated by the revolution itself.

A revolution drifts rapidly to the left and the crowd, once it finds itself dominant, reveals the outstanding psychological symptoms of crowd behaviour, a doctrinaire spirit or fixed system of ideas, an egomania, regarding itself as morally superior to its enemies, and a homicidal wish which easily becomes epidemic.

The first success of crowd revolt is regarded as a great triumph of humanity and the inauguration of a reign of peace, justice and universal brotherhood. In this the crowd is always disillusioned in the end, for revolutions do not accomplish the aims with which they start.

The dominance of the crowd is not the dominance of the mass, but is the dominance of a faction, by force, over the rest of the community. A dominance thus won by violence can only be maintained by force. Suspicions and conflicting ambitions

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

develop among the revolutionists. A lower type of man emerges to the position of crowd leadership. Factions develop within the revolutionary party and those who have been made to suffer by the revolution attempt counter-revolutionary and reactionary activities.

A revolution is a civil war and rapidly becomes a war of extermination. No revolution represents a majority of the people. Its position is, therefore, always desperately precarious and the revolutionists seek to maintain their hold by resort to terrorist methods. A revolution is, moreover, likely to find itself involved in war with neighbouring nations who, in self-defence, intervene and take the side of the counter-revolutionists. Great suffering and destitution result. There are bread riots and popular leaders are held to blame. The crowd makes it manifest that it does not really love liberty. "There is no liberty, but only hunger." A minority of a minority of extremists temporarily gains popular support and establishes a dictatorship. If the revolution exists long enough for a revolutionary army to achieve order and discipline, the dictatorial power will in the end be seized by army officers and the revolution will become side-tracked into a war of conquest and personal ambition and national glory.

The people always imagine that the revolution will bring into existence the dream of an ideal society. But new vested interests rapidly appear and new methods of exploitation. The workers are just as miserable after the revolution as before and the few beneficiaries of the struggle become a new ruling class and in turn develop a conservatism of their own and suppress all criticism and all opposition parties.

In the attempt to change by force the customs and habits of a nation, the revolution succeeds chiefly in breaking down established habit patterns and releasing the criminal tendencies in human nature and the criminal elements in the community. Revolutionists imagine they are accelerating the rate of human progress, but in fact they only set back the ordered advance of civilization and the peaceful arts. They place in temporary con-

WHY THE FRENCH REVOLUTION FAILED

trol of the cultural community a group of people who have few of the best traditions of civilization and possess little cultural experience or social sensitiveness. In the end the work of building a civilized community has to begin all over after the barbarian invasion has passed. What the masses usually get out of revolution is a certain amount of self-idealization, a new set of second-hand phrases, a brief sense of being free, followed by fear and destitution, and the privations of civil war, and in the end new forms of servitude. Those who survive the ordeal are generally glad when the inevitable reaction comes.

THE PROLETARIAT AND THE REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

DURING the nineteenth century, revolution threw away the mask of liberal idealism and religious sentiment and revealed its true nature. It unblushingly proclaimed itself to be the spirit of faction determined to conquer society by resort to conspiracy and violence and by appeal to the unadjusted elements in the community. In 1873 Karl Marx defined revolution as "undoubtedly the most authoritative thing possible. It is an act in which one section of the population imposes its will on the other by means of rifles, bayonets, cannon, i. e., by highly authoritative means, and the victorious party is inevitably forced to maintain its supremacy by means of that fear which its arms inspire in the reactionaries."

It was during this century that radicals learned those techniques of strategy which have, in our day, been successfully employed by both Communists and Nazis. In 1848, revolution was revived as a struggle for liberty. In 1871 and after, this revived movement abandoned liberty and demanded class dictatorship. The generation of radicals who came to their maturity along with Marx and Engels began their work in a struggle for democracy and ended it as democracy's bitterest enemies, thus vindicating the theory of Aristotle that democracy tends to end in tyranny. These men began as Rousseauist Jacobins and ended as Bolsheviki. They began in the belief that revolution was the uprising of the great mass of "the people," all the people, against the reactionary governments which followed the overthrow of Napoleon I. They ended with the doc-

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

trine that revolution is the establishment of a minority dictatorship forced upon the community in the alleged interest of a single group, the organized industrial workers.

Thus during the nineteenth century revolutionary philosophy abandoned not only the old liberal idea of the consent of the governed, but with it, and quite frankly, the classical idea of the State which had been a fundamental principle of liberalism for philosophers like Montesquieu, Grotius, Locke, Burke, and the founders of our own Republic—in fact, of true friends of liberty and justice since the days when Cicero perished for his opposition to the despotic ambitions of Mark Antony. The state was no longer regarded as the maintenance of a working plan of fellowship among men of conflicting interests and rival power-seeking groups; a device for preserving public peace and order along with freely-expressed differences of opinion; a social equilibrium achieved by many kinds of men and numerous classes, under a sovereignty so limited as to protect the rights of individuals and minorities. The state was now regarded merely as an organized system for the exploitation of the poor by the rich. The cultural achievements of existing society were said to be only the “ideology” of the ruling classes and the expression of the disguised material interests of the successful. And the alleged class character of the so-called bourgeois state was held to be ample justification for the imagined revolt of the workers and the “dictatorship of the proletariat.” In other words, class rule and class legislation motivated by purely material considerations were said to be the law of nature, and the class struggle was announced as the great progressive force of history. Therefore this “hypocrisy” of the state was to be abolished and the undisguised class supremacy of the workers was to be substituted—on the assumption, of course, that the dictatorship of the Revolutionary party would really be that of the proletariat.

Lenin, in 1919, said of the lessons which radicals had learned from the revolutions of the last century, “The brilliant analysis of the essence and significance of this Commune (that of Paris

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

in 1871) given by Marx in his *Civil War in France*, showed that the Commune created a *new type* of state, the *proletarian state*. Every state, including the most democratic republic, is nothing but a machine for the suppression of one class by another. The proletarian state is the machine for the suppression of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat. . . . The most perfect and advanced type of bourgeois state is that of the parliamentary democratic republic. . . . But the revolutionary epochs, beginning with the end of the nineteenth century, brought into existence the highest type of democratic state, the kind of state which, in certain respects, to quote Engels, 'ceases to be a state, is no longer a state in the proper sense of the word' " * (italics mine). And what remains when the state, for which men have struggled ever since the emergence of modern civilization out of oriental despotism, is abolished? There remain only the worst evils of any state, those against which liberals have always contended, the tyranny of faction supported by the mob, government by force and not by consent, the absolutism of irresponsible gangsters who maintain authority by terrorist methods, a ruthless partisan mechanism which rolls over and flattens out personal rights and cultural values with barbarian indifference to human excellence, a delusion that the condition of the masses is being improved by bureaucratic regulation of everybody and everything.

Furthermore, in observing the behaviour of the crowd in the revolutions of the nineteenth century, professional radical propagandists learned how to proceed with the business of the abolition of the state. On the 18th of March, 1908, Lenin delivered an address at Geneva. The occasion was the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the death of Marx, the sixtieth anniversary of the Revolution of 1848, and the thirty-seventh anniversary of the socialist Commune of Paris. Speaking of the Paris Commune, Lenin said, "The proletariat which rose against the old régime, took upon itself two tasks:—a general national and a class task, the liberation of France from the Ger-

* *The Civil War in France*, Karl Marx.

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

man invasion (following the Franco-Prussian War), and the liberation of the workers from capitalism. . . . The patriotic idea had its origin in the Great Revolution of the Eighteenth Century, the minds of the socialists of the Commune were under its spell. . . . It is this combination of contradictory tasks, patriotism and socialism, which constituted the fatal error of the French Socialists." Already in the manifesto of the *International*, September, 1870, Marx warned the French proletariat not to be carried away by the fake national idea. Profound changes had taken place since the time of the Great Revolution. Class differences had become more acute. ". . . the proletariat of the present time can no longer unite its interests with the interests of other classes hostile to it. Let the bourgeoisie bear the responsibility of national humiliation." * That is, it is good revolutionary tactics when the people of a nation have their backs to the wall, facing defeat and foreign invasion, to arouse the discontented elements among the labouring people and urge them to forsake the cause of their country and take advantage of the national crisis to start an insurrection.

The radicals of our time also learned other lessons from Marx's observations of the class wars of the nineteenth century. Lenin warned his hearers against two other causes of the failure of these earlier revolutions. "The workers replied by proclaiming the Commune and civil war. But two errors robbed the brilliant victory of its fruit. The proletariat stopped half way; instead of proceeding with the expropriation of expropriators [all classes except the proletariat were regarded as expropriators of wealth, properly belonging to labour], it was carried away by dreams of establishing supreme justice in the country, based on the common national task. . . . The second error was the unnecessary magnanimity of the proletariat: *instead of annihilating its enemies it endeavoured to exercise moral influence on them.* (Italics mine.) . . . A lesson was taught the proletariat which it is not likely to forget." †

This condemnation of the revolutionists of 1871 for mag-

* *The Paris Commune*, V. I. Lenin.

† *The Civil War in France*, Karl Marx.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

nanimity in refraining from the massacre of their alleged enemies appears ironical in view, as we shall see presently, of the frightful atrocities which were committed by both parties in that struggle. In passing we might inquire just who are the enemies of the proletariat according to this theory of class struggle. Millions of people who try to live decently, keep the peace, meet their responsibilities and educate their children, have no idea they are all the while enemies of the working class. And the great mass of the workers do not so regard them, but strive to emulate their example. But to the Marxist such people are hardly less enemies of the toiling masses than are the conscious exploiters of labour. Every advantage which anyone has gained in the daily struggle of life, can be regarded as something expropriated and enjoyed at the expense of the industrial workers, and only because of the protection of the police. "Labour creates all wealth." Even the professional classes are regarded as "retainers and flunkies" of capitalist exploiters, and in the hour of insurrection may be marked for destruction on the ground that the "intellectuals are by nature, education and alliance, counter-revolutionary." * Since the nineteenth century, social revolution aims at the "liquidation" of all classes except the industrial proletariat and the partisan bureaucracy which aspires to rule in its name.

The revolutions of the nineteenth century ended in the attempt to stir up class war. If, as Marx said, this class war was the result of "naked and shameless" exploitation of the workers, the protest against such exploitation became a no less naked and shameless attempt of minorities to impose on whole communities a despotism by methods which had been outlawed by civilized nations since before the time of Grotius.

From the time of Marx onward, social revolutionists have advocated a form of government in which there can be no guarantee of civil rights. In accordance with Rousseau's doctrine of the social contract, it is maintained that the individual needs no protection against the exercise of the sovereign will

* *Papers on the Russian Revolution*. Ed. by L. Fraina.

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

of the collectivity, even when the sovereign will is exercised by a minority party which has practically disfranchised the great majority of the population, stifled all criticism and opposition and operates at the discretion of a few leaders who have entrenched themselves in control of the party organization. Social revolution today attacks liberalism and democracy precisely because these aspects of civilization stand in the way of irresponsible government.

Lenin and Marx agree on another lesson learned by observing nineteenth-century revolution. Revolutionary government must be autocratic. "Furthermore, the importance of the Commune lies in the effort that was made to break up and destroy the capitalist state bureaucratic machine, the courts of justice, military and police apparatus, and to replace it by a self-governing mass organization of workmen making no distinction between the legislative and executive power." * Marx, before Lenin, laid great emphasis on this point and Communists, Fascists and Nazis alike have learned to follow Marx in this respect.

But such a government, even when with a Mussolini in control it aims to be benevolent, is essentially despotic. The destruction of the "political state" by Communists kills the political interest of the nation and turns the citizen into a mere subject. It concentrates the legislative, executive, judicial and military power in a single body and the result is the ideal revolutionary commissariat. A criminal could then rule with impunity. This is not to say that criminals may not at times gain control of a republic, but at least there are ways of getting rid of such rulers, if the public is so disposed. But under post-Marxian dictatorship there appears to be no open channel for the expression of public opinion. Opinion is manufactured by government propaganda and all papers except those of the dominant party are suppressed and all news censored in the interest of the rulers. There can be no court of review of the acts of official persons, no law-making body to restrain the executive

* *The Paris Commune*, V. I. Lenin.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

or prescribe for the public its duties by laws clearly stating duties and penalties in advance and in the open sight of all men. Instead of laws there are official mandates and decrees. Punishments may be fixed *post facto*—that is, after certain alleged offences have been committed. There is no bill of rights to restrain cruel and unusual punishment or unwarranted search and seizure, or imprisonment without trial. No appeal is provided except that of personal influence and favouritism from the judgments of a partisan revolutionary tribunal. Civil rights are suspended as truly as when martial law is decreed. There is only one reason why anybody should desire such dictatorial form of government—except in very rare and brief moments of great national danger—and that reason is that a revolutionary dictatorship enables a victorious faction of the community to exterminate entire classes of men and women, a homicidal wish which cannot be realized while more civilized forms of social organization are in force.

That such doctrines and plans of organization could have originated in the revolutions of the nineteenth century is at first surprising, for these revolutions were started by humanitarian liberals, democrats and idealists. Revolution began with what was honestly believed to be the uprising of whole peoples. Students and gentlemen farmers, and business men and peasants and workers at first fought side by side for liberty and constitutional government. It was only later, when existing authority was challenged and disorder reigned and newly-formed liberal governments were striving to achieve redress of old grievances and reorganize the body politic, that radical conspirators took advantage of the situation in the endeavour to turn political revolution into social class war.

Karl Marx, in 1852, had made a careful study of the Revolution in Germany in 1848 and 1849. On the basis of this study, he instructed his followers how to proceed to turn a democratic revolution into a dictatorship of the proletariat. The Communists are to wait until Liberals and Democrats first start trouble. The Communist party "never imagined itself capable

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

of producing at any time, and at its pleasure, that revolution which was to carry its ideas into practice. It studied the causes that had produced the revolutionary movements of 1848, and the causes that made them fail. Recognizing the social antagonism of classes at the bottom of all political struggles, it applied itself to the study of the conditions under which one class of society can and must be called on to represent the whole interests of a nation and thus politically rule over it. . . . The Democracy of petty traders must first have its turn before the Communist working class could hope to permanently establish itself in power and destroy that system of wage slavery which keeps it under the yoke of the bourgeoisie. Thus *the secret organization* of the Communists could not have the direct purpose of upsetting the present government of Germany, being formed to upset not these, but the insurrectionary government which is sooner or later to follow them." Of course the Communists lent an active hand in the democratic revolt, all the while engaged in the "secret spreading of Communist opinions by the masses."*

Once the conflict had started, Marx observed that it was possible for determined radicals to take the revolution out of the control of the middle classes. "The petty bourgeoisie, great in boasting, is very impotent for action and very shy in risking anything. . . . Wherever an armed conflict had brought matters to a serious crisis, there the shopkeepers stood aghast at the dangerous situation created for them, aghast at the people who had taken their boasting appeals to arms in earnest . . . in case of defeat they risked the loss of their capital. And in case of victory, were they not sure to be immediately turned out of office and to see their entire policy subverted by the victorious proletarians?"

To the proletarian partisans Marx said:—"Firstly never play with insurrection unless you are fully prepared to face the consequences of your play. . . . Secondly, the insurrectionary

* This and following passages from *German Revolution and Counter Revolution*, Engels (Letters by Karl Marx in the *New York Tribune*, 1851-2).

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

career once entered upon, act with the greatest determination and on the offensive . . . surprise your antagonists while their forces are scattering, prepare new successes however small, but daily . . . in the words of Danton, the greatest master of revolutionary policy yet known, *de l'audace, de l'audace encore de l'audace!*" This advice seems to be a little inconsistent with the Marxist doctrine that Communist revolution is inevitable in the cause of historic progress of industry. But perhaps he only means that the weakness of liberal democracy gives Communist revolution its opportunity.

Marx worked out the following technique for dealing with liberal democratic parties and governments, "in the coming revolutionary struggle":—"First, at the moment when the democratic petty bourgeoisie are everywhere oppressed, they in general preach unity and reconciliation with the proletariat. The proletariat is to make 'a kind of alliance' against a common enemy. But the proletariat must reject real unity with other classes in the struggle for liberty. Instead of letting themselves out to the bourgeoisie Democrats, to serve them as a sort of applauding choir, the workers . . . must work for the establishment of an independent secret and open organization . . . in which the position and interests of the proletariat should be discussed independently of bourgeois influence."

The leaders of the proletarian faction must "counteract, above all things and in so far as it is at all possible, bourgeois appeals for peace by *forcing the Democrats to carry out their present terroristic phases.* (Italics mine.) . . . The workers at every opportunity must put up their own demands in counter-distinction to the demands put forward by the bourgeois Democrats. They must demand guarantees for the workers. . . . In cases of necessity, *they must obtain those guarantees by force.* The surest way is to *force them to compromise themselves.*" (Italics mine.)

"They must check as far as possible all manifestation of intoxication for the victory (of Democracy) and enthusiasm for the new state of affairs . . . and must express candidly their

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

lack of confidence in the new government in every way. . . . They must simultaneously erect their own revolutionary workers' government hard by the new official government. . . . From the first moment of the victory and after it, the distrust of the workers must not be directed any more against the conquered reactionary party, but against their previous ally, the petty bourgeois Democrats. . . . The arming of the whole proletariat, with muskets, rifles, cannon and munitions, must be carried through immediately . . . workers must attempt to organize themselves independently as proletarian guards with their own chiefs and a general staff elected by themselves and to place themselves not under the orders of the existing state power, but under the revolutionary community councils." The central committee of the radicals will then call a congress and make provision "for the centralization of the workers clubs under a directorship functioning from the central point of the movement. . . . As in the first French Revolution, the petty bourgeoisie will give the feudal lands freely to the peasantry." The proletariat must oppose this plan. "They must demand that confiscated feudal property should be converted into state farms to be used as labour colonies. . . ." That is, the revolution must reduce the agrarian population to the level of the industrial proletariat—a splendid example of minority dictatorship of urban workers over peasant workers. The workers must also oppose local self-government and must strive "for the most decisive centralization of force in the hands of the state. They must not permit themselves to be fooled by the Democrats' talk of freedom. . . .

"Compel the Democrats to encroach as far as possible upon the existing system of society in order to interfere with its regular development and thus make them compromise their own position. . . ." The Radical party "must drive the proposals of the Democrats, which in any case are not revolutionary but reformistic, to the extreme and transform these proposals into direct attacks upon private property; as for example if the petty bourgeoisie propose to buy out the railroads and

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

factories, then the workers must demand that the railroads and factories, since they are the property of the reactionaries, must simply be confiscated by the state without compensation. If the Democrats propose proportional taxes, they must demand progressive (income) taxes; if the Democrats themselves bring forward a proposal for a moderate progressive (income) tax, then the workers must insist on a tax the rates of which are so steep that large capital would soon go to smash as a result. . . . If the Democrats demand the regulation of the state debt, the workers must insist upon its repudiation. . . . The demands of the workers will everywhere, therefore, depend on the concessions and measures advanced by the Democrats."

By such tactics, it was felt the task of governing could be made too difficult for Liberal Democracy and the radical element of the proletariat be inspired to open revolt. From the radical point of view, what the revolutions of the nineteenth century accomplished chiefly was to provide Marxists and other social revolutionists with the strategy for the attack on liberalism in the twentieth century. We shall see how each of these nineteenth-century revolutions began as a struggle for liberty and was defeated in large measure by emerging social class war which in the end, with one exception, enabled the forces of reaction to regain their mastery over both liberals and radicals.

Thus contemporary radicalism had its origin in the liberalism and humanitarian idealism of 1848. Much of the idealism of the nineteenth century is definitely "dated" and belongs to the Romantic Movement. No one knows this better than the "realistic" radical of our generation. Romanticism, in social philosophy, merely glorified the plebeian spirit of revolt; it idealized the masses and lent nobility to the material interests of both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. That the revolt in the beginning was justified and that the grievances against which men of all classes protested were real can hardly be denied. But the realities of the situation were seldom what inspired men to revolutionary outbreak.

People moved under the spell of a dream. Bourgeois en-

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

thusiasts, led on by optimistic visions of the future and by childlike faith in the dignity of man, believing they were leading the common people, many of whom were suffering under bourgeois industrialism itself, to universal emancipation, placed themselves in a position where radical conspirators could attack their ranks from the rear. Radical leaders, most of whom were of bourgeois origin, pushed the romantic logic of universal emancipation to its fatal conclusion, compromised humanitarian liberals by challenging them with their own ideals, and discovered in the very tolerance and trust in the people on which democracy was founded the opportunity to strike democracy down. Radicals thus retained the nineteenth-century utopian dream of an ideal society, and used it to stir up the proletariat against the revolutionary middle class, all the while carefully observing the weaknesses of democracy and working out those methods of propaganda and of crowd behaviour which promised the dictatorship of their own faction.

It was only in devising the techniques of faction and conspiracy that nineteenth-century radicals may be said to have been "realistic." Thus the radicals grasped the real significance of all revolution, which is the unchaining of barbarian impulses under the delusion that oppressed classes are leading mankind back to the recovery of a lost garden of Eden. It is the mob, once aroused to attack the repressions of civilization itself, which knows intuitively what revolution is really all about. I believe I have demonstrated that such revolt against civilization and such crowd will to power appear under the surface of all the revolutionary movements of history. Radicals, sensing this fact, have sought historical justification of it in their fiction of the "class struggle." In their attempts to carry nineteenth-century revolution to the extremities of crowd psychopathology, they believed that "the workers were the only truly revolutionary class" since the uprising of the proletariat would "blow all society to pieces." As they therefore sought to stir up the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, divide revolution into faction and use the middle-class idealists as means to their own ends, they

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

naturally believed that their own hoped-for class struggle was characteristic of the relations of mankind in all history, that men were always motivated primarily by their material interests, that all the social organizations which had ever existed had been nothing more than the systematic exploitation of the poor. In this manner, the revolt of the most violent elements of the community against organized society was justified.

But the working class as a whole did not rise against the bourgeoisie, and it never has. Mechanics, as a class, have been no more revolutionary than peasants and shopkeepers. Like the others, they were swayed by ideals of patriotism and liberty. Extreme radicalism has always been largely a movement of unadjusted intellectuals. Revolutions are always the work of minorities. Most people, even in revolt, stop short of the frightful conclusions of complete revolution. The attempt of Communists to graft their movement on the democratic Revolutions of 1848 and 1871 and to coerce labor into accepting their partisan dictatorship, while it served to reveal the true logic of revolution, remained a hope long deferred. It was not until 1917 in Russia that Communist conspirators, profiting by the instruction of Marx, the example of the Paris Commune, and the vicissitudes of a weak government struggling with both war and revolution, succeeded in capturing a democracy and bringing the whole cycle of revolutionary struggle for the "emancipation of the masses" to its logical and historical end.

The Revolution of 1848 was a transition stage between Danton and Lenin. There was great intellectual ferment in Europe during the first half of the nineteenth century. The gospel of science appealed to popular imagination, along with German idealism and English liberalism. Utopian dreams of social regeneration were common. Youth was in revolt. Poets like Goethe and Heine and Shelley and Byron and Schiller sang of the "free spirit." The "young Germany" movement attacked traditionalism of all sorts and had its counterparts in other lands. The radical *Rhenische Gazette* revived the revolutionary journalism of the days of Hébert and Marat. The *Communist*

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Manifesto had just been written by Marx and Engels. The teachings of Babeuf were recalled. In France, Fourier and St. Simon preached social reorganization with religious fervour.

There was also general political discontent. The French Revolution of the 1790's had failed in the reaction against the extravagances of Robespierre. It had not emancipated the masses. And with the conquests of Napoleon bourgeois ideas and interests had been extended through Europe. There was widespread hope of another revolution which would yet establish liberty, equality and fraternity. The democratic movement had even extended to Russia. In 1825 the Decembrist uprising in that country, led by young intellectuals, had demanded that the liberal Constantine be placed on the throne of the Czars and believed that the masses would support their movement for a limited monarchy and a constitution. But the hopes of the liberals were wrecked in the ignorance of the populace who misunderstood the revolutionary slogan "Constantine and Constitution" and thought that "constitution" was the name of the consort of the claimant to the throne. Disillusionments of this kind did not, however, discourage the belief of liberals that the masses generally wanted nothing so much as liberty. And throughout the continent an "enlightened" minority was preparing a crusade for constitutional government, either that of a restored French Republic, or of a limited monarchy like the British with universal suffrage, representative parliament, a ministry responsible to the people and a declaration of the Rights of Man.

Already there had been uprisings in France in the 1830's against the restoration of the Bourbon Kings and the placing of Louis XVIII on the throne of that country by the reactionary allied governments which had put an end to the Napoleonic era. The Congress of Vienna which followed the downfall of Napoleon in 1815, and the Holy Alliance, strove to blot out all traces of revolution and Bonapartism and bring Europe back to the condition which had existed in the seventeenth century. A wave of reactionism, and of royalist "legitimism" led by

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

Prince Metternich of Austria and the princes and higher clergy, seized the mind of the upper classes. But there was something unreal in this royalist gesture of official religious orthodoxy and political conservatism at a time when the Industrial Revolution was bringing a new economic order, and free thought and democratic enthusiasm were becoming the fashion. The reaction, which could not endure, served everywhere to re-awaken the passions of revolution and to give all kinds of opposition parties, Liberals, Communists, Anarchists, bourgeois Republicans, and Utopian Humanitarians a common cause and a common enemy.

The Revolution of 1848 was steeped in Romanticism. In an earlier chapter, I have shown the relations of this movement to the political and social philosophies of the nineteenth century. The revolt in literature and art against formalism, realism and nationalism, was carried over into revolutionary idealism. Again the Rousseauist return to nature inspired utopian dreams of the emancipation of the masses. Romanticists almost without exception proclaimed the freedom of the individual from the repressions of convention and the forms of civilized life. The principle of authoritarianism was challenged. The emphasis on inspiration in religion and art became internationalism in morals, voluntarism in philosophy, and radicalism in politics. The impulses of the crowd were encouraged to challenge the social order as men came to believe that instinct rather than habit, necessity and intelligence constituted the social bond. Benevolent sentiment, rather than wisdom, became a guide to social behaviour. It became popular to believe that humanity was held back from its true estate of perfection only by selfish exploiters, that the principle of perfect humanity existed in all men and needed only to be called forth by right incentive. A religion of humanity, proclaiming the divinity of the human race, was fabricated by thinkers like St. Simon and Comte and their followers. Thus did the voice of the people seem to be the voice of God and thus did radicals of all sorts seek to awaken the toiling masses to their true interests and their historic task of

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

revolution, imagining that an uprising of the masses was all that would be necessary to establish the ideal society and inaugurate the triumphant "Age of Man."

Labour, which most men perform of necessity and none too well, and in routine manner, was idealized and held to be the noblest estate of man by young intellectuals who were themselves spared the necessity of toiling for their daily bread. And this romantic notion of work was even more loudly proclaimed as machine industry came to supplant the old handicrafts. From the idealization of labour, it was but a step to the idealization and flattery of the working classes. Hence "labour produces all wealth." The wealth of the community properly belongs to the workers of the present generation. "To each according to his needs, and from each according to his ability." "The working class is the only truly revolutionary class." "The cause of labour is the cause of humanity." Only the workers are humanity; all other classes are but parasites and exploiters and enemies of mankind. The whole trend of history operates to this end of the development of the class-conscious revolutionary proletariat. The uprising of the proletariat will be *the Revolution* for which all previous revolutions were but preparation. It will be the culmination of history and the dictatorship of the proletariat will put an end to all class war, will bring about the long awaited cooperative commonwealth and "the Parliament of Man." Many of the presuppositions of revolutionary radicalism in the twentieth century still remain those of the romantic early nineteenth century.

Finally, the revolutionary unrest of 1848 was in part the result of economic causes. Under Napoleon a class of "new rich" had emerged, partly as a result of war profits, contracts and governmental favours. This class had come into possession of many of the estates of exiled aristocrats and resented their return. Having identified their fortunes with those of the Napoleonic régime, many powerful families were placed in opposition to royalty by the return of Louis XVIII. Moreover new industrial methods were spreading from England to the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

continent. This movement was not extensive as yet, but where it existed it brought new difficulties and intensified old ones. Rising industrialists demanded freedom from restriction on trade, and a voice in determining the economic policies of government, all of which was denied them by the legitimist reaction.

Machine production had brought certain hardships to a portion of the working class. It had displaced hand labour to some extent and caused unemployment in certain industries. It threatened the existence of the guild system. It placed an increasing number of factory workers in unsatisfactory relations toward employing capital. The industrial system was new, there was little protection of the rights of labour. Many employers were themselves ignorant, grasping plebeians, with little social outlook beyond their own interests and small sense of responsibility toward their employees. They naturally regarded any attempt at organized effort to improve the condition of the workers as seditious. The industrial proletariat, even had it been united, was too weak to have made a revolution, but its plight aroused the active sympathies of many good men and its grievances gave radical propagandists a cause.

There had been trouble in France for eighteen years before the storm swept Europe in 1848. Louis XVIII, Comte de Provence, brother of the unlamented Louis XVI, had been placed on the throne of France by the armed forces which had accomplished the overthrow of Napoleon. This King, supported by powers outside France, did the best he could to meet a difficult and embarrassing situation. He died in 1824 and was succeeded by his temperamental brother, the Comte d'Artois, as Charles X. Charles was a thoroughly reactionary Bourbon. In alliance with the higher clergy and the Jesuits, he became the champion of the legitimist movement. Exiled nobles were brought back to France and were indemnified, out of public funds raised by taxation, for the losses they had suffered during the Revolution. This partisan gesture cost the French people nearly one billion francs.

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

In July, 1830, the King decided to make reaction in France complete. A censorship of the press was put into operation and the right of franchise was restricted by a property qualification. The King, moreover, declared that he alone should henceforth have the right to propose laws. There was general indignation, journalists and public persons openly defied the King. On July 29th there was a Republican *coup d'état*. Barricades appeared in the streets, the citizens were called to arms, and the insurgents laid siege to Paris. Charles X resigned his throne and Louis Philippe, descendant of the deceased revolutionary Duke of Orleans, became regent. Louis, with the help of the aged Lafayette, made himself king. The Constitution was restored, civil rights were guaranteed and a liberal government established. The King sought to maintain a middle course between the Democratic party and the reactionaries. Partisan conflict was intensified. In 1839, Guizot, the King's Minister, attempted to enforce a policy of reaction similar to that which had wrecked the reign of Charles X and with like results.

On February 24, 1848, there were again riots in the streets of Paris and this time there was revolution. The tension which had been increasing all over Europe broke, and the masses were swept into revolt not only in all France but in Germany and Austria. Guizot resigned. His resignation was followed by that of the King. There was at first great enthusiasm for liberty and the rule of the people. Revolutionists were united so long as there was a common enemy. It was thought once more that the great day of Humanity had dawned. A provisional government was established to consolidate the Revolution and a national assembly elected by universal popular vote was set up to represent the common people.

But as usual, the authority of government had been weakened by popular revolt and the same thing happened that we have seen repeated again and again in the history of revolutions. No sooner was the "oppressor" removed than moderates and extremists were at one another's throats. The moderates tried to restore order and were obliged to adopt unwillingly many of

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

the repressive measures of their predecessors. For years, radical propaganda of all sorts and revolutionary societies of every description had multiplied under the legitimist reaction. Now the lid was off. Each partisan group had its doctrinaire apostles who were determined that the Revolution be established in their own peculiar way and in no other.

Schemes for the reorganization of society were presented with much conflict and confusion. The new government sought to compromise. Louis Blanc, bourgeois Utopian Socialist, became Minister of Labour of the Provisional Government. A great "Labour Parliament" was assembled at the Luxembourg Palace. But care was taken that the Congress should not constitute itself the revolutionary government. This body contained many benevolent theoreticians. It exhausted itself in debate and left the status of labour in the new society quite unsettled.

Meanwhile, unemployment relief was granted. National workshops were opened and over a hundred thousand men were given employment at public expense. But the experiment in nationalized industry was not financially successful and it raised an outcry against "Socialism." The National Assembly, elected by universal popular vote, repudiated Socialism and abolished the workshops.

The answer of the radicals was to arouse the proletariat of Paris with the cry, "Bread of bullets," and the Revolution developed into a desperate "class war."

" . . . the most terrible street fighting that Paris had ever witnessed ensued. The streets of the districts inhabited by the working classes were again torn up for barricades, and from Friday, June 23, until the following Monday a desperate conflict raged. The Assembly, fearing the triumph of the labour party, invested General Cavaignac with dictatorial power to crush the revolt. Victory was inevitably on the side of the government troops, who were well disciplined and well equipped, while the insurgents fought irregularly and were half-starved." *

* *Outlines of European History*, Robinson and Beard.

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Louis Blanc and his kind were undoubtedly dreamers. It is not surprising that their efforts failed to avert civil war. For remedial and constructive social legislation were certainly needed in 1848—and not only in France but wherever the ugly factory system had showed its face. Unfortunately the seeds of class war and subsequent revolution were planted when short-sighted, selfish industrialists permitted the developing capitalist system, almost from the very beginning, to place itself in opposition to many of the age-long decencies of civilization.

Blanc had no intention of establishing an insurrectionary working-class republic and had there been more practical intelligence on part of both reformers and capitalists, then, before the evils of the new industrial system had become deep-seated, much subsequent bitterness between labour and capital might never have existed. But bourgeois panic and outcry against "Socialism" initiated that policy of resistance to almost every effort for economic justice which has been characteristic of certain business interests from 1848 down to the criticism of "The New Deal" of President Roosevelt. It was said, just as it has been said since, that the reformers were "impractical," and that the national workshops were increasing taxes, placing the government in competition with its own enterprising citizens, and discouraging individual initiative and enterprise.

It should have been obvious, even then, that in an industrial society there are precisely the same reasons for regulating business in the public interest as existed for the public control of the military power in feudal society. It was not necessarily a restriction of wholesome liberty when robber barons were forced to swear allegiance to the sovereign, and it was quite in accord with the liberal tradition when the lord of the manor was compelled to respect the rights and vital necessities of his subjects. So it should have been with the industrial overlords. For of all social systems, the capitalist system gives the common man least economic security. The personal ties between rich and poor are displaced by an impersonal contractual relation in which one of the parties is at a tremendous disadvantage. With

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

the growth of the joint stock company, ownership of employing capital tended to take on the characteristics of the absentee land ownership which caused the peasant riots in old France. Workers were frightfully underpaid. They were thrown out of employment by the labour of children taken from the poorhouses and by periodic industrial crises. Very few workers could look forward to anything but starvation in their old age, and long hours of work and degrading conditions of unemployment were injurious to health and morale and were filling hideous mill towns with a dehumanized slum rabble strikingly like the proletariat of the ancient world.

In primitive society, tribal organization and communal ownership of land provided the common man with some measure of economic security. Even in famine, starvation did not occur until conditions were so bad that the whole tribe starved together. Under the class system of Greece and Rome, and the serfdom of the Middle Ages, the master took care of his servants. But under rising capitalism, the freedom of contract could be so interpreted as to relieve employers of all responsibility toward the mass of workers. There was terrible poverty in the midst of plenty. Inequalities of distribution gave rise to the ironical situation of "over-production" in which the very increased productiveness of labour led to its own undoing and markets were glutted with unsaleable goods produced by workers whose standard of living, even on full-time employment, was hardly above the level of bare subsistence.

Marx's terrible indictment of the capitalist system is confirmed by descriptions of conditions given by other more conservative writers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries—by Adam Smith, Ricardo, Malthus, Robert Owen, Fourier, Proudhon, and later by Charles Kingsley, Blatchford, Matthew Arnold and Nietzsche. It is interesting, furthermore, to note that many Americans, before the Civil War, were hardly more sparing than Karl Marx in their denunciation of capitalist industrialism. Many thousands of people had migrated to those shores to escape that very system. There was, therefore,

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

a strong agrarian hostility to the development and spread of New England industrialism on this continent. The school of John C. Calhoun made great point of comparing wage slavery under capitalism with its own system of chattel slavery, somewhat to the advantage of the latter, and Horace Greeley himself was sufficiently influenced by Fourier to employ Karl Marx as regular foreign contributor to the *New York Tribune*. It was not until later that criticism of the capitalist system in the United States ceased to be respectable.

Such criticism, during the early nineteenth century, either in Europe or in America, was by no means confined to radical propaganda. The newly dominant capitalist class often gave serious offence to the more cultivated elements of the community. It is an ironical fact that a large portion of radical leaders during the nineteenth century were gentlemen born, whereas most of the outstandingly successful business men were not. It is unfortunate that Marx, Engels, Bakunin—none of them, by the way, men of working-class origin—used the term “bourgeoisie” to designate the type of business man who was in their day forcing his way up out of the lower strata of the plebeian mass.

The old bourgeoisie, or middle class, had traditions and culture. It had risen through the guild organizations of the free cities of the Middle Ages and, under its leadership, cities like Florence, Venice and the towns of the Hanseatic League, had become centres of freedom and of enlightenment and cosmopolitan manners at a time when the surrounding feudal society was still half-barbarous. There is an historical relation between culture and urbanity which is well-exemplified by the old burgher classes, and if their wealth was gained by trade and commerce, their commercial contacts had greatly broadened their outlook and their industrial system was based on an organization of the useful, often liberal, arts. Many members of this class became leaders in the learned professions and in time their members included not only the professional classes, but much of the landed gentry.

It is the habit of propagandists to make caricatures of their

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

enemies and to select the most unpleasant examples of the opposition as representative of the entire class. So radical propagandists usually picture "the capitalists" as a band of industrial robbers whose chief interest is the oppression of labour. It should be remembered that this picture is as false and as unfair as the average political cartoon which appears in the more sensational newspapers. The truth is, of course, that the business class, like any other class, contains people of all types. The business world is now and has always been the possessor of its due proportion of honest, cultivated people sincerely devoted to the common welfare. Such stability as the business world has, is the result of the presence in it of large numbers of public-spirited, responsible people. In almost any community in our capitalistic age, there are scores of business men whom any society of freemen in history would be proud to own as citizens.

But in a time of social change, when opportunity is open to men of all sorts, the more modest and civilized persons tend to be lost to view among a hoard of cheaply ambitious newcomers to positions of wealth and power. Unfortunately, with the growth of democracy, the factory system and business opportunity, the old bourgeoisie was often driven into the background and a new class of enterprising, pushing, lower men, often without social responsibility or cultural traditions, or even the instincts of the gentleman, came into prominence. We have a notorious example of this sort of thing in the "Gilded Age" in America after the Civil War, when many of the wealthy social leaders were persons who had climbed up from obscurity to positions of great wealth by methods which a gentleman would have scorned. The influence of this type of man was severely denounced by the educated during the nineteenth century as "culture Philistinism." Long before, in Plato's *Republic*, attention had been called to the spiritual crudities of the "self-made man" and warning given that when such men of baser metal should come to rule the state, the state would be destroyed.

The modern type of business man was thrifty and he retained

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

certain plebeian virtues, but wherever his point of view has influenced modern culture it has tended to lower its standards—notably as the professions have become commercialized. Physicians become “fee splitters,” statesmen become politicians, lawyers become the mere servants of corporate interests, clergymen resort to advertising religion with neon lights, educators become narrow specialists and professional money-raisers. The executive and administrator everywhere tend to take precedence over the man of thought.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the materialism of the newly-dominant business man gave plausibility to the Marxian doctrine that man is motivated primarily by his economic interests. Nor is it surprising that the original struggle for liberty against Royalist reaction quickly degenerated into an economic class war. Just as John Brown, at Harper’s Ferry, imagined that the slave population of the South would respond to his call for an armed uprising against the master class, so the radical idealists of 1848 imagined the oppressed proletariat would rise up against the capitalists. This delusion was what might have been expected. The “class war” was inspired and led chiefly by upper-class humanitarians and their youthful student followers. Only a small number of industrial workers answered this call. Many of those who did so perished in the barricaded streets fighting desperately.

The victorious Republican forces of 1848 resorted to severe methods of retaliation. Four thousand citizens of France were exiled without trial. Thirty-two newspapers were suppressed and hundreds of radical leaders were put in prison. The so-called working-class insurrection drove the Republican revolutionists rapidly toward the Right. Louis Napoleon, a queer mixture of Bonapartist pretender to the throne and Liberal disciple of Louis Blanc, was brought back from exile and elected President of the Republic of France. The election of Napoleon was an overwhelming victory for the Conservative party. Bonaparte received five and a half million popular votes against one and one-half million votes divided among all opposing candi-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

dates. Here again is evidence that radical revolutions are the work always of a small minority. Radical sentiment was, as we have seen, very widespread in 1848—probably more so than it has ever been since. Yet the masses remained essentially conservative.

In 1851 Napoleon, by a *coup d'état*, seized the government and established a Bonapartist dictatorship. This act was submitted to a plebiscite—similar to that recently ordered by Hitler—and the people approved it by a vote of seven million seven hundred and forty thousand against six hundred and forty-six thousand. In 1852, again with the approval of the overwhelming majority of Frenchmen, Bonaparte proclaimed himself Emperor Napoleon III. Lip service was given to the principles of the Revolution of 1848, but Imperial France lived under a bourgeois dictatorship. The press was placed under a rigid censorship and education of the masses, particularly the teaching of history and philosophy, brought under governmental espionage and regulation. But France was prosperous. The capitalist system of industry made rapid progress. Vast new fortunes were accumulated and in great numbers. In 1855, the first modern World Exhibition was held in Paris, dedicated to the Progress of Humanity.

It was the Revolution of 1848, rather than that of 1789, which may be said to have established the supremacy of the capitalist class, and France was apparently content with the dictatorship. Napoleon III remained intensely popular until his defeat in the Franco-Prussian War. Had he been victorious over Germany in that quixotic struggle, there doubtless would have been no third revolution in 1871 and the name of Louis Napoleon would have survived in history as that of a benevolent and much-loved ruler. Do not the masses really love and admire the dictator? Is it possible that the public accepts even revolution, partly because half-consciously it suspects that revolution always holds the prospect of dictatorship?

The Revolution in France in 1848 became the signal for a general uprising in Germany and Austria. There is an illumi-

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

nating account of the German Revolution in the letters which Marx and Engels wrote for the columns of the *New York Tribune* during the years 1851 and 1852. Just as in France, radical propagandists tried to turn this struggle for liberal constitutional government into the social revolution. And, as in France, the class war brought disaster, not only to the cause of radicalism but to the general revolution itself. The outstanding results of this heroic struggle—which Marx tried to show failed because the liberals did not follow the extreme radicals—were the rise of Bismarck to power, the later unification of Germany under a Prussian Emperor, and the triumph of Catholic reaction in Austria. Such constitutional liberty as existed in Germany at the end of the nineteenth century was the result of Bismarck's concessions to popular sentiment rather than of the glorious struggle for freedom in 1848.

In 1848, the Industrial Revolution had made relatively little progress in Germany. The number of industrial workers was small. Such class-conscious revolutionary philosophy as existed among the proletariat was almost lost to view in the liberal democratic sentiment of the much more numerous groups of artisans, shopkeepers and dissatisfied peasants. The middle classes, intellectuals and bourgeoisie, demanded a constitution with an elected parliament and a bill of rights. In Germany, as elsewhere, revolutionary ideas were chiefly the expression of opposition to the legitimist reaction of Metternich. Democrats had good reason to regard the uprising of 1848 as their own revolution and the appearance of Communist class war as an intrusion.

In both Germany and Austria there was what appeared to be a general spontaneous insurrection of the masses. The forces of reaction were easily swept from power by united public sentiment. On March 13th, the Democrats, whose propaganda had long been smuggled into the country in spite of a rigid censorship, gained control of the government, forced the resignation of Metternich and drove out the Hapsburgs. Dissension then developed between the moderates and radicals. The latter

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

held Vienna in terror with a citizen army of workers and students until von Haynau suppressed the Revolution in Italy and returned to become Dictator of Hungary, and until the reactionary forces under the command of Radetzky put an end to the revolt.

In Prussia, the King faced a financial crisis not unlike that of Louis XVI in France in 1789. A national assembly called to vote additional taxes refused, and instead demanded a parliamentary constitution, trial by jury, a free press and a united Germany. Immediately there was a radical popular uprising in Berlin which was ruthlessly crushed. The King yielded to the demands of the bourgeois liberals and a national assembly, meeting at Frankfort, set to work to draw up a liberal constitution for all Germany. Marx says that the members of the Assembly, "the flower of the land," were wholly incompetent, vacillating and doctrinaire. But Marx merely expressed the opinion of the extremely radical minority which urged the masses to revolt against the Assembly. In October, 1848, when Radetzky subdued the radicals of Austria, with extreme brutality, the Frankfort Assembly failed to come to their aid. The German liberals had no intention of repeating the experience of the French Assembly of 1792. On November 8th, General von Wrangel, at the head of forty thousand Royalist troops, entered Berlin and restored order. The Communists were crushed and there was no serious protest on the part of the Liberal Parliament at Frankfort. The national (Republican) guard, authorized by the Assembly, was disbanded by the government at Berlin, and the Assembly which had become involved in a series of quarrels with various German states was obliged to turn to its professed enemies, the Royalist army officers of Prussia, for protection. In its efforts to compel the German states to accept the constitution it had drawn up, it was obliged to part company with the radicals. The rebellious workers in the cities were crushed, along with the Assembly itself, by Royalist forces in July, 1849, and there was a general exodus of German

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

liberals to America and other lands. When the makeshift Constitution of the new Empire was presented to the King of Prussia for his signature, the King refused to sign, having been advised by Bismarck to wait and gain a real crown based on "Blood and Iron." The Revolution, its councils divided by radical propaganda and radical insurrection, was forced to compromise itself and make alliance with reactionaries in its efforts to preserve order. Thus deprived of popular support, it was snubbed by its Royalist protectors and ended its existence in futility and humiliation.

But the Revolution of 1848 was an important step in the completion of the modern cycle of revolution. It began in a united struggle of Democrats for liberty and against absolute monarchy. It ended everywhere in the class struggle. Inevitably the communistic class struggle came to take the place of the older democratic spirit of revolution, and the next step in the development of revolutionary psychology was taken when radicals staged a demonstration of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" for the instruction of revolutionists of our own generation. After that, revolution became Communist conspiracy and the long revolutionary struggle for the liberty of the people was brought to a close. This important step was taken by the Commune of Paris in 1871.

It was an ill-advised war into which Napoleon III led the French in 1870. Victory at most could have brought but little gain to the masses of France and defeat meant not only their humiliation but the strengthening and unification of the rival Empire of Germany. Had there been no conflict in 1870, there doubtless would never have been a World War in 1914. The Germans, however, greatly desired the war and were well prepared for it. The patriotic French enthusiastically walked into the German trap. Inevitable defeat put an end to that Empire of Bonaparte, which, as Marx says, "was hailed throughout the world as the saviour of society." A provisional Republican government was formed and a national guard composed of volun-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

teer citizens, largely working men, vainly tried to defend the territory of France against the invader. The Germans surrounded Paris, crowned the King of Prussia Emperor of united Germany, and forced the provisional government of France to agree to a shameful peace. French territory was occupied, Alsace-Lorraine ceded to the enemy and the French agreed to pay the Germans an indemnity of five billion francs.

Many among the populace saw in the situation a return to the days of the first Revolution when the armies of the Duke of Brunswick had been hurled back by the heroic efforts of free French citizens. Great numbers of the common people refused to accept the peace. There was patriotic revolt against the provisional government and to the desperate sentiment for national defence was added a revival of Jacobinism.

In the general confusion and apparent defencelessness of the government, radical propagandists, whose cause had failed in the disorder it had created in 1848, again saw opportunity for class war. At the very time, September 4, 1870, when the Republic was proclaimed as a measure of national defence, the national guard set up its insurrectionary committees "for the defense of Paris and to assure the food supply." During the following January the Germans occupied portions of the city, and the national guard, refusing at the behest of the provisional government to surrender its arms, made a separate armistice with the conquerors and was now in a position to turn its weapons against the struggling government of France. There was much disorder and defiance of law. The die-hard movement for national defence had simply armed the social revolution. On the 18th of March, 1871, the government sought to assert its authority by ordering the insurgents to surrender their arms. The central committee of the national guard of Paris sent to the provisional government the following reply:—

"The proletarians of Paris, in the midst of the defeats and betrayals of the ruling class, have come to understand that they must save the situation by taking the conduct of public affairs into their own hands. . . . They have realized that it is their highest duty

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

and their absolute right to make themselves masters of their own fates and to seize the power of the government." *

Anyone acquainted with the nature of radical propaganda and conspiracy can easily detect the fact that a well-organized Communist faction had been busily at work. Patriotic sentiment was being used, just as the unemployment situation has recently been used by professional agitators in America, to insinuate insurrection. The government sought to compel the insurgents to disarm. There was a great anti-Communist demonstration in the Place Vendome which was attacked by radical mobs, and broken up in confusion and bloodshed. Marx said that the radicals made a great mistake in not marching immediately to Versailles, where the provisional government had taken refuge. He thought the Republicans could have been exterminated at that time.

However, the Commune proclaimed itself the true government of France and issued a call to workers throughout all nations to join it. Open civil war followed and the Germans in Paris must have been entertained at the spectacle of their former enemies tearing at one another's throats. Barricades again appeared in the streets of Paris. The Commune issued an order demanding reprisals for all its defenders who should be killed by the supporters of the Republic. An archbishop and two Republican generals were assassinated. Fifty members of the bourgeois class were held in Paris as hostages and later massacred. Monuments were destroyed and many homes of the wealthy were burned. In retaliation the government's forces fired on the city and burned houses in which radicals had taken refuge.

The Commune proceeded to enact its programme of legislation. Suffrage was again made universal. Municipal officers were elected for short terms and made subject to popular recall. A revolutionary form of government was set up, abolishing the parliamentary system, reestablishing the revolutionary tribunal

* *The Civil War in France*, Karl Marx.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

and concentrating all power, executive, legislative, judicial, military, in the hands of a single committee. We have already seen that such remains the ideal form of government for the Communists since it means the uncompromising supremacy of their own party. Revolutions are loud in their professions of love of liberty, but we have had numerous occasions to learn what revolutionary liberty is. It is not the rule of the majority, it is not civil rights, not academic freedom nor personal liberty—it is the freedom of a crowd to break all restraint upon its will to power.

Judges under the Commune were deprived of all independence of the crowd and were elected, for short terms, from among the members of the proletariat. That is, the courts became merely the judicial instruments of partisan rule. All public servants were to receive the same wages as ordinary working men. Communism understands democracy to mean simply the abolition of all class differences and perhaps of all recognition of superiority among men.

Lenin, commenting on Marx's account of the Commune of 1871, says that "the transition from capitalism to socialism is *impossible* without a certain return to primitive democracy." By primitive democracy he means the right and capacity of the average worker to hold any office and exercise authority over the community. He goes beyond Andrew Jackson in his declaration of the fitness of members of the lower orders to rule society. Capitalist culture has created large-scale production, factories, railways, the postal service, telephones, etc., *and on this basis* the great majority of the functions of the old State Power have been so simplified and can be reduced to such simple operations of registering, filing and checking, that they will be quite within the capacity of every literate person, and it will be possible to perform them for the "wage rate of an ordinary working man. . . ." * This idea of the level on which government should be conducted is worthy of notice, especially in the light of the serious need of present-day society for more intelligent

* *The Paris Commune*, V. I. Lenin.

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

leadership. Radicalism has simply retained the worst features of the democracy it hates.

The social programme of the Commune of 1871, while radical, did not really attempt to establish Communism on a complete scale. Many of the leaders of the Revolution, including Blanqui and Flourens, were not Communists in the strict party sense of the term. The former was a disciple of Babeuf and the latter of Proudhon. Blanqui, however, believed in the efficacy of secret conspiracy and worked on the theory that a desperate minority could stir up the working class to general revolt and seize the government. Flourens had certain anarchistic tendencies. Had the Revolution succeeded, the Communists would doubtless have become divided among themselves and have "liquidated" the party of these leaders before completing the establishment of the cooperative commonwealth.

But the Commune survived long enough to impress subsequent radicals with its sincere class-consciousness. It released the peasants from the burden of taxes—proletarian leaders always are friends of the peasants until they get them in their power. It abolished rents, it confiscated certain factories which had been closed by strikes, and it passed certain laws for the advantage of small bourgeoisie and shopkeepers whose sympathy it still needed. It was less successful in suppressing banditry and crime. Every revolutionary movement is joined by the irresponsible and the lawless. Marx admits that the Commune had its problems in dealing with the criminal element, but says it did its best to suppress it. However, in this respect all revolutionary authority is weak.

The Commune survived only a few weeks. Bismarck released troops of the former Emperor Napoleon III. These soldiers were permitted to return to Paris under command of the provisional government on condition that they suppress the Commune. Most of them were as truly members of the working class as were the members of the national guard of the Commune. They passed through the German lines and crushed the Commune. The revenge of the conservatives was terrible. Marx

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

and Lenin have possibly exaggerated the extent of the massacre. But according to the figures I have, thirty thousand were slain and forty thousand were captured, many of whom were exiled or deported. In all, the Commune cost the French nation more than one hundred thousand lives.

The radical movement, during the revolutions of the nineteenth century, revived civil war on a scale such as probably no generation had suffered since the days of Marius and Sulla in Rome. People who talk lightly about the possibility of revolution often do not realize what civil war means. War, under any circumstances, turns the nations into homicidal mobs. But there is—or was before the recent World War—a difference between war between nations and civil war. National wars are usually fought by trained soldiers and only a portion of the nation participates in actual slaughter. Civil war divides the whole nation against itself, arms the people as mass, and there is no escape. All men are forced to take sides, neighbour against neighbour, citizen against citizen. There is no middle ground and no safety zone. War is carried into the very homes of men and women. Houses of peaceable citizens are entered at night and captives slaughtered or carried away to face their enemies in a revolutionary tribunal. The bond of fellowship which constitutes any society or community is broken up. Anarchy reigns and with it madness and universal fear. Wars between nations, barbarous as they are, retain a certain measure of respect for the enemy. There is usually respect for the flag of truce. There is a little control of passion through military discipline and some deference to the opinion of civilized humanity. There may even be humanity in the treatment of prisoners and abstinence from needless butchery. Long ago, Grotius compiled the laws of war which have always had at least a pretence of recognition among civilized nations.

In civil war, the restraints of civilization are relaxed—certainly abandoned when civil war becomes class war. Ordinarily peaceable people are driven to acts of violence and extreme cruelty. An undisciplined soldiery pillages its own home land.

REVOLUTIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Brigandage rules. Adventurers of all sorts take advantage of the breakdown of law, reason and authority. There are orgies of wantonness and massacre. In civil war, the forces of law and order are suspended, the state struggles desperately to maintain or restore its challenged authority. There are spasms of mutual suspicion, rumour and uncontrolled hatred. Mere sympathy for the cause of the opposition or indifference to issues which are but half true become presumption of guilt. Opponents are regarded not as human beings but as fiends, devils, enemies of mankind, and are treated accordingly. The significance of every act or thought is twisted out of all perspective. The imaginings of the mob are regarded as ultimate truth and the will of the mob is law.

Civil war, as class war, is war of extermination. As Lenin said in 1908, "—under certain conditions the class struggle assumes forms of armed struggle and civil war: there are times when the interests of the proletariat demand ruthless annihilation of its enemies in open battle." * Whole sections of the population are destroyed, not because of what they have done but because of what they are, or what they believe, or because of the social advantages their ancestors may have enjoyed. Class war is war of revenge. It is return to savagery. If it were honest revolt against exploitation, would it then be always necessary to resort to clever propaganda to stir it up? Would the propagandists of social revolution in France in 1871 have had to appeal to patriotic sentiment in order to secure the commitment of the masses to their Communist creed? Would revolution always wait to strike until the moment when a government is weakened by financial crisis or foreign war or internal dissension? Would it be that men who a few hours previously had been friends suddenly discover that they are deadly enemies? Would not the instigators of alleged proletarian revolt be themselves more frequently working men? That there are serious class antagonisms in every society there can be no doubt. But certainly in a democracy the machinery exists for their peace-

* *Zagranichnaya Gazeta*, No. 2. Quoted in *The Civil War in France*.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

able adjustment. No social conflict is ever wholly settled. In any civilized community there must be concession to conflicting ideas and interests. The spirit of no compromise is the spirit of revolt against civilization.

The Commune of Paris was proclaimed as the revolutionary expression of the working class, but it is clear that only a small number of the working people of France had a part in it. It was rather, at the beginning, a popular outburst of patriotic sentiment which was given the semblance of a revolt against the capitalist system by a Communist faction, which since the Revolution of 1848 had acquired mastery of the techniques of propaganda and organization. From the Communist point of view, except for the lessons it taught in the strategy of insurrection, the Commune was a tragic failure, as were all the revolutions of the nineteenth century. From the liberal point of view, many of the objectives of those who first led the revolt against Royalist reaction were, during the nineteenth century, later gained by peaceable methods—universal suffrage, constitutional guarantees of the rights of individuals and minorities, parliamentary government, a ministry responsible to parliament, trial by jury, freedom of speech and assembly, and an extensive programme of needed social legislation. All these achievements are today challenged by the revolutionary movements of the twentieth century. The nineteenth century made clear the issue between liberalism and radicalism. It remained for the Russian Communists, following the example of the Paris Commune, to challenge liberalism the world over, set up a partisan dictatorship in the name of a proletariat which hardly existed in Russia, and thus put an end to the delusion that the aim of revolution is the emancipation of the masses.

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY
STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY

THE long cycle of revolutionary struggle for liberty, which began in England in 1642, came to its close in Russia in October, 1917. From the time of Cromwell to the fall of Kerensky, the great majority of those who participated in revolution were inspired by visions of a republic of free men. They fought for the limitation of the power of the sovereign, for individual responsibility, for the reign of law over despotism, for the consent of the governed in public affairs, for a state which would not be the dictatorship of any faction. These principles, so far as they have been realized, have been put in practice, not by the uprising of the masses, but as a result of the growth of civilization and the spread of enlightenment and good will. Each of the revolutions in modern times became distracted from its original aims, developed into a partisan struggle between moderates and extremists, each seeking power, and nearly all ended in reaction.

During the nineteenth century it became increasingly evident that revolutions are minority movements through which a well-organized faction seeks, by popular appeal, mob violence and class war, to take advantage of a national crisis or weakening of the authority of government to seize the power of the state. Each such conspiracy, like that of Robespierre in 1793 and that of Blanqui in 1871, ended in disaster, and its failure also brought an end to the popular revolution in which it had its origin and to the general disorder which had been its opportunity. Is it possible that social revolution, terrorism, the destruction of the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

leadership of the educated and responsible elements of society, the unrestrained indulgence of the hatred and envy of the mob, and a partisan dictatorship ruling in the name of "the masses," were all along the real, though half-conscious, objective of revolution? Were good men and idealistic youth who perished in the barricades self-deceived? Was most of the talk about Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, really a disguise for the half-secret aims of crowd revolt? Were moral ideals and humanitarian enthusiasms merely invoked in order to justify indulgence in anti-social behaviour and the exercise of the will to power of a faction? Such an explanation would be quite in accord with what we know about the psychology of the crowd. If revolutions were, as their leaders maintained, uprisings of the majority, we might be forced to some such gloomy view of human nature. But the notion that any revolution is a revolt of the whole people is one among many revolutionary delusions—a delusion repeatedly belied by the realistic strategy of radical conspirators.

Through repeated outbreaks of violence during the nineteenth century, professional propagandists of social revolution learned to master the techniques of turning a national crisis to partisan advantage, to impose upon the dissatisfied their claims to class leadership, and over the heads of a distracted public carry the logic of revolution to the achievement of its ultimate objectives.

In the autumn of 1917, the extremist faction which we have seen to be active under the surface of all revolution seized control of the provisional government of Russia and proclaimed "we will now proceed to organize the Social Revolution." The *coup d'état*, by means of which the Bolshevik faction made itself the new autocracy of Russia, took place on the eve of the calling of a national convention whose delegates were authorized to create a democratic constitution—a convention to which universal popular vote had elected only a hopelessly small minority of Bolshevik deputies.

At last a revolution was successful. The Communist conspiracy was "*The Revolution*" of which all previous insurrections

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

were only unfulfilled promises. Now the true nature of revolution revealed itself. Democratic and idealistic disguises were thrown away. The Liberal Movement, in which revolution had had its origin, was mocked by the changeling it had reared. The professed aims of revolution, during more than two hundred years of civil wars, were abandoned the day the real aims were achieved. Oppressed humanity did not want liberty after all, but only security and a new master. The long crusade for democracy was over. The very "success" of the Russian Revolution put an end to the struggle for constitutional democracy and personal and civil liberty. Henceforth, the nations were to move toward dictatorship, government by faction, technocracy, and a new economic imperialism.

The word "conspiracy" is a harsh word. I would hesitate to use it even to designate the Russian Revolution, had not Communists themselves used the term quite frankly and somewhat boastfully. In the chapter on "The Art of Insurrection" in his book on *The History of the Russian Revolution*, Trotsky says:

"Conspiracy is ordinarily contrasted to insurrection as the deliberate undertaking of a minority to a spontaneous movement of the majority. . . .

"In every class society there are enough contradictions so that a conspiracy can take root in its cracks. . . . A pure conspiracy even when victorious can only replace one clique of the ruling class by another. . . .

"This does not mean, however, that popular insurrection and conspiracy are in all respects mutually exclusive. . . . The higher the political level of a revolutionary movement and the more serious its leadership, the greater will be the place occupied by conspiracy in a popular insurrection. . . .

"Just as a blacksmith cannot seize the red hot iron in his naked hand, so the proletariat cannot directly seize power: it has to have an organization accommodated to the task. . . .

"An active minority of the proletariat, no matter how well organized, cannot seize the power regardless of the general conditions of the country. In order to conquer the power the proletariat needs more than a spontaneous insurrection. It needs a suitable organi-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

zation: it needs a plan: it needs a conspiracy. Such is the Leninist view of this question."

In other words, the proletariat is to be led into revolution and its forces used by the party of intellectual radicals. "When headed (note the word) by a revolutionary party the soviet consciously and in good season strives for a conquest of power. . . . In order to win, it (an insurrection) must be organized in advance, then the revolutionary leaders are presented with a task of correct diagnosis. They must feel out the growing insurrection in good season and supplement it with a conspiracy." Whence shall come these leaders—from the ranks of labour? Hardly, for "Intuition and experience are necessary for revolutionary leadership, just as for creative activity of other kinds." Trotsky proceeds to say that "mighty historical upheavals" have "no use for witch doctors." The leaders must be trained in a comprehensive, materialistic philosophy and be able "to discover behind the moving shadows of programme and slogan, the actual movement of social bodies."

"The proletariat can become imbued with confidence necessary for a governmental overthrow only if a clear prospect opens before it, *only if it feels above it a far-sighted, firm and confident leadership* (italics mine)—the revolutionary party as a tightly welded and tempered vanguard of the class. The Russian proletariat was headed by a party of extraordinary political clarity and unexampled revolutionary temper."

Against whom was this well-directed conspiracy directed? It was directed against a liberal and democratic government which had driven out the Czar, and it struck at the moment when this provisional Republic, authorized by the Russian people, was about to form a constitutional and republican government with universal suffrage, popular representation and a bill of rights guaranteeing individual liberty. Trotsky proceeds to say "Notwithstanding the number of great social and political crises, a coincidence of all the conditions necessary to a victorious and stable proletarian revolution has so far occurred but once in

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

history—in Russia in October 1917.” Trotsky is quite correct not only about the conspiracy, but about the conditions of which it took advantage.

The spirit of faction which lives in the heart of all revolution, had made great headway since the democratic crusades of the early nineteenth century. Communism everywhere had begun to make use of the hospitality and tolerance of liberal governments to “bore from within” and to organize revolutionary propaganda against republican institutions and the “capitalist system.” Every liberal criticism of economic injustice and political corruption was seized upon by radicals and turned into a demand for the revolt of the masses. Even the Social Democratic parties were torn by dissension, chiefly by the activities of the “Left Wing.” In every strike or labour dispute Communist agitators appeared, gratuitously offered their services, and urged the lawless elements to acts of violence. Workers were advised to resort to “direct action” and sabotage. Just as in France in 1871 Communists sought to enhance their cause by appeal to the patriotic sentiments of the masses, so after 1914 they allied themselves with pacifist opposition to the War and did much to compromise the course of peace. By 1917 revolution had become a movement quite different from that which existed in the minds of the liberals.

In the early summer of 1917, shortly after America’s entrance into the War and while Miliukoff and Kerensky, after the fall of the Czar, were struggling to keep Russia’s pledges to the other allied nations, there was a great patriotic meeting in New York. The meeting was held in Carnegie Hall to express the sympathetic greeting of the American people to the new Liberal Republic of Russia. Every seat in the house was filled and the galleries were crowded. Among the speakers were John P. Mitchell, the Mayor of New York, George Kenyon, and others who had long been friends of Russian freedom. For some time Trotsky had maintained an organization in New York and the galleries were filled with his followers. I sat in a box near the front and could see the consternation on the faces of those

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

on the platform as the utterances of well-known liberals were answered with jeers and booing from the galleries. Several of the speakers were howled down and the confusion was so great that even the Mayor was unable to finish his speech.

If the voice of the real Revolution caused consternation among distant American friends of Russian freedom, what must have been the astonishment and despair of those thousands of Russian liberals who had endured a lifetime of hardship in the effort for the liberation of their country, when the Communist conspiracy of October drowned in blood their last hope! Many of the early Russian revolutionists were Social Democrats, for revolutionary propaganda had already become saturated with the doctrines of Marxian economics. It should have been obvious that the day of democratic revolution was over. Democracy and liberalism were already on the defensive. Many people in all lands, both conservative and radical, regarded with scepticism, if not cynicism, the idea that the purpose of the War was to "make the world safe for democracy." Radicals declared, with some justification, that the War was the suicide of capitalist society.

But while the Social Democrats and other Russian revolutionists accepted the Marxian criticisms of the capitalist system, the economics of Marx was in Russia hardly more than a matter of academic interest. Capitalism was not far advanced in that land of peasant agriculture and semi-Asiatic civilization. The Revolution there was not precipitated by any breakdown of the capitalist system such as Marx had said would be the occasion for the revolt of the class-conscious proletariat. Russia, in 1917, was industrially a backward country. It was little further advanced toward modern industrialization than Germany and Austria had been in 1848. There was a very small bourgeois class. Capital invested in Russian industry was largely drawn from foreign sources. The working population of the nation was overwhelmingly peasant. The small urban proletariat counted for very little as an industrial or revolutionary force.

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

Marx had said that Socialism would follow when the capitalist system had run its course and had passed beyond its full development into decline and bankruptcy. So glaringly inconsistent was the actual situation in Russia with the theories of Marx, that the Communists, after they became supreme, were obliged to hurry up the process of the forced and artificial industrialization of the nation, farming included, in order to make their economic theories seem at all applicable.

It was not the downfall of capitalism and the consequent seizure of industry by a modernized proletariat which caused the Revolution in Russia. The Revolution was the result of the collapse of Czarism in its inefficient conduct of the war. The chaos which followed the breakdown of the old order gave radical conspirators an opportunity to seize power in the interest of a proletariat which hardly existed at all—except in Communist imagination.

It was not primarily the economic doctrines of Marx which led to the Communist Revolution, but the other side of Marx's teaching, his revolutionary strategy. The Bolsheviki alone adhered rigorously to the Marxist programme of insurrection. Concerning the Marxist economics they did not differ radically from the majority of Socialists generally. But they were impatient with democratic procedure. In the confusion of the nation they saw their opportunity for partisan dictatorship. The Bolsheviki alone were well-organized and rigorously disciplined. Although they were regarded as but "a handful of lunatics," so small were their numbers, they sincerely believed that they alone represented the interests of the Russian people. With the Blanquist and Marxist techniques of conspiracy and propaganda, they created a situation with which the provisional government of Kerensky was unable to cope. They bribed the peasants with promises of free land, encouraged agrarian lawlessness, organized deserting soldiers in the service of the Communist party, armed rebellious workers, struck down the infant Republic while its face was turned to the German frontier

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

and destroyed, along with the propertied and professional "bourgeois" classes, the political Socialists and Democrats who had initiated the Revolution.

The Russian people had never become politically-minded like the peoples of Western Europe. They had, except in the brief uprising of 1905, placidly endured autocratic government long after the rest of Europe had progressed beyond despotism. The government suppressed revolutionary propaganda with the secret police, censorship, exile and imprisonment. Yet during the early months of the War, the Czar was popular. As the War continued and the early victories of the Russian armies were blotted out by a series of crushing defeats, the fighting morale of the nation was weakened. Patriotic sentiment was still strong, however, and among the educated classes the suspicion grew that the nation was being betrayed to Germany by a conspiracy among the rulers. The Rasputin scandal had brought discredit to persons in the inner circles of Russian society. The incompetence and corruption of certain people charged with the prosecution of the War had brought the nation to the verge of disaster. Thousands of Russian soldiers were sent into action without supplies of arms or munitions. There had been seven million casualties in the army and in Russia, as in Germany, the War had caused severe hardship and shortage of food for the civilian population. The food supply, like everything else in Russia, was badly managed. It was this disorganization, rather than hunger alone, which caused the Revolution of March, 1917. Everywhere it became apparent that the government had failed.

On the eighth of March there was a strike of workers in Petrograd. The strikers were joined by throngs of people who had stood in line for days about government supply stores. There was a rumour that quantities of food were stored near Petrograd for the use of the army. The strike became a bread riot and the crowd, rapidly growing in numbers, was joined by many deserters from the army. The police tried in vain to restore order and disperse the mobs. Soldiers were ordered to clear the streets and

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

on the following day the rioters mingled freely among the soldiers and called to them "Don't shoot us, dear little soldiers. All we want is bread." But as the soldiers did not fire, the crowd soon sensed its power and demanded much more than bread. On Saturday, one of the regiments mutinied and joined the mob. The officers of the regiment were surrounded and their swords seized and broken, and several killed. Detachments of police were driven to cover and a number were burned to death in a building where the crowd held them prisoners. The battle between the mobs and the loyal troops lasted through the following day and night. The Duma, which had been dissolved, reassembled, summoned the Czar to return to Petrograd from the front and on March 15th secured his abdication. The government was provisionally placed in charge of a committee of the Duma and the provinces were notified that the revolutionary change had occurred.

In Moscow the course of events was much the same as in Petrograd. The Revolution for which Nihilists had plotted in vain and for which thousands of Siberian exiles had waited so long was remarkably swift and easy when it finally came. In Moscow there was almost no fighting. There were crowds of students singing. It seems that the students took the lead in organizing and controlling the crowds. On the day the Czar abdicated, the Kremlin surrendered without the firing of a shot. Russia free! It was a glorious victory for humanity. It was almost unbelievable that the Revolution had been accomplished as if by a benevolent magic. There would be no more secret police, no more passports, no more censorship of the press, no more exiles. All men could be brothers now. Constitutional government, democracy and liberty were assured. Everywhere there were smiling faces. One observer remarked, "There was not one angry voice in all Moscow." A holiday spirit prevailed everywhere. There was much rejoicing among the people. There were parades. The bands played the *Internationale*. There were many orations and there was much applause. Was ever a nation so united in the sacred cause of liberty? There was

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

a general release of political prisoners and the crowds in Petrograd wept as the trucks paraded through the streets bearing these apostles of freedom to the Duma where they received the honour and gratitude of a happy nation.

The provisional government expressed the generosity and good will which then characterized the spirit of the nation. All classes were to be represented. To the original Executive Committee of the Duma were added representatives of the Council of Workers and Soldiers and Peasants Delegates. Shortly after March 18th, the new government proclaimed its policy. There would be immediate general amnesty for all political and religious offences, including terrorist acts and military and agrarian mutiny. The freedom of the press was proclaimed and with it freedom for alliances, unions and strikes. All social, class, religious and national restrictions within the Empire were abolished. A call was issued for a national constitutional assembly, elected by universal suffrage, to meet in the fall and form a permanent government of the people. The old police system was discarded and the government authorized the organization of a national militia, whose officers were to be elected. The revolutionary troops who had overthrown the Czar were to remain in Petrograd. Soldiers were to enjoy all civil rights. A New Russia was proclaimed, devoted to the principles of liberty and equality.

The industrial and economic life of the nation had been badly disorganized by the War. The government requested the cooperation of all classes in an emergency programme of industrial recovery. There would be a coördination of various trade associations under government control. Labour unions were encouraged to aid workers in collective bargaining. The government attempted to discourage speculation in the necessities of life and to fix prices and limit profits. The hours of labour were reduced to eight a day and a decree was issued establishing a minimum wage. In order to lighten the burden of taxes, a tariff law was enacted. Foreign capital was encouraged to invest in

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

Russian industry. An elaborate programme of workers' education was begun and boards of arbitration were created to settle labour disputes.

But a revolution had occurred in Russia and the people were supreme. Each faction identified itself with the sovereign people and refused to be content with compromise or half-measures. With the increased sense of power, the demands of each crowd increased. Revolution had weakened the prestige of government and had broken up people's established habit patterns, chiefly the habits of obedience to authority and of social cooperation. It soon became apparent that the emancipated people was not a homogeneous mass, but consisted of various intensely partisan groups, each with its special interests and its peculiar dogma. The revolutionary public was united only in its hatred of Czarism. When the common enemy was destroyed, the bond of union failed and inter-group enmities rose to the surface. The general feeling of confidence and good will soon passed. Enthusiasm over the popular victory gave way to dissatisfaction. The beautiful, free society is not created by the magic of overthrowing a defunct ruling class. For any society at all to exist, there must be discipline and order. There must be a general spirit of co-operation, a recognition of a common leadership and a willingness on the part of contending crowds to compromise rather than break the social bond.

Revolutionary Russia, lacking these necessary habits of a free people, drifted rapidly into chaos and the chaotic situation was made worse by busy Communist propagandists. It became increasingly difficult for conservatives, liberals, social revolutionaries and the Bolsheviki to work together for the common good. Russia was still at war with Germany and the Revolution had failed to create a united front against the enemy. The Executive Committee of the provisional government was obliged to make all sorts of concessions to the peasants and their cooperative societies, to the Soviets, to trade unions, to the soldiers' organizations. Each concession resulted in still greater demands and

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

in general confusion and disorder. All the while the small minority of active Communist propagandists tried to magnify each group dissatisfaction and compromise the government by slogans such as "Peace and to the peasants the land," "All power to the Soviets."

The attempt of the government to strengthen national unity by a patriotic appeal resulted only in the embarrassment of its foreign ministry. On May 1, Miliukoff, Minister of Foreign Affairs, issued a statement to the allied governments assuring them that Russia would keep its treaties and would help to carry on the war to victory. This statement was severely criticized by the Council of Workers and Soldiers Delegates. The Council objected to such "perfect agreement" with the allied powers. The objection was put forth in the name of patriotism. Miliukoff was permitting Russia "to be led by the nose" by the Allies. Furthermore, it was said, Russia was not in the war for conquest. It wanted no domination over other nations, but only an honourable peace. The Council, over the head of the Foreign Office, issued a call for an international convention of Socialists. It stated that it had now become necessary for Russia to fight to defend the Revolution and that the Revolution was opposed not only to Czarism, but also to war. The Russian Revolution was said to be not national in its scope but only the first step to the world revolution and the peace of mankind. German Socialists and workers were implored not to permit their government to become the "executioner of Russian liberty." The idea of world revolution took deep hold in the minds of Russian radicals, especially the Communists who firmly believed that just as the German Revolution of 1848 followed immediately upon that of France, so now the workers and common people of all the belligerent nations would immediately rise against their capitalistic governments and end the war.

The Bolsheviki members of the Council abstained from voting for or against this resolution because, pacifist as it was in sentiment, it seemed to be a compromise. But Miliukoff, embarrassed and disgusted, resigned, and with his retirement the

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

Revolution lost the first of the strong capable men who left the service of the government at a time when decisive leadership was most needed.

Had it been, as Communists say, that the industrial proletariat was the only true revolutionary class, the Bolsheviks would doubtless never have come into power. During the summer of 1917, it was not primarily the small urban working class which broke out in insurrection against the provisional government, but the great mass of the peasantry. All through the summer and throughout the nation, agrarian disorders increased in number and in intensity. So much has been said about the proletariat that it is well to remind ourselves that Russia is overwhelmingly a nation of peasants. Neither were the peasants all of one class. Some had become wealthy land-owners; some were small independent farmers and leaseholders; many living in villages carried on those peasant handicrafts which have always been part of peasant culture; some were apprentices and hired labourers; some, former serfs, were, at the beginning of the Revolution, tenant farmers paying rent to owners of great estates; some were household servants.

The land-owners differed greatly in their treatment of the peasants. Some cruelly exploited them. Others, a growing number, had done much for the education and material improvement of their people and were loved and respected by their peasant neighbours. Many men of peasant origin were university students and even the learned professions were open to the educated sons of the villagers. Many villages were practically self-governing, through organizations and communities whose officers were elected from their own ranks.

But there was much poverty. The pressure of the increase of the peasant population caused widespread demand for more land and reduction of rents, dues and taxes. Since 1905 there had been growing unrest, and this discontent of the peasants had been the strength, not of the Bolsheviks, but of the older Social Revolutionary party. When the news spread that the Czar was no more, thousands of peasants reasoned, "No Czar,

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

then no landlord; the land is ours." An interesting account of the situation which followed is given by Mme. Ponafidine in her book *Russia My Home*. Almost all this author's experiences during the Revolution, except for her occasional contact with Communist politicians from the cities, had to do with the ever-increasing demands of local peasant communities. So it was in Russia generally. Long-standing personal relations between classes and neighbours were broken and what had once been friendliness turned to hatred, to desire for revenge and to rapacity and destruction.

At first village committees presented the landlords with certain demands. Unused lands were to be divided. Owners were prevented from cutting forests. Then hay crops, buildings and grain were seized by revolutionary committees. Peasant labourers refused to work on the proprietors' estates. Their live stock and personal property were taken from them; former owners were permitted to live on as best they could. Later their homes were seized and the occupants placed under arrest or executed. Raids were organized to plunder the large estates. Buildings were burned and often food and grain destroyed. Rich peasants were compelled by village committees, armed with clubs and pitchforks, to join bands of night raiders. Mobs went from door to door killing members of the former master classes, seizing what property they could carry away, while the more prosperous peasants often followed the marauders with carts and wagons to carry home the larger share of the plunder.

Moderates protested against the destruction of farm equipment and produce. The government implored the peasants to wait until fall when the popularly elected Constitutional Assembly would divide the land amongst the population in an official and orderly manner. The Bolsheviks were accused of arousing the peasants to immediate and direct action. Finally, and this was before the Communist *coup d'état* of October, many of the more prosperous and responsible peasants and local tradespeople appealed in vain to the government to stop the disorders. The wealthier peasants found themselves the objects

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

of mob attack and in entire districts the propertied classes disappeared. In one populous section, some six hundred thousand small home owners turned toward the Kadets for protection. Mob disorders were increased by thousands of deserters from the army. The government tried to put down the agrarian riots and the soldiers sent to the provinces refused to obey orders or suppress insurrection. Before the end of the summer, agriculture was so disorganized that there was a serious food shortage throughout the nation. It is evident that the Russian Revolution was repeating the course of events followed by the French Revolution in 1791.

The provisional government not only had trouble with the peasants, but faced even more serious difficulty in the situation which developed in the army. Here, also, it was compromised by Communist propaganda and by its concession to radical demands. The army had become badly disorganized under the Czarist régime. At the beginning of the war, the equipment was so inadequate that there was only one rifle for every two men in military service. Later there was one rifle for every four men and, at the time of the March Revolution, there were arms for only one man in eight or ten. After the Revolution the production of military supplies slowed down. Older men and the more restless soldiers were called home from the front and their numbers were increased by thousands of deserters, many of them armed, who wandered at will making trouble. Organized into soldiers' soviets, these idle troops became more and more a powerful ally of the Communist party.

On May 27th, Kerensky signed the notorious military "Order Number One." This order was really drafted by the Petrograd Council of Workers and Soldiers Delegates. The government must have been desperate in its effort to keep the support of the army and carry on the war. For it is difficult to imagine a more ill-advised concession of authority to the rule of the crowd than the issuing of this order. Soldiers were told not to execute military orders of their officers unless such orders were approved by the Revolutionary Committee. The government gave

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

its approval to a "declaration of soldiers' rights." Enlisted men and officers were to enjoy the same rights as other citizens. Soldiers were permitted to participate in political activities. They might belong to any party they chose and might write and speak freely on any subject. The compulsory military salute was abolished. Soldiers and sailors were free to leave barracks and ships at will except during hours of actual duty. Regimental officers were to be elected by committees, only one-fifth of whose members should be officers. Thus it was announced the army of Russia would be "the freest army in the world."

The result of this order was the demoralization of the army. The supply of food and fodder was seriously disorganized. There were more desertions and much fraternizing with the enemy at the front. There was a general unwillingness on the part of the men to keep the trenches and barracks sanitary. The commands of the officers were ignored. The conviction became general that Russia was tired of the war. The great oratorical efforts of Kerensky and others high in the government, instead of restoring the morale of the army, only made it apparent that the government was reduced to the necessity of pleading with the men in the ranks to carry out its policies and orders. The army was deluged with pacifist propaganda. Trotsky says:

" . . . On the Roumanian front, where the Bolsheviks were very weak, whole regiments were refusing to shoot. 'In two or three weeks the soldiers themselves will declare an armistice and lay down their arms.' The delegates from one of the divisions reported: 'With the coming of the first snow the soldiers have decided to go home.' The delegates of the 133rd army corps made this threat at a plenary session of the Petrograd Soviet: 'If there is not a real struggle for peace, the soldiers themselves will take the power and declare an armistice.' The commissar of the Second Army reported to the War Minister: 'There is no little talk to the effect that with the arrival of cold weather they will abandon their position.'

"Fraternizing, which had almost stopped since the July days, began again and grew rapidly. Instances not only of the arrest of

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

officers by the soldiers, but of the murder of the more hateful began to multiply. These things were done almost publicly, before the eyes of the soldiers. . . .

"On the initiative of War Minister Verkhovsky, it was decided to transfer the oldest classes into the reserve. The railroad groaned under the burden of these returning soldiers. In the overloaded cars the springs broke and the floors fell through. This did not improve the mood of those left behind. 'The trenches are breaking down,' writes Budberg. 'The communication trenches are flooded; there is refuse and excrement everywhere. . . . The soldiers flatly refuse to work at cleaning up the trenches. . . . It is dreadful to think where this will lead when spring comes and all this begins to rot and decompose.' In a state of embittered inaction the soldiers refused in droves even to undergo preventive inoculation. This too became a form of struggle against the war." *

The officers were blamed for continuing the conflict and many were killed by their own men. There was mutiny in the Balkan fleet. Kornilov, convinced that the general confusion and incompetence meant certain defeat at the hands of Germany, attempted a patriotic counter-revolution. The Communists also attempted, during the summer, to seize power. But the provisional government was still strong enough to put down these movements of insurrection. The intellectuals, however, began to lose their enthusiasm for the Revolution and this coolness later caused them to be branded a counter-revolutionary class and to be marked for destruction by the Bolsheviki. The government in desperation restored the death penalty for serious infractions of military discipline. But it was too late. The Germans entered the Gulf of Finland. There was talk of moving the capital from Petrograd to Moscow, but the Communists opposed this suggestion. The national crisis became so great that the provisional government was obliged to issue a call for a meeting of a pre-parliament to assemble in October in advance of the date set for the Constitutional Convention.

It is interesting to note that in this pre-parliament, the Bol-

* *History of the Russian Revolution*, Leon Trotsky.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

shevik party, notwithstanding all its propaganda, made a negligible showing so far as numbers were concerned. Trotsky says that out of a total of about five hundred delegates, there was a democratic majority of three hundred and eight against the Bolsheviks. When the Communists discovered they were outnumbered by the delegates chosen by the people of the nation, they decided that "the time for talk had passed." They knew they had the support of the Workers and Soldiers Soviet of Petrograd, among whom agents of the party had been very active. Trotsky with fifty-three Bolsheviks and five others withdrew from the Parliamentary Assembly. He used this act of withdrawal as a significant propagandist gesture. In his farewell speech he accused the bourgeois classes of intending to crush the coming Constitutional Assembly. This accusation throws some light on the nature of Communist propaganda, for the crushing of the Constitutional Convention was precisely what the Bolsheviks themselves intended to do and did do later. Trotsky also uttered certain patriotic sentiments which must have been a little surprising considering the declared Communist attitude on this subject. He denounced the government for its plan to move the capital to safety away from Petrograd. Undoubtedly he wished to keep the government within reach of the Communistic Petrograd Soviet. He appealed to the Russian people not to permit the abandonment of Petrograd and thus leave "the revolutionary capital surrounded by German troops." This plan, he declared, was a link in the general policy to promote counter-revolution. "With this council of counter-revolutionary connivance, we have nothing whatever in common. . . . We summon the workers, soldiers and peasants of all Russia to be on their guard, to be courageous. Petrograd is in danger. The Revolution is in danger. The people are in danger. . . . All power to the Soviets!"

The Bolsheviks professed to be the party of the people. They were always a very small minority in every popular assembly. With Trotsky's act of leading the radical group out of the pre-parliament this minority openly challenged the Russian

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

democracy and resorted to faction and insurrection against the Republic. Lenin said during the summer, "Since March, 1917, the word democracy is simply a shackle fastened upon the revolutionary nation. . . . Democracy is only a form of authority. We Marxists are opposed to every form of authority. . . . The difference between Marxism and Anarchism is that Marxism admits the necessity of some sort of authority during the transition from capitalism to socialism; not the kind of authority represented by a democratic bourgeois republic and its parliamentary system, but the kind of authority represented by the Paris Commune of 1871 and the Council of Workers' Delegates of 1905 and 1917."

All through the summer of 1917, the Bolshevik Communist party was busy at the work of weakening and compromising the provisional government. Wherever there was discontent or disorder, there were the Bolsheviks increasing the trouble and spreading their propaganda. They did not represent the nation. Lenin admits as much in the following passage:

"Comrade Kamenev likens the 'party of the masses' to a 'group of propagandists.' But the 'masses' have just now yielded to the 'hysteria' of 'revolutionary defence,' of cooperation with the bourgeois government. Wouldn't it be more becoming for internationalists to be able to resist, at such a moment, the 'mass' hysteria than 'want to be with the masses,' that is, to yield to the general epidemic? Haven't we seen in all the belligerent European countries how the social-patriots and betrayers of Socialism justified themselves by emphasizing their desire to 'remain with the masses'? Is it not necessary for a certain time to be able to remain in a minority against the 'mass'? Is not the task of the propagandist, just at this moment, a central point in the struggle to *liberate* the proletarian cause from the 'mass' defensive-bourgeois hysteria? The fusion of the masses, proletarian and non-proletarian, without distinctions of class differences within the masses, is one of the conditions producing the 'defensive' epidemic. To speak contemptuously of the 'group of propagandists' of the *proletarian* cause, is, as a matter of fact, very unbecoming." *

* *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia*, Lenin and Trotsky. Ed. by L. C. Fraina.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

That the Bolsheviki, even while Trotsky was making his patriotic appeal, had decided to give their nation no aid whatsoever in the war with Germany, is made clear by Lenin's thesis written in April. These resolutions were at first resisted by the party but later came to dominate its policy.

"As I only arrived in Petrograd on the night of April 16, I could not, of course, on my own responsibility alone and without sufficient preparation render a report on April 17 on the problems of the revolutionary proletariat.

"The only thing that I could do to explain my position was to prepare written theses. I read them, and gave the text to Comrade Tseretelli. I read them twice, very slowly: first at the meeting of the Bolsheviki, then at the joint meeting of the Bolsheviki and Mensheviki.

"I am publishing these personal 'theses,' provided with very short explanatory notes, which were developed in more detail in the report:

"1.—In our relation to war, which on the part of Russia and with the new government of Lvov, Guchkov & Co. unquestionably remains a predatory imperialistic war in virtue of the capitalistic character of this government, not the smallest concessions to 'revolutionary defence' are permissible.

"The class conscious proletariat can give its consent to a revolutionary war, which really justifies revolutionary defence, only under conditions of (a) the transference of all power to the proletariat and its ally the poorest peasantry; (b) the repudiation of annexations in fact and not in words; (c) the complete break with the interests of capital.

"In view of the undoubted integrity of the mass of adherents of 'revolutionary defence,' who recognize war only as a necessity and not for the sake of conquests, in view of their deception by the bourgeoisie, it is necessary to explain their mistake to them in detail, to explain the indissoluble connection between capital and the imperialistic war, to prove to them that it is *impossible* to end the war by a truly democratic peace, not a peace of violence, without the overthrow of capital.

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

"The organization of an extensive propaganda of these ideas is necessary in the active army.

"2.—The peculiarity of the present moment in Russia consists in the *transition* from the first stage of the Revolution, which gave power to the bourgeoisie because of the insufficient class consciousness and organization of the proletariat, to the *second* stage, which must give power to the proletariat and poorest peasantry.

"This transition is characterized by the maximum of 'legality' (Russia *now* is the freest of all the belligerent nations of the world), by the absence of violence of the masses, and, finally, by the masses' trustful, unconscious attitude towards the government of capitalists, the worst enemies of peace and Socialism.

"This peculiarity demands of us the ability to adapt ourselves to certain conditions of partisan work among the broad masses of the proletariat, who have only now awakened to political life.

"3.—No support for the Provisional Government; explanation of the emptiness of its promises, especially concerning the repudiation of annexations. The revelation of the real character of this government, instead of the illusory 'demand' that *this* government, a government of *capitalists*, should *cease* to be imperialistic.

"4.—Recognition of the fact that in the majority of the Soviets of Workmen's Delegates our party is in the minority, and thus far in a small minority, against the *bloc* of all the petty bourgeois opportunistic elements, who have come under the influence of the bourgeoisie and who carry this influence into the ranks of the proletariat.

"It should be explained to the masses that the Soviets of Workmen, Soldiers and Peasants constitute the *only* possible form of revolutionary government, and that therefore our problem, as long as *this* government is influenced by the bourgeoisie, is to adapt our propaganda, systematic, patient, persistent, to the practical needs of the masses, to *explain* their errors and our tactics.

"As long as we are in the minority, we are carrying on work of criticism and explanation of errors; preaching, in the meantime, the necessity of a transference of the whole governmental power to the Soviets, in order that the masses should rid themselves of their errors by experience." . . .*

* *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia*, Lenin and Trotsky. Ed. by L. C. Fraina.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

Naturally the seizure of power by a faction resulted in violent opposition called "counter-revolution." The Communist group manifested the spirit of faction by including among the enemies of the people's revolution all parties other than their own. Louis Fraina tells us how this party regarded all other parties:

"Moderate Socialism has much to atone for. It is the arch-enemy of the proletariat and of Socialism. In all nations it is the curse of the revolutionary movement. Moderate Socialism in Russia might have been forgiven its attitude prior to November 7; its acts thereafter will be forever an indelible brand of shame. The international proletariat will learn from the history of the war, from the history of the Russian Revolution, *that the proletarian revolution must necessarily wage a merciless, uncompromising struggle against moderate Socialism, which in its tendency is counter-revolutionary.*

"The Soviet government used drastic measures against the counter-revolution. Its policy was unwavering and stern; the hesitancy of the coalition regime was a thing of the past. . . . But the Soviet Government was reared upon the solid basis of the revolutionary proletariat; it could, and did, adopt a consistent, courageous and uncompromising policy. The counter-revolutionary revolts were crushed ruthlessly, not simply by armed force, but by intensifying class antagonism. . . . Against the *intelligentsia* coercive measures were adopted, the only way to convince them of the futility of their course. The bourgeoisie was attacked by means of the expropriation of large enterprises and by a rigid workers' control of industry, the drastic regulation of the economic activity of the country. Perhaps the most effective measure against the opposition in general was the exclusion of the bourgeoisie from participation in the government, —which is another necessary feature of the dictatorship of the proletariat. And underlying all these measures was the Soviets' merciless use of *mass terror* against the counter-revolution." *

It should be noted here that the classes mentioned included hundreds of thousands of people who had been the lifelong enemies of Czarism and had taken the lead in the Revolution of March, 1917.

After Trotsky left the pre-parliament, the activities of the

* Ibid.

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

Communist minority, both open and secret, increased in intensity and in resort to desperate measures. Lenin summoned "all organizations and all workers and soldiers to an all-sided and most rigorous preparation for armed insurrection." Naturally there was some hesitation on the part of various Communist leaders who feared they had no right to stake the whole future on an insurrection while the Bolsheviki were still so unprepared and in such minority. However, a call was issued for a meeting of a Congress of the Soviets on October 20th and it was hoped that the Bolsheviki could induce the Congress to demand that all governmental power be transferred to it, thus circumventing the Constitutional Convention which would be representative of the entire nation.

Meanwhile Trotsky was hard at work in Petrograd perfecting plans for the *coup d'état*. Intensive propaganda was carried on to insure the mutiny of the garrison at the fortress of Peter and Paul. Local revolutionary committees were organized and given instructions. The Smolny Institute was ablaze with revolutionary activity. By a clever ruse an order was issued resulting in the distribution of more than twenty-five thousand firearms and stores of ammunition to the radical labor organizations of the city. The Communist press was inspired to ferocious attacks on the government. As had been anticipated, the government finally decided to suppress the Bolsheviki and seize their publications. This act had been decided upon as the signal for the insurrection.

Trotsky gives a vivid picture of the night of October 25th.

"All remains as before and yet nobody knows himself. The aristocratic quarters feel that they have moved out into the back-yard; the quarters of the liberal bourgeoisie have moved nearer the aristocracy. From being a patriotic myth, the Russian people have become an awful reality. Everything is billowing and shaking under foot. Mysticism flares up with sharpened force in those circles which not long ago were making fun of the superstitions of the monarchy.

"Brokers, lawyers, ballerinas are cursing the oncoming eclipse of

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

public morals. Faith in the Constituent Assembly is evaporating day by day. Gorky in his newspaper is prophesying the approaching downfall of culture. The flight from raving and hungry Petrograd to a more peaceful and well-fed province, on the increase ever since the July Days, now becomes a stampede. Respectable families who have not succeeded in getting away from the capital, try in vain to insulate themselves from reality behind stone wall and under iron roof. But the echoes of the storm penetrate on every side; through the market, where everything is getting dear and nothing to be had; through the respectable press, which is turning into one yelp of hatred and fear; through the seething streets where from time to time shootings are to be heard under the windows; and finally through the back entrance, through the servants, who are no longer humbly submissive. It is here that the revolution strikes home to the most sensitive spot. The obstreperousness of the household slaves destroys utterly the stability of the family regime.

"Nevertheless the everyday routine defends itself with all its might. School-boys are still studying the old text-books, functionaries drawing up the same useless papers, poets scribbling the verses that nobody reads, nurses telling the fairy-tales about Ivan Tzarevich. The nobility's and merchants' daughters, coming in from the provinces, for studying music or hunting husbands. The same old cannon on the wall of the Peter and Paul fortress continues to announce the noon hour. A new ballet is going on in the Mariinsky theater, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Tereshchenko, stronger on choreography than diplomacy, finds time, we may assume, to admire the steel toes of the ballerina and thus demonstrate the stability of the regime.

"The remnants of the old banquet are still very plentiful and everything can be had for big money. The Guard officers still click their spurs accurately and go after adventures. Wild parties are in progress in the private dining rooms of expensive restaurants. The shutting-off of the electric lights at midnight does not prevent the flourishing of gambling clubs where champagne sparkles by candle-light, where illustrious speculators swindle no less illustrious German spies, where monarchist conspirators call the bets of Semitic smugglers, and where the astronomical figures of the stakes played for indicate both the scale of debauchery and the scale of inflation.

"Can it be that a mere tramcar, run-down, dirty, dilatory, draped

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

with clusters of people, leads from this St. Petersburg in its death-agony into the workers' quarters so passionately and tensely alive with a new hope? The blue-and-gold cupola of Smolny Convent announces from afar the headquarters of the insurrection." . . .*

By morning the red guard of the Communist party was in practical control of Petrograd. In the brief struggle against the Winter Palace, the provisional government was overthrown. Its defence was pitifully weak. Kerensky fled under the protection of the American flag. Republican liberty in Russia, for which revolutionists like Mme. Breshkovskaya had given their lives, was at an end. A short session of the Congress of the Soviets, postponed from October 20th, empowered a committee of the Communist party with full powers.

" . . . The deed is done. Even the most favourable correlation of forces contains concealed surprises, but the victory becomes indubitable when the enemy's staff is made prisoner.

"Kamenev impressively reads the list of those arrested. The better known names bring hostile or ironic exclamations from the Congress. Especially bitter is the greeting of Tereshchenko who has guided the foreign destinies of Russia. And Kerensky? Kerensky? It has become known that at ten o'clock this morning he was orating without great success to the garrison of Gatchina. 'Where he went from there is not exactly known; rumour says to the front.'

"The fellow-travellers of the revolution feel bad. They foresee that now the stride of the Bolsheviks will become more firm. Somebody from the Left Social Revolutionaries objects to the arrest of the Socialist ministers. A representative of the United Internationalists offers a warning—'lest the Minister of Agriculture, Maslov, turn up in the same cell in which he sat under the monarchy.' He is answered by Trotsky, who was imprisoned during the ministry of Maslov in the same 'Kresty' as under Nicholas: 'Political arrest is not a matter of vengeance; it is dictated . . . by considerations of expediency. The government . . . should be indicted and tried, first of all for its indubitable connection with Kornilov. . . .'

The moderates withdrew from the Congress.

* *History of the Russian Revolution*, Leon Trotsky.

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

"Lenin, whom the Congress has not yet seen, is given the floor for a report on peace. His appearance in the tribune evokes a tumultuous greeting. The trench delegates gaze with all their eyes at this mysterious being whom they had been taught to hate and whom they have learned without seeing him to love. Now Lenin, gripping the edges of the reading-stand, let little winking eyes travel over the crowd as he stood there waiting, apparently oblivious to the long-rolling ovation, which lasted several minutes. When it finished, he said simply, 'We shall now proceed to construct the socialist order.' " *

"The minutes of the Congress were not preserved." . . .

All remaining members of this revolutionary assembly which had established a dictatorship of a minority over more than one hundred millions of people, in the midst of their struggle for liberty, rose and said, "The Race of Man Shall Rise Again."

It is not within the scope of this study to enter upon the merits or demerits of Communism. Whether this system is more practicable than capitalism, or is more in harmony with the depersonalizing processes of our machine age, perhaps only future experience can determine. If experience should prove that such is the case—and well it may, save for psychological reasons—there still remains the question whether the material advantages of such a system will be worth the cost to human personality and to culture. No nation-wide problem of the socialization of a highly developed industrial system confronted Russia in 1917. Capitalist industry was in its infancy in that country and the immediate problem was whether the Russian people, long inured to tyranny, were capable of democracy and that meeting of minds which is requisite for a free society. Russia did not answer in the negative. It had no opportunity to give its answer. Its Constitutional Assembly never had an opportunity to meet. Its liberal government was destroyed before the nation could extricate itself from the war and before it could recover from the Revolution of March, 1917. The Communist

* Ibid.

RUSSIA ENDS THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

party, deriving its ideology from the more developed industrial nations of the West, found that it could continue its gesture of proletarian dictatorship only by a forced process of industrialization. Whether that process will in the end succeed better than individualism has succeeded in America is a question yet undecided. I see no reason why any sensible person should wish Russia to fail. And it must be admitted that America's efforts have met with only partial success.

The question of Communism vs. Capitalism should not distract our attention from the purpose of this study, which is to examine the history of revolution in the light of the psychology of the crowd. Under Communist dictatorship all the typical phenomena of the revolutionary episode are manifest. There was the usual counter-revolution. The dictatorship, in a desperate situation, believed that it was saving the Revolution by a reign of terror. The usual revolutionary tribunal was set up. There were the repetitions of all previous revolutionary efforts at government, the same ignorant judges and juries, the same class hatreds, fanned into burning hatred by propaganda. These hatreds, the real issue rather than the guilt or innocence of the accused, determined the fate of many thousands of suspected persons. There was the usual homicidal orgy of mob hatred. I will not attempt to quote the figures of the many thousands of people who went to their deaths because of the frenzy of the mob and its leaders. No serious effort has been made by the apologists of the Communist Revolution in Russia to deny the attempt of this plebeian despotism to exterminate entire classes of the community and all persons suspected of counter-revolutionary sympathies. In a revolution anybody may suspect anyone and send him before a tribunal to be tried on charges which are revealed only when he comes, after days of imprisonment, isolation and torture, before his hostile judges. It is impossible to justify the extermination by the Communist faction of its rival parties, not only when its power was threatened, but later when it was supreme, "liquidating" thousands who were pre-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

sumed to stand in the way of its forced gesture of rapid industrialization of the nation. The treatment of the peasants is both a mystery and an atrocity.

Such is the course of revolution. The Revolution in Russia is said to be the *real revolution*. This statement is true in more than one sense. Not only did the revolutionary tactics of Marx succeed, not only did a doctrinaire party persuade or intimidate the bulk of the workers to believe that their imagined cause was the cause of humanity, not only was this class driven to set up a factionist dictatorship over a nation, but in the Russian episode, revolution can go no further. The cycle is closed. This is verily what revolution means. It means the triumph and self-slavery of the revolutionary crowd. It means the use of force to defeat government by consent. It means the completion of Aristotle's cycle and the return to despotism. It means the rise and mastery, by forced labour if necessary, of a tyranny over all the population in the name of an absolutist and totalitarian state. It means that liberty is dead—all that men have struggled for since the ancient Republic of Athens. It means planned economy and planned thinking subordinated to a state ruled not by a common agreement but by force. The Russian Revolution brought revolution to success—and to its end. After Russia, revolution can be only more and more the brazen rule of faction over the body politic. After the Russian Revolution, man ceases to be a political animal and becomes what he was before all revolutions and all liberal philosophies began—a subject of autocratic rule.

REVOLUTION AS NATIONAL SOCIALISM
DESTROYS ITSELF

REVOLUTION in the twentieth century has become an apparently new social phenomenon. It has definitely broken with liberalism and democracy, and with most of the ideas which have inspired mass revolt since the Protestant Reformation. It remains romantic in its mass appeal, but it has become, as the Germans say, "Steel Romanticism." That is, it has combined a romantic idealization of class or nation with a very realistic technique of conspiracy, of propaganda and of manipulating the crowd. Communists speak of the Fascist and Nazi movements of Italy and Germany as "counter-revolution." But counter-revolution during the nineteenth century was something quite different from that which we see today in Italy and Germany. By "counter-revolution" is meant a return to Catholic legitimist reaction, a triumph of royalist sentiment over republicanism, a reaffirmation of traditionalism and the authority of the historic master classes.

The Nazis of Germany are not counter-revolutionary in any historical sense. They have merely adopted the methods of crowd appeal and conspiracy of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky and have, by the help of certain favourable historical accidents, carried the "art of revolution" one step farther. The farther step is not, of course, in the direction of the ideal of the cooperative commonwealth. Russia itself, as time goes on, is bound to recede from that ideal, first because it is a conception inherited from primitive society and is out of harmony with the differentiation of people which is necessary in an age of specialization;

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

second, because much which in Russia appears to be an effort toward Communism, is in fact merely the programme of a backward people trying, by planned effort under a dictatorship, to catch up with the industrial progress of Western nations; third, because the very realism of revolutionary strategy and that of the age of machinery is out of harmony with the romantic ideal of nineteenth-century utopianism; fourth, because the bureaucracy of any planned economy must inevitably create an official class with its own special privileges and its new vested interests and power of making such interests secure.

Meanwhile, the non-Communist nations are also moving in the direction of a planned economy of bureaucracy necessitated by the problem of feeding an increasingly unemployed proletariat made so by the multiplication of inventions and the engineering skill of modern technology. Who can question the fact that applied science has left the statesman far behind, not only in Communistic Russia but everywhere? The attempt of Russia to meet the situation has merely the temporary advantage of a dictatorship. The danger to human liberty and to all the values of civilization we know is that other dictatorships may also arise. Whatever happens, revolution or no revolution, that society will survive which has the wisdom not only to follow the development of automatically controlled machinery, but also to preserve, in this age of rapid industrial change, the cultural values which humanity has painfully discovered during its long past. If I were to venture a prediction, it would be that within a few years it will be impossible to distinguish, except superficially, Communist Russia, Fascist and Nazi Italy and Germany and Capitalist America and England and doubtful France—except that these latter countries have more likelihood of remembering the decencies of civilization and the importance of individual liberty.

I said that so far as Germany and Italy have gone beyond the ideals of Russian Communists, their activities do not yet indicate much. By this statement that the Nazis have gone beyond the Communists I mean that the strategy of revolutionary con-

REVOLUTION AS NATIONAL SOCIALISM

spiracy discovered by Marx and elaborated by Lenin, became for Fascists and Nazis something more realistic. We have seen that with the Communists the relation of the revolutionary proletariat to the lower artisan classes and the peasantry is always unconvincing. Class appeal has always something spurious about it, partly because men, the very men to whom it appeals, are ambitious to rise out of their class, partly because the industrial proletariat is a minority in any nation, partly because it is suspected that such appeal is the propaganda of a conspiracy, partly because appeal to national and racial propaganda is much more effective and realistic than class appeal. Common men have always a sense of inferiority when they are asked to recognize themselves as "the proletariat." But they have a sense of superiority when they are appealed to on the basis of patriotism, of national ambition and of racial superiority. In this respect the propagandists of German and Italian Fascism were more clever than the Socialists.

Socialists appeal to the class-consciousness of the poor. But people have a sense of class only when they can feel themselves superior to those who are worse off than themselves. Socialists also appeal to workers' class solidarity, but the ideals of democracy tend to stimulate the individualistic ambitions of all workers except the sodden element which could not be depended upon in any revolutionary effort for the ideal society. Nationalistic and racial appeals exalt the ego of the common man. Lacking education, culture and renown, such people compensate for their feeling of inferiority by the fiction that any native-born person is superior to all foreigners whatever their cultural attainments. Hence the popularity of "yellow journalism" with its response in America. The revolutionists of earlier generations were instinctively clever enough to appeal to the suppressed classes as "the people." They also appealed to their moral idealism. Communists in the twentieth century reduced such idealism to second-hand and worn-out nineteenth-century sentiments, which in practice they repudiated. And they appealed to the crass materialistic interests of the masses. But these

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

materialistic interests of the people are widely distributed and are anything but an appeal to collective egoism. Ordinarily a man's material ambition is individualistic. Many workers have joined labour organizations only under compulsion and without much class enthusiasm.

Fascist and Nazi revolutionary conspirators, ambitious to capture the power of liberal and tolerant governments, knew this psychological fact. They knew that an appeal to the feeling of racial or nationalistic superiority was a much more effective kind of compensation for the ego-feeling of the common man than telling him he was a member of the proletariat. The Nazi leaders in forming their conspiracy to seize the power of government were psychologically more sophisticated than the Bolsheviks. They appealed to the egotism of the average man. I know that the average man is materialistic in his ambitions and that he is often interested in ideals only in so far as they may serve his economic interests. But his ego feeling is stronger than his crass material needs—beyond the basic level of survival. Beyond that level even economic interest is also an ideal, ego interest. Economic interests as such do not, to the extent that Marxists imagine, interest the common people any more than do the problems of their health. For years I have tried at Cooper Union to interest people in public health and in their pressing economic problems. I have never been able to gain a large response for either cause as an isolated subject of study. But if a problem is discussed which involves the ego ideal of men, be it as abstruse as the Einstein theory or the idea of substance and self in the Middle Ages, there is a response, as such ideas imply the relation of the human spirit to the cosmos.

The materialistic philosophy of the Communists denies that men are really motivated by ideals. It preserves only the utopian idealism of the nineteenth century—an idealism which it repudiates in its very realism of revolutionary technique. It is in the technique of revolutionary propaganda that Fascists and Nazis surpassed the Communists. They were clever enough to

REVOLUTION AS NATIONAL SOCIALISM

employ all the Marxian strategy of conspiracy and insurrection and at the same time take from the Socialists their nineteenth-century utopian idealism and support it by an appeal to the fiction of ideal and national superiority. In addition, being citizens of advanced industrial nations, their proposed solutions of pressing economic problems had more appeal than did the early nineteenth-century utopianism of the *Communist Manifesto*. Fascism and Nazism were not, therefore, "counter-revolutionary" movements. They were simply more clever and timely conspiracies than that of the Communists. Yes, the twentieth-century revolutions were not "counter-revolutionary." They merely beat the Communists at their own game in the trick of taking advantage of the crises of democratic government and of the very decencies of civilized liberalism. As Aristotle said, democracy will some day end in tyranny. To the partisans of Communism or Nazism there is a homicidal difference over the question whose tyranny it shall be. To the social philosopher both tyrannies are very much alike.

Nazis and Communists, much as they wish to destroy one another, are very much alike. Both show how far the spirit of revolution in the twentieth century has departed from that of three centuries before. In fact, this is the first time in history that popular revolutionary propaganda has consciously advocated the mass revolt against freedom. Heretofore, denial of government by the consent of the governed was merely an attempt of the traditional master classes to regain their privileges, or an expression of philosophical doubt of the ability of the masses to govern themselves. Now this illiberal idea is put forth, not by an old master class which justifies its rule by "Noblesse Oblige" and the apology that it guards the culture of the age. It is now imposed by violent men of plebeian point of view who know better than the Communists how to pander to the prejudices of the common man. Neither the Communist nor the Fascist or Nazi Revolution, was in any real sense a mass movement. But the latter, outside of Russia, were more successful

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

in mass appeal, probably, because they were less under the spell of a utopian Communist dream and a little more adroit with the methods of revolutionary conspiracy.

The Russian Revolution perfected the methods which brought success—if it is success—to the Fascists and Nazis. The openly revealed strategy of the Bolsheviki in Russia left the devices of propaganda and conspiracy no secret. There is a certain ironic logic of history in the fact that the revolutionary techniques carefully elaborated by Marx should in time have been turned against his fiction of class revolt in the interest of national or alleged racial solidarity and egotism.

Both Communism and Nazism reveal the fact that many of the nineteenth-century illusions in which Socialism had its origin are passing. Man was held to be motivated primarily by his material interests. But now it is sure that man is more easily moved by an appeal to follow the crowd and by devotion to a totalitarian state which takes the place of the church of the Middle Ages and moreover gives the members of the dominant faction a sense of power and importance. The masses were formerly believed to be inspired by a natural love of liberty. Twentieth-century revolutionary leaders have discovered that much of the alleged popular love of freedom is a fiction. Hence Communists and Fascists both agree that liberalism is a middle-class philosophy. On this point both are in accord with that reaction against liberalism which for the more traditionally minded leads toward a return to Medievalism. Revolutionists of the nineteenth century, Socialists included, retained much of the Rousseauist idealization of humanity as mass. "The people could do no wrong." Socialists had the habit of identifying humanity with the proletariat; the workers were the great bulk of the nation. And by workers was meant primarily the industrial working class, since this class alone among workers came into clash with employing capital.

But since in Russia it was impossible to maintain the fiction that the small industrial proletariat was the same as all the people, the dictatorship of the proletariat was held at least to

REVOLUTION AS NATIONAL SOCIALISM

represent the interests of all. When this dictatorship was seen to be that of a political party—really of an oligarchy which could control the party machinery—the principle became established among twentieth-century revolutionary leaders that it is the right and duty of the few to decide for the many. Older revolutionary propaganda sought to awaken the masses, to enlighten them as to their true interests and natural rights. In all this, there was great respect for man, and a professed love for truth. Twentieth-century revolutionists, on the other hand, in their disrespect for the intelligence of the masses, learned to outdo the high-pressure salesmanship of certain capitalists in resorting to the trick of advertising and to a propaganda of misrepresentation. The end appeared to justify the means. Let us remember Lenin's use of the slogan "Peace and the Land to the Peasants" when what he really intended was the overthrow of representative government and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

On this point Hitler is very interesting. "I began," he says, "to reflect then on propaganda and the most useful forms of it." "We had not the slightest conception of the nature of the forces which could lead men to their death of their own free will and volition. As long as the German people continued to think in 1914 that they were fighting for ideals, they stood their ground: but the moment it became evident that they were merely fighting for their daily bread, they were glad to throw up the sponge . . . the business of propaganda was always of extreme interest to me. In it I saw an instrument which the Socialist-Marxist organization had long controlled with masterly skill and employed to the full. I soon came to realize that the right use of propaganda was a regular art. . . . The cruellest weapons were humane if they conduced to a speedier victory."

Propaganda "is nothing more nor less than a weapon—a really terrible weapon in the hands of one who understands it. All propaganda should be popular and should adapt its intellectual level to the receptive ability of the least intellectual. . . . There cannot be enough attention paid to the avoidance of too high a

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

level of intellectuality. The receptive ability of the masses is very limited and their understanding small; on the other hand they have a great power for forgetting. It was fundamentally wrong when discussing the subject of war guilt to suggest that Germany could be counted as partly responsible . . . the proper thing would have been to lay the burden of it without cease upon the enemy, *even if this did not correspond with the true course of events*" [italics mine]. The success of any advertisement, whether in business or politics, is due to the continuity and consistency with which it is employed." * (He says nothing about the truthfulness of it.)

The earlier revolutionary movements shared with liberalism the belief in the principle of representative or parliamentary government. It is significant that all three of the distinctively twentieth-century revolutions have abandoned this principle. Hitler expresses this change of belief in the following words: "The young movement is in its essence and organization anti-parliamentarian: i. e., it rejects in principle and in its composition any theory of the majority vote implying that the leader is degraded to being merely there to carry out the orders and opinions of others. In small things and in great, the movement stands for the principle of unquestioned authority of the leader." Stalin or Mussolini would doubtless be less naïve in the choice of words, but in sentiment all three are one. In the new revolutionary governments, whether Communist or Nazi, there is to be no majority vote, no representative assembly, no individual responsibility. In small things and large, there is to be unquestioned obedience to the authority of the leader. The historian might well ask, in what respect does this principle differ from that of any medieval conqueror or absolutist ruler? All revolution heretofore, in theory at least, has been rebellion against just such despotism. Yet to this very principle of despotism has revolution come at last!

The principle of despotism has always lain in the heart of revolution, for it is inherent in the psychology of the crowd.

* These and following passages quoted from *My Battle*, A. Hitler (Eng. trans.).

REVOLUTION AS NATIONAL SOCIALISM

Were it not for this fact, contemporary revolutionists would not dare to appeal to the masses to support them in their presumption to tyranny. Tyranny in both Russia and Germany appears to have the support of the crowd, for the crowd mind, wherever it appears, is essentially tyrannical. Aristotle discovered this psychological fact many centuries ago. The only escape from tyranny is a voluntarily accepted leadership of liberally educated people whose spirit of tolerance somehow seems to prevent the masses from turning to crowd behaviour and faction. Twentieth-century revolution merely shows the success of propaganda and organization in directing the crowd toward tyranny, using the very methods of manipulating the masses which capitalistic salesmen and politicians use in their mob appeal.

The hostility of contemporary revolution to liberalism, democracy and representative government may be variously explained. It may be said that parliaments are not in practice what they are in theory. Carlyle, nearly a century ago, saw this discrepancy. Most thinking people today are aware of the follies and the frequent betrayals of public trust by legislative assemblies which misrepresent the interests of the public. Even when public opinion is correctly registered, it may often be foolish and dangerous to the general welfare. In the present period of the rapid coordination of industry, it may well be that the national debating society, made up as it frequently is of second-rate men representing narrow local interests, is inadequate to the task of governing the machine age. Certainly, in highly developed industrial nations, the public turns more and more away from the legislative to the executive and administrative public official person. But this may be only because the national debating society has now become the public itself. Under a dictatorship there is no such national debate.

Communism and Nazism may to some extent be inspired by the growing distrust of parliaments the world over. But one suspects that the attitude they really have in common is something more crowd-minded. Communists, from the beginning,

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

were hostile to parliamentary government because Communists stood for the rule of a single class over the whole community. The presumption that they represented the working class has been revealed to be at bottom nothing other than the will of a party or faction to rule without any attempt to respect the desires of its rivals. The real reason for the hostility to parliamentary government on the part of both Communists and Nazis, as well as Fascists, lies in their own spirit of faction and of fanaticism.

Hitler says: "The seizure of power is the preliminary to the practical carrying out of reforms. . . . The future of a movement is dependent on the fanaticism, the intolerance even, with which its adherents defend it as the one right course. . . . The greatness of any organization which is the embodiment of an idea lies in the spirit of religious fanaticism and intolerance in which it attacks all others, being fanatically convinced that it alone is right." How, one may ask, can there be any parliament or meeting of minds when mob appeal takes such an attitude to the community as a whole? Nazism is what revolutionary appeal to force really means. The Nazi Revolution is the perfect revolution because every element of crowd psychology, propaganda and mass appeal is in it carried to the extreme.

It will in time be recognized that, as we have said, the Nazis have carried revolution one step beyond the Communists, because the Communists are doctrinaire and still retain the nineteenth-century idea of Utopia. The Nazis know better the art of crowd propaganda. At the same time they have made use of all the revolutionary strategy of Marx and Lenin. Do they not call themselves National Socialists? And does not nationalism today and always have greater mob appeal than internationalism? The Communists of Russia made a great point of the fact that their party alone constituted the well-drilled fighting edge of the forces of popular discontent. Hitler's storm troops have beaten them at their own game. Is it not likely that, while the Communists are still so preoccupied with early nineteenth-century humanitarian dreams, a more realistic propagandist

REVOLUTION AS NATIONAL SOCIALISM

who had learned how to make use of their own techniques of mass appeal, showmanship and conspiracy, might have come closer to the common man's susceptibility to crowd manipulation?

The Communists assumed, with their nineteenth-century psychology, that the chief impulses against which they had to contend were the material interests of the "exploiting classes," the royalists and the bourgeoisie. They imagined that when the bourgeoisie rebelled against the reactionary royalists, the natural enemies of the hard-pressed working masses would be divided and that this was the moment for the real people to rise up and throw off all their oppressors. Their materialist conception of history betrayed them into the hands of the Fascists and Nazis. For they had persuaded themselves that organized society is nothing but a systematic device for economic exploitation and that all the ideals of mankind and all cultural sentiments were only "ideology," that is, instruments for the justification and security of the rule of a class. I wonder if it will ever be discovered that this philosophy is merely that of the average business man turned upside-down. The Communist interpretation of history is the dark shadow of the philosophy of most business men. Communism and capitalism may both alike fail because of their very materialism. Mankind, foolish as it is, is not quite the merely economic creature both imagine.

A philosopher, looking at history and at the nature of mankind, may well despair when he sees the cause of liberalism defended by successful materialists. For a like reason the Communists tremble before Fascism and Nazism. But Communists defended a nineteenth-century ideal by resort to a materialistic philosophy. They have lived to see their nationalistic rivals in mass psychology defend a materialist nationalism by appeal to idealism. I am not now discussing materialism as a metaphysic, but as a faith of the masses. On this point Hitler is wiser than Lenin and Trotsky.

Communist leaders have made many psychological mistakes. Their policy with regard to the peasant class, as I said, has never

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

been really clear and the peasants make up the great majority of the workers in every nation of Europe except England. Communists at first assumed that the peasants, already in revolt, would follow the leadership of the industrial workers. So thought Marx. Lenin made appeal to the peasants, and like the revolutionists of 1848 promised them the land—which most of them had already taken. Later he championed the cause of the small class of hired farm labourers in what he imagined must be their grievance against their peasant employers. Finally, the Communists insisted upon the socialization of the land and the industrialization of agricultural methods, and then upon the destruction of the peasant class and its reduction to the status of the industrial urban proletariat. So Communist propaganda amongst the peasants has always been insincere.

The Communists have always under-estimated the fighting qualities of the small shopkeepers, the "white collar class" and the learned professions. Marx has for such people nothing but contempt. Yet it is such people who are the great majority of most nations. Communists should have known that such people, for important psychological reasons, are intensely nationalistic. The lower middle class is not negligible in class war, nor in response to propagandist appeal to the crowd. As every class once made crowd-minded resents those above it and affects to despise those beneath it in the economic scale, so the lower middle class despises those beneath itself, for it is essential to the egotism of the crowd mind that there be those to whom the crowd may feel superior. This class will more readily identify itself with the idea of the nation than with that of the working-class dictatorship. And it was shown in the World War that the lower middle class of every nation can and will fight for nationalism.

The Communists also over-estimated the class consciousness of labour. One always gains the impression that much radical talk about labour is that of the organizers. Labour as a whole responds under ordinary circumstances rather half-heartedly to such talk. The working man has other interests than those of revolution.

REVOLUTION AS NATIONAL SOCIALISM

He may be on friendly terms with his boss and be astonished to learn that his interests are irreconcilable with those of his employer. He may be critical of the behaviour of members of his class and hope to educate his children so that they may rise to better station. He may belong to religious and fraternal and patriotic organizations which include business and professional men. His children may attend the same public school with members of other classes and become their friends. He may be more concerned about good workmanship than about setting the world upside down. He may feel himself a member of the community in which he lives rather than merely a working man.

There are so many appeals in modern life to all sorts of people that it is not surprising if men in various occupations forget to think all the time about the class to which they belong. All of us have loyalty to diverse things and persons as well as to class, and none of us meditates day and night on the economic interests which our group might derive by united action against all other groups. It is only in moments of crowd excitement, when the power of organization is challenged, that the working man or anyone else is inclined to resort to faction.

Communists forget that the working man is very patriotic and will stand up for his nation, rather than for an international class revolt against his neighbours. The theory of the class struggle is very academic. It is not surprising that the ordinary working man is glad to have a job and, like everyone else, wants to be let alone. The cultural ideals of many workers differ very little from those of the lower bourgeoisie. So it happens that the American Federation of Labour in the most advanced of all industrial nations is anything but revolutionary. Moreover, there is what is called by radicals "the aristocracy of labour." Certain trades require much more skill than others, and to ask the highly trained artisan to ignore all differences of excellence and to cast his lot in with the common, unskilled proletariat, is a demand to which few superior working men will respond with much enthusiasm.

The exigencies of modern industrial organization lead to the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

advisability of collective bargaining on the part of labour. But I have talked to many skilled workers and find that it is not unusual for such men to be suspicious of labour union politicians and to resent their policy of intimidation. It is only a seizure of episodic crowd enthusiasm or a serious industrial crisis which will force such men out of their habitual interests, and then only for a short time. The Nazis discovered the obvious fact that even in a period of industrial depression the working people are more susceptible to a nationalistic appeal than to an appeal to their class consciousness. The Hearst newspapers and the tabloids have made a like discovery with regard to the majority of American working men and women. Hence, in a situation which Socialists regard as the collapse of the capitalist system, it is to be expected that the masses will seek relief in a nationalistic type of planned economy.

Mussolini was, I think, the first man trained in the techniques and philosophy of Socialism to understand and utilize the psychology of the masses for materialistic ends. At that time the Communists were still preoccupied with the idea of the international solidarity of the workers. Mussolini took advantage of the nationalistic sentiment of the common people of Italy. He made use of the Fiume incident and of the confusion of efforts of the Communists and the liberals in the National Parliament. He had at his back a powerful organization of ex-soldiers of all classes. He knew how to fascinate Italians by a gesture of return to the grandeur that was Rome. His march on Rome met with almost no resistance and his government, while basically illiberal, apparently has the support of the masses. Fascist Italy, while on a different level, is, like Russia and Germany—and even America—moving in the direction of a planned economy and the socialization of industry.

Revolution today would seem to be little more than the expression of popular impatience to hasten the course of economic planning and the belief of the crowd that dictatorship is requisite for the accomplishment of the new industrial order.

REVOLUTION AS NATIONAL SOCIALISM

There will be bitter struggles to determine which crowd or faction will set up the dictator, but in the end the difference will doubtless be immaterial. As I have already suggested, in twenty-five years it will perhaps be impossible to distinguish between Communism, Fascism and Nazism—and all alike will have destroyed most of the liberties for which liberals and revolutionists have struggled since the days of Charles I.

The Nazis have carried out the revolt against liberalism with characteristic German thoroughness, ruthlessness and naïveté. There have been the burning of books, the exile of such men as Einstein, mass murders, refusal to permit open discussion in the conduct of the affairs of the state, invasion of individual rights long guaranteed by constitutional enactment, return to medieval persecution, the execution of people according to laws enacted after the offences for which they were found guilty, the attempt of ignorance to regulate art and culture, the censorship of education by politicians, the subjugation of women, the suppression of journalism, terrorism generally. There has been a return to a species of madness not unlike that which characterized Germany's entrance into the World War. In a word, the Nazi Revolution combines many of the essential features of the crowd in all revolutions with those of the barbarian overthrow of the Roman Empire.

Ever since the abdication of the Kaiser, Germany had been in a condition of transition. Communists would have characterized this condition as a revolutionary situation, and according to Marxist theory the nation should have experienced a successful Communist revolution. But Communism was no longer the last word in revolution. The Germans, like the Russians, were defeated in the World War, and national defeat is often occasion for revolution. In both nations there was popular uprising and the establishment of a provisional republican government. Socialism was stronger in Germany than in Russia. But when the Communists sought to gain partisan dictator-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

ship, the politically minded Social Democrats succeeded in suppressing the attempt. A liberal government was established in which the Socialist party had an important part.

Nationalist sentiment was also stronger in Germany than in Russia and the policy of Germany's victorious enemies only served to intensify it. Allied propaganda during the War voiced professedly a struggle of democratic nations against Prussian militarism. After the War and the Revolution, the Germans found they were still regarded as the guilty nation and subjected to crushing penalties. There was terrible hardship and general poverty in the nation both during and after the War. The native romanticism of the German peoples, added to the facts of the Treaty of Versailles, made it easy for the Germans to believe they had been betrayed. Germany's economic rivals did much to prevent the nation from industrial recovery. I have never seen more distressing evidence of national bankruptcy than was evident in Munich in 1931. But the psychological causes of the subsequent revolution, which few people at that time seemed to take seriously, were more compelling than the material causes. It was inevitable that there should be popular opposition to a government which had accepted the Peace of Versailles.

The German Communists, under the delusion of their philosophy of history, believing that the working-class revolution must inevitably follow the establishment of a bourgeois republic, made serious attempts to seize power during the years 1918 to 1920. At one time they gained brief mastery of Hamburg and Munich and other cities and in Thuringia they had proclaimed a Soviet Republic. As in Russia, they had challenged the validity of universal suffrage and appealed to force. There had been the usual social phenomena of a Communist revolution: barricades in the streets, terrorism, the killing of hostages, the destruction of property in civil war. It was easy for the Nazis to appeal to nationalist sentiment against the menace of Communism. But, in fact, the menace of Communism was over long before the Nazis came into power. The Nazi opposi-

REVOLUTION AS NATIONAL SOCIALISM

tion to Communism was whipping a dead horse. It was an appeal to the liberals' fear of Communism by a group which had appropriated all the Communist party's most anti-liberal ideas and techniques of conspiracy and proposed, by appeal to race and nationalist egoist sentiment, rather than class, to outdo the Communists in revolutionary strategy and dictatorial arrogance.

I have had many times in this book to recall the salient features of the psychology of the crowd: its fixed system of obsessive ideas, its egomania, its homicidal tendencies. I have in an earlier work shown the analogy of these mental traits to those of paranoia. It is obvious that if during a period of national stress the ego feeling of a nation were seriously hurt, as it was in Germany, the nation would be psychologically prepared for a great crowd revolutionary movement—if a leader should arise whose personality exactly duplicated the psychological drama through which the lower middle classes of Germany were passing.

Adolf Hitler was the man. In Hitler's protest against the feeling of inferiority, the common man saw all his own grievances; his violent temper expressed the exasperation of a defeated nation; his dictatorial presumption symbolized the passion of the German crowd to rule the world. Hitler and an increasing group in Germany could agree on all the essentials of crowd paranoia. The fixed system of obsessive ideas could become the delusion that Germany's victorious and stalwart soldiers were not defeated in the War, but betrayed by traitors behind the lines. The egomania could become the delusion of the superiority of the pure Aryan race. The homicidal wish could easily be re-stimulated and justified. Since it was no longer possible to continue the War and kill Germany's alien enemies, this homicidal tendency of the crowd could easily be turned to Germany's enemies from within, under the delusion that these were the people who had betrayed the nation behind the fighting line. Who were these alleged traitors? They were, of course, those who by their very existence challenged the fiction that

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

Germany had not been defeated, gave plausibility to her protestation of racial superiority, or were in such minority that the homicidal wish could be gratified with impunity: the Communists, the liberals and the Jews.

Hitler gives us a revealing account of the revolutionary leader in *My Battle*. The book gives very little of the experiences of the author's life, but it is vivid in its exhibition of his type of mind. The book is the story of an obsession. Fanaticism has long been recognized as a commonly recurrent characteristic of revolutionary leaders. Hitler makes no attempt to suppress such fanaticism nor to disguise it. He declares that it is necessary to the success of a great crowd movement. He says: "No social sacrifice is too great to win the masses over to the national movement. . . . Nationalizing the masses can never be effected by half measures or by mild expression of an 'objective standpoint,' but by determined and fanatical concentration on the object aimed at. . . . There can only be success in winning the soul of the people if, while we are conducting the political struggle for our own aim, we also destroy those who oppose it. . . . *What they [the masses] wish to see is victory for the stronger and destruction of the weaker*" [italics mine].

An interesting study could be made of the fanaticism of a certain type of revolutionary leader, a psychological type that emerges with surprising regularity in revolutionary crises throughout history. A very clever propagandist might, for a time, simulate the symptoms of paranoia in order to pose as a man of the crowd. But his deception would be only temporary and would in time, as is often the case, be suspected. The crowd is a temporary paranoiac phenomenon. But the crowd leader par excellence is one whose whole personality has been developed through the possession of an obsessive system of ideas with which he identifies himself. The obsessive ideas are related to an inner lack of emotional adjustment and become a form of protest against the feeling of inferiority. This self-identification appears in consciousness as excessive devotion to the cause. It

REVOLUTION AS NATIONAL SOCIALISM

is really devotion to the insecure image of the self. And precisely as in paranoia, the devotee is prepared to die or kill for his cause.

In Hitler's self-revelation all these symptoms are evident. Born of humble people, in an Austrian village near the German border, an orphan who early had to earn his living, his mind was, we learn, from early childhood haunted by doubts, by hatreds, by cares of state and by ambition. He early considered and rejected the thought of becoming a government official. "I hated and was bored with the idea of having to sit tied to an office, of not being master of my own time. . . . By the time I was fifteen I had understood the difference between dynastic 'patriotism' and popular 'nationalism'; I knew far more about the latter." Yet it appears he did not hesitate to pass judgment on the former. He believes the House of Hapsburg is secretly plotting against German unity. "I was convinced that Austria's destruction was a necessary condition for the security of the German race . . . also that the House of Hapsburg was set upon doing harm to the German race . . . this problem began to seethe in my childish brain."

Young Hitler's brain seems to have done much seething. As a young man in Vienna, "being confused by the mass of architectural impressions and crushed by the hardness of my own plight, I was at first unaware of the stratifications of the people within that immense city." We learn that his mind was the prey of anxiety, that he seemed to be possessed by feelings of moral indignation, even before the objects of his future detestation were clear to him. "At that time I was a prey to discontent. . . . I hated the motley collection of Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, Ruthenians, Serbs, Croats, and above all that ever-present fungoid growth—Jews and again Jews. . . . I do not know what my attitude towards Judaism, Social Democracy and all that is meant by Marxism, the social question, etc., would have been today, if the force of destiny had not at that early period of my life given me a foundation of opinions based on personal experience."

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

Hitler's personal experience is evidently that of an inner psychic conflict, a feeling of inferiority for which he needs compensation by the identification of himself with the German race and nation and by the wish to destroy the imagined enemies of that race. Gradually the Jew emerged as the symbolic object of Hitler's own protest against the feeling of inferiority.

"It was not till I was fourteen or fifteen years old that I frequently met the word 'Jew,' partly in connection with political talk. I then took a slight dislike to it and could not escape an uncomfortable feeling which came over me when religious differences were discussed in my presence."

He is also easily irritated by anything which lowers the prestige of the German state. "It enraged me that in a State in which any fool could claim the right to criticise, and was actually let loose on the nation as a 'law giver' in the Reichstag, the wearer of the Imperial Crown could be reprimanded by the most insipid and absurd institution of all time. . . . I suddenly came across a being in a long caftan with black side locks. My first thought was: Is that a Jew? . . . I watched the man stealthily and cautiously, but the longer I stared at that strange countenance and studied it feature by feature, the more the question in a different form turned in my brain: Is that a German? . . . I bought some anti-Semitic pamphlets. . . . The subject appeared so vast and the study of it so endless that, tortured by fear of doing an injustice, *I again became anxious and unsure of myself.*" (Italics mine)

Soon he saw Judaism as a "pestilence, a spiritual pestilence, worse than the Black Death." He became the victim of ideas closely akin to the delusion of persecution common among paranoiacs. "Then I began to examine my favorite 'world-press' . . . I saw the Liberal tendencies of that press in another light; its dignified tone in replying to attacks, its complete ignoring of them were now revealed to me as a cunning, mean trick; their brilliantly written theatrical critiques always favoured Jewish authors. . . . I gradually realized that the Social Democratic press was preponderantly controlled by Jews. . . . I got

REVOLUTION AS NATIONAL SOCIALISM

over my reluctance and tried to read this sort of Marxian stuff . . . I now tried to get acquainted with the compilers of that mass knavery; from the editors downward they were all Jews. . . . I gradually began to hate them. . . . My love for my own nation inevitably increased. . . . If the Jew with the help of his Marxian creed conquers the nations of the world, his crown will be the funeral wreath of the human race. . . . Thus did I now believe that I must act in the sense of the Almighty Creator; by fighting against the Jews I am doing the Lord's work."

Such was Hitler's state of mind years before the World War, before Communism had become the issue it has since become and when the nations of the civilized world were moving toward toleration and mutual understanding. It is the nature of a paranoiac delusion that it spreads and grows until it becomes a monomania. In this respect Hitler's anti-Semitism is no exception. He comes to see conspiracies on every hand. He blames the Jews for the defeat of Germany in 1918. Behind all his enemies and beneath whatever arouses his militant antipathy, he sees always his imaginary Jew. Marxism is but a Jewish plot to destroy the German race and its culture. Finally, he identifies all liberalism everywhere, even that of England and the international politics of Japan, with this alleged plot. And he even sees the International Jewish Bankers as parties to the Marxist conspiracy! Hitler has the mentality of a born revolutionary leader.

The story of Hitler's rise to power is too well known to require repetition here. Various explanations have been suggested to account for the acceptance of the Nazi despotism by the German people. It is said that the Germans feared the menace of Communism. But the Communist movement was less strong in 1932 than it had been in 1924 when Hitler's first "putsch" failed. The industrial depression has been held responsible, but we have seen that depression is not in itself a sufficient cause of revolution. There have been many periods of severe depression when no revolution occurred and there have been revolutions in fairly prosperous times. It has been said that the Nazi

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

movement was swept into power by means of a propagandist campaign financed by the large industrial interests. But no such propaganda could have induced the nation to surrender its liberties if it had not put into words things the average man wanted to hear. The Treaty of Versailles has also been blamed. But the sense of the injustice of the treaty did not necessarily require resort to tyranny and the persecution of the Jews. Again I think the true explanation of Nazism will be found in the psychology of the crowd.

People wanted to believe that Germany was not defeated but betrayed. Membership in the intensely nationalist party of Hitler gave one a sense of importance and of restored ego feeling and of justification in hostility toward the non-German world. Furthermore, it gave crowds a cause which seemed to justify indulgence in anti-social behaviour. As the party grew in numbers, its demands and its terrorism naturally increased until it was able to intimidate the entire nation. This intimidation was quite in line with the growing demand the world over for dictatorship and a totalitarian state. Many old beliefs have been challenged by the advance of liberal ideas. Yet the masses still show the need of some kind of unquestioning faith. The Protestant Reformation, as we saw, tended to put the state in the place of the church as an object of men's devotion and need of dependence. And we have also seen that the old idea of revolution as struggle for liberty had already been abandoned by Communism. Nazism and Fascism are clear indications of the new turn which revolution has taken since 1917.

As the spirit of faction develops in the modern industrial community the masses become impatient with liberalism and tolerance. Men cast ever more power-hungry and jealous eyes on the state. The state comes to be regarded as the instrument for compelling all men to obey the will of a faction. This attitude becomes inevitable now that revolution has ceased to be the struggle for liberty and has become the struggle for power. As Hitler says, the question of the power of the nation comes first and a growing number is ceasing to regard conciliation as

REVOLUTION AS NATIONAL SOCIALISM

the proper method of determining national policy. "The deep discontent felt by millions proves that in their hearts they cherish a longing for a thorough change in conditions as they are today. The many who are sick of elections are a witness to this; also numbers who incline to the fanatical extreme of the Left. It is to these that the young movement should first turn."

Hitler is correct on this point. Both the extreme Left and the extreme Right are sick of elections, compromises and arbitration of differences among men. Both aim at the seizure of power and at the establishment of despotism. Both are done with liberalism because liberalism recognizes the basic rights of men and women outside the dominant party and views society as a cooperation through mutual respect and common consent. The thorough change which both Communists and Nazis desire is the abandonment of mutual respect and of the whole conception of society which has come to mankind through thousands of years, the efforts of liberal education and the advance of civilization.

Since Mussolini and Hitler, Communist revolution is an outmoded method of social procedure. What was once the extreme Left has now become the extreme Right. It was the doctrinaire temper of the Communists which in Western nations relegated the movement to the museum of lost causes. Marxists in the 1930's continued to think and act under the spell of the Paris Commune of 1871. Marx, considering what was known of the psychology of the crowd in his day, made most clever deductions from the revolutions of the nineteenth century. But the whole system of his ideas and strategy belongs to a century that is gone. Communist propaganda, under the influence of Marxist orthodoxy, has now become a kind of somnambulism. It is more interested in what Marx said than in what people really are in the world today. It cares more about the correctness of its gestures than about the results of its procedure.

If there should be resort to violence in the present world crisis, we should expect, on the basis of historical precedent, that the control of affairs would be taken out of the hands of the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

moderates and that there would be a rapid drift to the Left. But if the extreme Left, as I said, has now become the extreme Right, what then? I would expect to see such a revolution in America drift toward Fascism or an American species of Nazism. Revolutionary movements can no longer appeal to the idealisms of the nineteenth century, democracy, liberty and the class struggle. The materialism of the Communists themselves and their realistic resort to the tactics of conspiracy did much to destroy the faith of the working masses in such ideals. The intensification of nationalism since the World War, the growing spirit of faction and the disillusionment about democracy, the impatience with liberalism and the spreading desire for dictatorship, all these work to the advantage of the Fascist and Nazi type of revolution. Communists, on the other hand, are handicapped by the very humanitarianism which they have repudiated in practice; also by the increasing nationalism of Soviet Russia in world politics. I have always suspected that Lenin knew Communism was outmoded when industrial workers the world over, during the closing years of the War, failed to follow Russia into the Social Revolution. There can be little doubt that Hitler and Mussolini have taken this fact into account. The Fascists and Nazis have been able to secure an even more effective party discipline than the Communists and to secure it without fixation of the minds of their party members in nineteenth-century ideologies. Being less philosophical and fluid, they have been better able, as we have seen, to utilize to their own ends certain twentieth-century phenomena of popular folly.

THE FUTILITY OF REVOLUTION

IT is ironical that three hundred years of revolutionary struggle for liberty should have ended in Nazism. But such appears to have been the logical outcome of it all. There is something essentially paradoxical in the very idea of revolution, an irony we have seen again and again in every revolution we have studied in this book. It lies in that paranoiac psychology of the crowd which all revolutionary movements need for success. Hence the very success of a revolution becomes its failure through the behaviour of the crowd and at the moment when people, after the crowd madness, come to.

Much is said today of the futility of liberalism. It is time something was said of the historically demonstrated, repeated futility of revolution.

For what have revolutions accomplished? I have in this book told the story of the ten great revolutions of history—revolutions which are popularly supposed to have achieved for mankind its liberties and progress. I think that the realistic view shows that every one of these revolutions was a drama of delusion. Not one accomplished its aim. All were irrelevant and quixotic efforts to achieve by sudden violence what was really being achieved by the advance of culture. This advance was set back by each revolution and civilized men and women were obliged, after the earthquake, to pick up the débris of the great emotional debauch and begin again the building of the republic of free men.

Much of the fallacy that revolutions have accomplished the advancement of civilization results, as I said in the first chapter, from the ambiguous use of the word "revolution." The word is

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

used both as a description of the cycle of progress through the ages and as a term for a sudden violent seizure of power by a faction. I have used the term in the latter, and more commonly accepted, sense. If anyone wishes to use the word revolution to designate the age-long cycles of the progress of civilization, I can see no objection. Only a writer should make it clear in what sense he uses the term. What any intelligent reader should object to is the deliberate confusion of the two senses of the word. This kind of obscurantism is habitual with Marxian propagandists even when they are as objective and obviously sincere as George Soule in *The Coming American Revolution*.

Mr. Soule sees clearly that revolutions are not the result of oppression or even of the starvation of the masses, but rather of the will to power of a growing group or class. He has described with accuracy the pre-revolutionary situation as it has recurred often in history. I think he has over-emphasized an imaginary, half-hidden economic force running through the ages and has given too little attention to the psychology of the crowd. But his account of the present situation is otherwise clear and instructive. However, the ambiguous usage of the word revolution remains, and Mr. Soule, like all Marxists, seems to regard the mob uprising as a necessary factor in the cycle of progress. I regard revolution as a social accident, the result of misunderstood tendencies which, by placing extra burdens on constituted authority, so weaken the government that the mob has opportunity to raise its head and destroy all cultural values in its path.

When, therefore, we inquire, What have revolutions accomplished, let us remember first that so far as the advance of civilization is concerned, ever since the ancient Hebrew prophets and the Greek educators, creative minds have been at work extending the tradition of the liberal philosophy of life and its application to art, science, philosophy, morals, manners and human relationships. Revolutions, on the other hand, have been episodic seizures of the mass mind and always at moments

THE FUTILITY OF REVOLUTION

when not crowd behaviour but intelligent direction was most needed.

Looking back over the history of revolution, we may divide all revolutionary episodes into three cycles. First, that of the ancient world, second, that of the Middle Ages, third, that of modern times. The cycle of revolution in the ancient world, which began with Solon in Athens and included in Rome the activities of the Gracchi, Marius, Catiline and Julius Caesar—also the rise of primitive Christianity—was primarily motivated by a desire for a kind of equality among men. The demands for a redistribution of wealth, together with the denunciation of wealth by early Christianity, were all parts of this same hope for equality in an old and stratified civilization. And the end of all revolutionary effort in the ancient world was the triumph of the Julian party in Rome. It resulted in the dictatorship of Caesar, the assumption of divine honours by Octavian, and the reduction of everybody to the slavery of the state under an imperial despotism. I have shown that the overthrow of this despotism, which grew more and more arbitrary as it destroyed all political sense in the people, was the Barbarian Invasion, which had all the psychological characteristics of crowd behaviour and of all subsequent revolutions.

The second cycle of revolution, that of the Middle Ages, began when Hildebrand (Pope Gregory) in the eleventh century set out to reform the church which had surrendered to feudalism in its efforts to civilize the barbarians. The aim of this cycle of revolution was return to the primitive Christian community, that is, to the brotherhood of man. The cycle ended with the Protestant Reformation, the rise of the secular princes against the sovereignty of the Pope, the principle of nationalism, nationalist rivalry and wars such as the world outside Christendom never knew, the destruction of the Catholic effort for international fellowship, and finally the World War, with all its unfraternal results for Europe and America.

The third cycle began in 1642 as a struggle for liberty against the reactionary Stuart Kings of England. It adopted the liberal

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

philosophy of constitutional limitation of the power of the sovereign, a bill of rights, representative government and a responsible ministry. In the late eighteenth century this liberal philosophy became corrupted by the teachings of Rousseau which identified liberty with return to nature and the people with the revolutionary mob. So this corruption led to the failure of the French Revolution in the dictatorship, first of Robespierre and later of Napoleon.

But the struggle for liberty went on during the nineteenth-century revolutions, always compromised by Rousseauist sentimentality and mob appeal. Finally the latter triumphed over liberalism in the Russian Revolution and put an end to the delusion that mass revolution means liberty. Then Fascism and Nazism, taking advantage of the fact that Communism had resulted in dictatorship, and making use of new psychology of propaganda, carried the Communist strategy of revolution to its logical conclusion in nationalistic dictatorship in the interest of planned economy and an absolutist state.

Is there now anything left for revolution? Only the ideal of the secular state in the place of the medieval church. Only the repudiation of centuries of liberalism and a return to a paternalistic regimentation of the masses. This regimentation is rationalized as a requirement of modern industrialism. In part it is. But in its mass appeal, the real motive is the desire of millions of people, who have never grown up spiritually, to have a new faith and a new authority in the role of the father image. The masses turn to the religion of the state. So a thousand years of revolution have but brought mankind to the religion of the state, a religion which the intelligent minority had outgrown before the days of Aristotle, a religion which may yet restore the rack and stake and the abject superstition of the masses. The true progress of mankind in politics, in culture and in industry has been achieved through science and the liberal arts. I have marvelled at the thousands of people who during the last two summers have wandered through the exhibition of the Century of Progress in Chicago. In every respect,

THE FUTILITY OF REVOLUTION

except perhaps its architecture, this exhibition shows the progress of the liberal arts and of liberalism in science. Do not these masses yet realize that such progress is the work, not of mob outrage, but of peace, freedom and intelligence?

Revolution, then, is essentially hostile to the progress of civilization. What other conclusion may we draw from the story of the great revolutions of history? It is time we turned from contemplation of revolution to a reconsideration of liberalism, the one progressive movement in the long story of the advance of civilization.

Even if both liberalism and revolution were equally futile, the one as appeal to reason and cultural decency has all to gain and nothing to lose by way of destruction of human life. The futility of liberation might be comic, with the irony of a philosophy which expected too much of mankind. But the futility of revolution is tragic. It has meant the countless sacrifice of human life and happiness on the altar of theory and conspiracy. And all for worse than nothing.

REVOLUTION VS. LIBERALISM

THE history of revolutions shows that people take refuge in false dilemmas because they have stopped thinking. The chief reason why revolutions have failed is that each has presented society with a false dilemma. Most of the bitterness of the Reformation grew out of the delusion that the community must be all Catholic or all Protestant. After the years of homicide were over experience proved the falsity of such an idea. Today Catholics and Protestants live side by side and may be excellent neighbours. Neither side had the finality or the all-inclusiveness that men imagined. Had people, instead of thinking it their duty to compel everyone to accept a crowd dogma, been willing to grant religious toleration, the story of the Reformation would have been quite different. The same may be said of the French Revolution of 1789 with its attempt to secure liberty, equality and fraternity by force. It is doubtful if realities can or should be achieved by force; it is certain that falsities cannot.

As I left Cooper Union after one of my recent lectures, there was an after-meeting of excited students on the stairs. A Communist had one of our young liberals on the defensive. He said, "But everybody in the United States knows that liberalism is dead. Can't you see that the only choice is whether we are to have Communism or Fascism?" This is precisely the kind of reasoning with which revolutionists deceive themselves. It is the type of false statement of fact which has in the past led to spurious issues and to unnecessary social conflict, conflict which can result only in general disillusionment. Liberalism is not

REVOLUTION VS. LIBERALISM

dead. And the dilemma of Communism or Fascism, a choice to which both these crowd movements seek to limit us all, is like saying to a man, "Now choose, will you strangle your mother with a rope, or stab her with a knife? If you refuse to choose you are a compromiser, a middle-of-the-road person. You have no convictions. Your philosophy is dead!" One would answer, "Since I have no intention of killing my mother, I am not interested in your dilemma. I am not, moreover, a middle-of-the-road person. I am not on your road at all." This I believe is the answer of thinking people to those who would force them into the Communist-Fascist dilemma. We are not on that road. It is a road which leads to the destruction of much of our cultural inheritance.

From the standpoint of one who understands the importance of three hundred years of struggle of English-speaking peoples for such liberty as we now enjoy there is little choice between Communism and Fascism. I have shown how alike they are in many respects. Both would resort to violent revolutionary methods in nations which have made every effort to devise methods whereby differences may be settled peaceably and without resort to revolution. Both aim at a minority dictatorship, at the substitution for responsible government of a form of tyranny. Both would subjugate the individual to the ends of an absolutist state. Both would abolish those constitutional guarantees of civil rights which have made possible the advance of civilization among us. Both are avowed enemies of liberalism since the liberal's tolerance, his open-mindedness and his doctrine of the consent of the governed are sure to be obstacles to faction and terrorism.

It should be remembered that the worst features of revolution have always occurred when leadership in a critical period has been taken out of the hands of the liberals or moderates. The moderates have been regarded by the extremists as mere opportunists. But subsequent events have usually proved the moderates right. They have been wise enough to know there is no one right way for all men. People can live in the same com-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

munity only when certain differences are permitted. It is a major task of government to keep the social peace, that is, to preserve some kind of working balance among contending factions. When government ceases to perform this task, when it becomes the instrument for carrying out the will of any faction without regard to the humanity of men in general, it ceases to be government and becomes only the agency of terrorism. Then it not only permits one faction to exterminate its rivals, it becomes itself a mass executioner. This is revolution.

Sometimes the moderate is a mere time-server. In such cases he is not a true liberal. But even the liberal is often said to have no programme. This charge is made against liberalism today. Much depends on what is meant by the word program. People often use the word programme when what they really mean is revolutionary propaganda. But revolutionary propaganda is never the same as social programme. There is no problem-solving thinking in such propaganda; it is chiefly designed to appeal to the crowd. If a social programme means considering the next practical step, it is not true that liberalism has no programme. Most such practical measures in the English-speaking world have been carried through by liberals and without resort to violence. The liberal philosophy, however, may hold that there may be more than one practical means to a desired end. It also holds that no social problem is really solved while a large portion of reasonable people remains unconvinced. The attempt to convince good people by terrorism is certainly not part of the liberal program. This revolutionary attempt is an abandonment of what liberals regard as an essential of civilization. It is to change the whole principle of human association from that of a fellowship of free men to that of a chain gang. Liberalism hopes for a kind of political fellowship in which people live under government which itself must obey the law, government about which the citizen has something to say, government in the very constitution of which certain respect for personal rights is assured. If this hope is abandoned, no alleged solution of the economic problem can be truly a solution.

REVOLUTION VS. LIBERALISM

People who say that liberalism is merely a bourgeois philosophy would do well to remember that liberalism is much older than the capitalist system or the Industrial Revolution. The liberal tradition is a noble one and had its origin when men first began to meditate on the problem of the good life. Founded in the wisest and most critical thinking of antiquity, it has run like a golden thread through the fabric of subsequent ages. Again and again, as it has emerged out of turmoil and class struggle and barbarism, it has given a dignity and a pattern to the generations that have grasped its true meaning.

Let us try to think out what we mean by the term liberal. So far as I know the first great thinker who used this term was Aristotle, and he used it to describe the kind of education which would give the free citizen a philosophy of living. Aristotle was interested in the "good life"—for as many people as possible. He thought that people could be happy and free only if they governed themselves by reason and strove for a kind of excellence, for wisdom and courage and temperance and justice. He thought that those who so strive and govern themselves by their intelligence are nature's free men. It was Cicero, three centuries later, who, under the influence of Aristotle, conceived of a republic of free men whose liberties could be won by self-discipline and reason and maintained by a republican constitution. In the sixteenth century, in the Renaissance, educated Italians became fascinated with the spirit of Cicero, and this spirit was brought to England by such men as Thomas More, Erasmus and John Milton. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, it gave rise to English liberty. This liberty was not something supposed to be a gift of nature. It was to be based on education and guaranteed by a bill of rights and a constitution designed to compel the King to obey the law and respect the personality of other people. This English idea of reason, open-mindedness which is just teachableness, mutual respect, tolerance, personal integrity and independence sought expression too, in America. We should remember that America is, and has always been, a republic, committed to the philosophy of liberalism. To deny

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

that philosophy would be to repudiate the country's whole history.

I think these principles are the only ones which enable a community to exist on any other basis than force, persecution, terrorism and cultural stagnation; for these principles make for a community which is a true human fellowship and not the dominance of a grim determined minority over the rest of humanity. They mean that it is the business of government to preserve justice and not give over its machinery to the special advantage of any one.

Those who speak of the futility of liberalism today have probably overlooked many things which liberals in the past have accomplished for humanity and the advancement of civilization. There is, for instance, the right of free speech which is based upon a spirit of tolerance of the expression of heretical or unpopular belief. No partisan group, as we have seen, even though it demands this freedom for its own propaganda, has ever been willing to grant it to others. We owe this liberty to such men as Erasmus, Montaigne, John Milton, Burke, Huxley and Mill, to the humanists of the Renaissance and the deists of the eighteenth century—good liberals all. With the exercise of this right has come to mankind the greater part of the progress of science with its independence of theological dogma and political repression and its freedom for research. It is the liberals' insistence on tolerance more than any other one fact of history that has minimized persecution. Every entrenched institution when challenged and every crowd or faction will persecute on occasion. Liberals, knowing the disposition of mankind to practice this evil, have persistently fought against it. A splendid example of the liberal challenge to persecution is Voltaire's *Essay on Toleration*. Much the same may be said of the writings of John Locke and David Hume. As a result of the activity of liberals of the past, we have now in our Bill of Rights certain clauses which make it difficult—if not impossible—for a crowd under constitutional government to make use of the agencies of government to liquidate rivals, nonconformists, or opposition

REVOLUTION VS. LIBERALISM

to minorities. Those clauses which forbid cruel and unusual punishments, search and seizure without warrant of law, imprisonment without trial, are monuments to the liberal's struggle for decency in human relationships.

We are indebted to the liberal tradition for our present-day efforts for universal popular education. Liberals have turned to education, as Voltaire once told Casanova, in their long struggle against the tyranny of superstition. I sometimes think they idealized and exaggerated humanity's willingness to learn. But education is ceasing to be class privilege and increasing efforts are being made to give all who desire, both children and adults, a share in our common cultural inheritance.

Every dogmatist, whether reactionary or radical, is at heart a propagandist. No propagandist really believes in education. The propagandist strives for a closed mind, the educator for an open mind. The propagandist desires immediate action, the educator the flowering of personality. The propagandist insists that you think as he thinks. The educator is more modest. He is so delighted if you think at all that he lets you think in your own way. He knows that *how* and *why* you believe anything is more important than *what* you believe. The difference between these two attitudes toward the mind is an almost impassable gulf dividing men. I think the advantages historically have been on the side of the liberal educator.

Finally, we are indebted to liberalism for whatever humanitarian and philanthropic movements differentiate our times from earlier Christian centuries. It is not fair to say that liberalism has been merely rugged individualism, with each man for himself. Under its influence there have been more social consciousness, more private and public benevolence, more concern for the general good, more interest in the under-privileged than ever before in history. I am not so naïve as to hold that all this has been wise or sociologically beneficial. Eugenists often say that it has served very largely to increase the number of the congenitally inferior and unfit. Radicals frequently look upon it as a rather cheap and sometimes insincere palliative or sub-

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

stitute for a denied social justice. Certainly there is much nineteenth-century romanticism in the humanitarian movement; but radicals might do well to remember that their own movement had its origin in such romantic idealism and retains, even to this day, a large measure of it. An excellent example of the humanitarian spirit of liberalism is the letter of instruction with which Peter Cooper accompanied his large gift for the improvement of the conditions of the working classes of New York. He required of his Trustees that always there be given in the Great Hall of Cooper Union instruction in the science and philosophy of a just and equitable form of government in which men and nations do to one another as they wish to be done by.

This is just the trouble, someone will say. Liberalism has no remedy for present world evils except charity. People do not want charity now, they demand justice. Liberalism is the philosophy of those who have grasped all the wealth and power. They can afford to make minor concessions, but they refuse to surrender their privileges. Their liberalism is but an attempt to patch up a crumbling system which works only to the advantage of the few. I understand the impatience with the present industrial system which gives rise to statements like this. But a moment's reflection should make it clear that such an argument is at most a jumble of half truths, mostly irrelevant. I have already discussed the question whether liberalism has a remedy. I would add that a distinction should be made between remedy and dogma. Revolutionary slogans are really not remedies. In fact there is no one remedy for the ills of the world. Human life may be improved only by specific planning to meet concrete situations and by trial and error. Liberalism, in encouraging open-mindedness regarding proposed social change, does much to make possible any remedy that is at all acceptable. Liberalism is not and never has been merely an economic creed. It is not a doctrine of the Millennium. Its main contention is that whatever remedy men propose they must show consideration for one another. It is the doctrine that society is a human

REVOLUTION VS. LIBERALISM

fellowship which cannot be broken—even by men acting in a good cause. There is a better way to win a cause.

Furthermore it is not true that liberalism is the philosophy of the few who possess the wealth and power of the world. It is today as it has been for a century and more the political belief of the great mass of American people of all classes, though not many take the trouble to think about it much. Of course, self-respecting men do not want to become objects of charity, and no one is more concerned than the honest liberals that measures be devised which will not only meet present-day emergencies, but will permanently reform and improve conditions. But have people stopped to think what society would be without the spirit of charitableness? There are those who imagine a social order in which charity will be unnecessary. This is a utopian dream, not a principle of social philosophy. It is right for men to demand social and economic justice. But the mere sentiment for justice does not give assurance that the thing demanded is itself just. It is easy to mistake class hatred and envy for a passion for justice. The wisest men since Plato have tried to decide which is just and their success is far from perfect. It can hardly be said that the policies pursued by revolutionary Russia or Germany have given mankind a triumph of justice. There can be no justice unless men are dealt with according to their merits, and unless people retain for one another some measure of intelligent mutual respect. Finally it is not correct to say that liberals are merely trying to patch up the present social system. Most liberals I know are working for the only social change that is enduring—an ordered, intelligently planned change. There is a necessary continuity in all life. The idea of sudden violent change of an entire system we have seen to be a delusion. The revolutions which have attempted such immediate world transformation have all failed, and those who succeeded the revolutionists have had to go back, pick up the broken threads and begin all over again.

This is not to say there is anything inconsistent with the

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

liberal position in advocating very important radical changes in the present social order. Liberals, however, do not believe that such changes can be effected by revolutionary crowds. Perhaps it is too much to ask of human nature to expect those who enjoy special advantages to give them up, even for the general welfare, without struggle. This is as it should be. All progress takes place through struggle and the conflict of interest and opinion. If our age were unprogressive or stagnant, there might be some point in being impatient about the necessity of change. But we are now in the very midst of the most rapid changes in all history. It is well to think about the ends of this change and to try to give it direction. But the change itself is upon us; it is proceeding so rapidly that most of the population are even now psychologically unable to keep up with it or adjust to it. What is most needed is clear thinking and the reasonableness of civilized men and women.

Another principle of liberalism now made the object of revolutionary attack is its advocacy of liberty. This is not surprising, since both Communists and Fascists aim to abolish liberty in the interest of the totalitarian state—that is, the dictatorship of the revolutionary crowd. It is said that people talk about the value of individual liberty only because they want freedom for capitalistic exploitation. I deny this. Men have talked about liberty and have struggled for it for two thousand years. Until the Revolution of October, 1917, it was considered by all classes the modern man's priceless inheritance from the past and forward-looking people everywhere hoped that coming years would bring increase in freedom and in individual opportunity. Undoubtedly they are, and have always been, those who regarded liberty chiefly as freedom from social regulation of industry. At one time much could be said for this point of view. It is not astonishing that now this demand for individual freedom is often used to justify anti-social interests and behaviour. But this is only to say, what is obvious, that freedom, if it exists at all, will be abused. If men are free to do right they are also thereby

REVOLUTION VS. LIBERALISM

free to do wrong. It is the course of wisdom to work to limit the abuses, not to abandon freedom itself.

On this point I have received many letters from radical students. They say: "Why talk about liberty when you know we do not have it. Look at all the unemployed in the streets. What liberty have they—except to go cold and hungry? And those who are employed are hardly more free. These wage-slaves toil all their lives for barely enough to support a miserable existence. There can be no liberty while there is no economic freedom." I might reply that bad as conditions are even now, the material condition of the masses is doubtless better than in any preceding generation. But this answer would be beside the point. The point is that people do not stop to think what they mean by liberty. At times we all may dream of a world in which we may have what we want and do what we please. But the dream is a kind of return to infancy. Since our desires are in conflict with those of our neighbours and are moreover often themselves incompatible, perfect liberty is impossible in any social system. Is it wise to discard what liberty we have because it is not the perfect dream of universal freedom?

Since the eighteenth century it has been the fashion to imagine that perfect liberty is the gift of nature, and to believe that if the freedom of anyone is restricted, someone, aristocrat or capitalist, or society is to blame. But the freedom of nature is a delusion. Species prey on one another and no living organism is secure for one minute. Liberty as a gift of nature is a survival of romantic idealization. As Hobbes said: "Man in the state of nature lives in a state of war of all against all." There is enough such mutual warfare in organized society. But in the measure that civilization has been able to lessen and restrain it, men enjoy certain civil rights. These are the only rights men have. The phrase, economic liberty, like most slogans of propaganda, is misleading. It is not a natural right, for there is no economics in the state of nature. It is not a civil right, for no state up to the present has been able to guarantee it. The

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

best men have yet been able to do has been to guarantee in some measure certain property rights and the freedom of contract. But what are these to a destitute person? Does the phrase economic liberty mean that society owes everyone a comfortable living? Does it mean that no one should live by exploiting the less fortunate? Few will deny that increased material abundance and the achievement of industrial equity are most desirable social objectives. Most real liberals are actively interested in the achievement of these ends. Perhaps it is true, as some maintain, that now for the first time in history, science and invention make it possible to hope for an economy of abundance and so to plan the reorganization of the industrial system. The reorganization will not be easy; it will require the best intelligence mankind possesses. The great danger is that in their impatience for what they imagine to be economic liberty, excited crowds will cast away even the few liberties and civil rights we now possess. Then there will be no liberty for anyone—either economic or civil.

One way of avoiding this danger is to avoid confusion of terms. People may be easily tempted to exchange the few and hard-won liberties they now have for a material abundance gained at the price of tyranny and slavery if they persuade themselves that the slavery means larger liberty. It is well to restrict the word liberty to certain definite specific rights, rights which have at last gained legal recognition. In this way, it may be clear that we have not much liberty. But we can at least know what we are talking about when we use the word. Then we can ask ourselves how much we care about these rights, whether any social future would be desirable without them and whether it is possible to achieve a planned economy in which these rights may still exist.

What we mean by liberty is, first, mankind's achievement, so far as it is an achievement, in limiting tyranny. Free men are not subjects but citizens. There are some things which it is unlawful for rulers to do to citizens. The sovereign like everyone else must obey the law. Government is in some way accountable

REVOLUTION VS. LIBERALISM

to the public. It may exercise only such powers as are granted to it by the citizens. It is their agent, it is not their lord. Obedience to it is not submission to the will of a master, it is a rational obedience, a recognition of the necessity of law and the rule of reason. This is not to say that laws are always reasonable or just, or ever can be; but where liberty exists men may protest against laws of which they disapprove and may openly try to have them changed. There can be no liberty where government is not responsible, and responsibility requires not only that government give an account of itself to the public, but also that it operate as a check upon itself, so that those in authority may not exceed their power, so that it may not become the tool of a dominant faction and be used to destroy unpopular individuals or dissenting minorities. So it has been found that it is the advantage of freedom that the same person shall not be able to make laws, then execute them, then pass on the legality of his acts. In a free government, therefore, the executive, legislative and judicial functions of government are delegated to different persons. In dictatorial and notably in revolutionary governments, all powers of government tend to be exercised by the same central committee. Revolutionary government is not responsible government. It exists by force, not by reason and assent. Nothing could be further from the truth than its profession that it represents the people. So Communists and Nazis alike denounce liberal democracy.

In order to see realistically what liberty means, let us try to imagine living in a state which did not recognize that individual freedom guaranteed to us in our Constitutional Bill of Rights. Our ancestors were very sensitive about these rights; they knew what they meant and what they had cost. They also had had some experience with governments which did not respect them. We often take these rights for granted. Certain people speak lightly of liberty because they have forgotten what liberty meant to the generations that had to struggle to achieve it. There are, for example, in our Constitution two restrictions upon officialdom which many radicals seem to think are there only to

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

protect the interests of the property-owning classes. They are the clause which forbids unwarranted search and seizure, and that which says property may not be taken without due process of law. I hold no apology for the interpretation which the courts have sometimes given the latter. But we know historically what has happened when the agents of government have not been so restrained. The homes of rich and poor have been entered by day or night on any pretext whatever. Politicians and their favorites have practised all sorts of outrages, robbing people of whatever they desired, often driving their victims to pauperism and death, and there has been no redress. This evil is as old as recorded history. The Old Testament tells the story of King Ahab's seizure of Naboth's vineyard. The ancient prophets bitterly denounced this as a common practice of the rich and powerful who had friends at court in dealing with their poorer neighbors. Tacitus relates how under the early dictatorship of the Caesars no man's life or household was safe from sycophants and the envious who, if they wanted anything, turned informer against its possessor, had his home secretly raided, and shared the loot with the raiding officers. Cicero gained his fame as a Roman orator protesting against this practice by the agents of the dictator Sulla. It was this evil, as much as any other, which made wretched the life of the Jews in the Middle Ages. It is always practised by the henchmen of dictators. We have creditable rumours of its practice in both Germany and Russia since the revolutions in those countries.

There is also in the Constitution a group of restrictions against dictatorial government which have to do with securing justice for those whom the government may accuse or try to persecute. We are likely to think that these rights are made use of chiefly by criminal lawyers in protecting offenders. They were intended to protect innocent men against despotism. And when there are no such laws, it has often been the innocent rather than the guilty who have suffered most. There is the right of habeas corpus, to which the English-speaking peoples have clung since the thirteenth century. This prohibits putting people in

REVOLUTION VS. LIBERALISM

prison and keeping them there indefinitely without trial. Every tyrant in history has resorted to this practice, and it was a rule among tyrants of the ancient world to make use of it to destroy the best men in the state, the men they most feared. Medieval tyrants imprisoned and executed at will anyone who aroused their displeasure. Any government is likely to do the same if it is not prohibited. Revolutionary governments are notorious in this respect. Every reign of terror is an example of it. People are imprisoned on suspicion, often not because of any offence, but because of the class or party to which they belong, or because some relative or friend has aroused the suspicion of the dictator or of his agents or of nameless informers. Thousands have been massacred by despots, conquerors and revolutionary governments in violation of this very principle of liberty.

Liberty requires that the accused have a fair trial, in open court, that he know that of which he is accused and who his accusers are. It was disrespect for this basic human right which aroused the resentment of good men against the Inquisition. When, on June 30, 1934, Hitler "purged" the Nazi party by killing more than three score of his former followers without trial, he placed himself and his government outside the pale of civilization. Sir Philip Gibbs says in *European Journey*:

"In any case, and whatever evidence may be presented later, if ever in history, there will be no alteration in the verdict of civilized minds. This killing of seventy-seven men—or many more—without giving them a chance of defence was a return to the darkest period of Mediaevalism. It does not come within the code of civilized peoples. . . . The world outside Germany was shocked and stunned. There was no insincerity in the expression of horror which came from French or English or American minds. Hitler will find it difficult to regain the respect which was given to him as a simple man, an honest man, even by his enemies. 'When,' said a distinguished French writer, 'he comes to any international assembly such as the League of Nations, to which he wishes to return, he will be received by a great silence, and all eyes will stare at his hands.'"

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

But is Hitler different in this matter of a fair trial to his alleged enemies from other revolutionary leaders? I doubt it.

The same sense of liberty and justice caused our ancestors to require that there be no *ex post facto* laws, that is, that no one be punished according to a law passed after the offense he is charged with committing. Despots and mobs have frequently been tempted to justify their homicide in this manner. The Nazis only recently did this in the matter of the burning of the Parliament building. Furthermore it has been required that the accused be tried by a jury of his peers, not by a court of his enemies. No revolution, so far as I know, ever respects this right. And it has also been required that there be no cruel and unusual punishments. One has but to visit the museum of instruments of torture in old Nuremburg to realize the meaning of this right. And finally it was required, in the name of liberty, that no accused person be forced to testify against himself. I am aware that this principle is often abused. But the abuses testify to the temptation to practise this sort of coercion. Think of the trial and tortures of Savonarola and of thousands accused by the Inquisition and tortured, until half demented they sought escape in confession and death. This clause preserved in our Bill of Rights put an end to the rack and the torture chamber.

It is not necessary to deal further with the human rights guaranteed by our Constitution. Enough has been said to give some idea of what life has been and is without such liberty. This liberty may not be much, compared with the perfect freedom one can imagine. But it is better than none. It has taken centuries to achieve even this and it still has to contend against the greed and love of power and against the bigotry of the crowd everywhere in the world. This liberty is real, at least so far as it goes. It makes a tremendous difference whether a people has it. It is for the most part the work of the liberal-minded minority in all civilized times.

I would ask those who say that liberalism is dead, just what in it is dead? Do these people really mean that responsible government and a bill of rights are out of date? Is Aristotle's "Mag-

REVOLUTION VS. LIBERALISM

nanimous Man" out of date? But this idea of the man with broad sympathies, far vision and large-mindedness is a requirement of civilized living in any time. Are teachableness, self-criticism, humour and the ability to think before one acts now to become out of date? Is it out of date for men and women to try and put themselves in other people's places and to regard those who do not agree with them as human beings? Does anyone imagine that people lacking these virtues are capable of solving any social problem? Is it out of date to insist that human beings may not attain their full development unless they are guaranteed certain personal liberties? If so, I would suspect that civilization itself is becoming out of date.

I do not believe that civilization is out of date. I do not see how any social solution is possible by men and women who would approach the future in any less civilized spirit than that we have inherited from the past. We need more civilized people, not less, if we are to achieve a better social future. I am painfully aware of the precariousness and inadequacy of modern civilization. But it is all we have, and we shall not gain more by trampling even this little under the feet of half deluded crowds. It would seem that after all the centuries of difficult advancement, we at last may be civilized enough to solve our economic problems without resort again to the barbarisms of revolution and despotism. Here as I see it is the first task of the liberal. It is to labour to the end that whatever direction the changing social order may take, we do not throw away our cultural inheritance. Many liberals are so deeply impressed by the seriousness of the economic crisis and the suffering of millions that they become confused, and are sometimes prepared to run along with revolutionary propagandists, leaving behind the one thing which would make the new order endurable even if it should ever be achieved, that is, our hard-won liberty.

I have said that liberalism in our time has become confused. The confusion has done much to render obscure the entire tradition. As might have been expected during the nineteenth century when it was usual in these matters for emotionalism to

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

take precedence over reason, the liberal tradition was vulgarized and became a house divided against itself. What today is known as liberalism is often little more than a caricature of this philosophy. In fact there are two caricatures of liberalism today, equally plebeian in nature, representing chiefly the conflict of material interests between the successful and the unsuccessful.

The first caricature is the result of the Industrial Revolution and the rise of the capitalist system. Hence "laissez faire"; "more business in government and less government in business." This has meant a false individualism, an emphasis on personality only so far as money-making interests are concerned, and so a denial of many values of civilization and a resistance by selfish interests toward much needed social legislation. Hence it is a kind of mock liberalism, inasmuch as it denies the very thing which historic liberalism strives for: the community of free men realizing itself in a kind of human fellowship.

Radicals commonly speak of this distorted type of liberalism as conservatism or reactionism. It is conservatism only from the point of view of the radical. It is in fact a vulgarization of the liberal tradition of Adam Smith, Montesquieu, Malthus and Mill. But there was a spiritual element in the liberalism of these writers. The individualism which they advocated still had in it something of the classical ideals of personal excellence, of moral responsibility and devotion to the common good. These values are usually lost sight of by contemporary advocates of economic individualism. The phrases which are borrowed from the classics have a different connotation. A type of rationalization is elaborated to serve as an apology for the special interests and methods of exploitation of financiers and industrialists. The ethical ideals of Adam Smith are so perverted that they seem to mean that a man will not exert himself unless he has the incentive of getting rich, often at the expense of his neighbours. Undoubtedly many men who hold this philosophy are people of that type, but their spirit is far removed from that of the classical writers on this subject. Theirs is the spirit of Mark Hanna, not of Cicero.

REVOLUTION VS. LIBERALISM

In practice, the irony of this type of liberalism is manifest, for most of those who hold it are associated with corporations which have prospered by means of special government favors, tariffs, bounties and franchises, and the political corruption associated with what is called "invisible government." The illiberalism of spirit of this type of "liberalism" is further manifest in its frequent hostility to freedom of speech and to academic liberty. It is, therefore, not surprising that when Professor André Siegfried of the Sorbonne visited America recently he said that Americans of all classes seemed to be willing to sacrifice much of their hard-won liberties, together with many precious cultural values, for their material interests.

It is obvious that under the influence of such a spirit education becomes almost wholly utilitarian and is no longer able to comprehend the cultural tradition which has been giving freedom and grace to the human mind since the days of Socrates.

The second caricature is no more fortunate. Though it seemed for a time to be very democratic, it did democracy much harm. This pseudo-liberalism was derived from romanticism and from the teachings of Rousseau. The doctrine of the "free spirit" came to mean a release from the hamperings of civilization. Hence liberalism became identified with the idea of the "return to nature"—an old idea in America where men had for many years to grapple with nature in a new continent. But the nineteenth century added something. The "return to nature" was to be also something social. The rights of man were no longer to be based on law and reason but would be bestowed by kind nature in the degree that humanity could become emancipated from traditional masters. So liberty became identified with mass action. It became, not the specific rights a man may have in civilization and supported by law, but a demand—the demand that the people rule. The rule of the people is not new; there had been democracies in antiquity and in the Free Cities during the Middle Ages. But this cry was new. It meant, as Rousseau said, that there need not be and should not be any

FAREWELL TO REVOLUTION

constitutional restrictions upon the will of a crowd acting as mass. And since most crowd movements tend to identify themselves with "the people," liberalism tended to become a philosophy of crowd or partisan behaviour.

Thus the liberal of this type frequently finds himself an embarrassed and half-hearted companion of Communists and extreme radicals. There is a historical reason for this situation for, as I have said, the radical movement had its origin in the humanitarian movement of the nineteenth century and still retains much of the Rousseauist romanticism of those days. Furthermore, as it becomes necessary to socialize industry through an increasingly executive type of government, the second type of liberalism inevitably comes into conflict with the liberalism of the first type and in that sense has something in common with the radical movement. The social problem cannot be solved by fanatical cults, nor in a spirit which Ortega has called "The revolt of the masses."

I do not believe that a better society can be created by partly civilized people nor by people who still idealize Rousseau's "noble savage," nor by undifferentiated man acting as mass. There is much return to barbarism in contemporary revolutionary enthusiasm, all of which is quite as far removed from classical liberalism as is the pseudo-liberalism of the so-called rugged individualist. In fact both of these caricatures of liberalism are just what might have been expected in an age when half-educated people strive to assume cultural leadership in a democracy.

The time has come to reaffirm and make live that philosophy of freedom, reasonableness and the good life which has distinguished liberalism since the days of Socrates. Every age which has made this tradition its own has found not only liberty but a dignity of living. Every generation which has forgotten it has lost its liberty and has slumped into mob rule, despotism and cultural decline. How can we preserve our cultural inheritance, liberty included, unless we know what it is? Everywhere people propose solutions for the problems of the world who act and

REVOLUTION VS. LIBERALISM

speaking as if such men as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Erasmus, Milton, Locke, Voltaire, Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill had never existed! I wonder what men thought a century ago when they said that the school house was to be the foundation of our free institutions? Did they mean merely an education which would improve the individual's opportunities in a competitive struggle for money? Did they mean a patriotic propaganda which would make the population the half grown up victims of crowd appeal? Did they mean schooling which would lead to mere socialization without understanding or habits of reflection? Or did they mean to encourage reasonableness among the people and so see to it that there would be a sensitive and critical public opinion? Liberty is a cultural achievement; it cannot be preserved by a populace which is moved by passion and sentiment and has no knowledge of the principles upon which life in any free society must always be based. We have too long undervalued intelligence in this country, except that of the narrow expert. All history shows that a free people must be a thinking people, and must prize wisdom, as much as military peoples prize the glory of war. Yes, as much even as our democracy in the past has revered business success. Education preserves and enhances liberty, not only by acquainting people with facts, but most of all by putting the mind in immediate contact with the great free master minds of all ages. Then something happens, something of excellence and human understanding, something liberating, is caught up out of the ashes of the past, which crosses the dead centuries and lives to enrich and light the present. Revolutions have their passing hour and are gone. They come like dreams of horror, they pass and leave but exhaustion and sad awakening. But the stream of wisdom coursing through the centuries flows steadily on. Lost for a time it reappears richer and deeper than before. It has brought with it such freedom and civilization as man has yet known. It is the life of reason which will yet create the republic of the free.

INDEX

- Abelard, 1, 43
 Adams, James Truslow, 204 f., 208 f.,
Revolutionary New England, 217 f.,
 221
 Adams, John, 216, 221
 Adams, Samuel, 200, 206, 214
 Adolphus, Gustavus, 145, 164
 Aeschylus, 100
 Agrarian riots, in France, 239; in Rus-
 sia, 309
 Aix-la-Chapelle, Treaty of, 211
 Albigenses, 129
 Alexander VI, Pope, 142
 Amalricians, 127
 American Federation of Labor, 335
 American Revolution, 171, 199 ff.
 Anabaptist, 132
 Anne Boleyn, 176
 Antoninus, 88
 Antony, Mark, 74, 77 f., 261
 Archbishop of Canterbury, William
 Laud, 188 f.
 Archbishop of Mayence, 152
 Archbishop of Treves, 163 f.
 Aristotle, *Politics*, 22; on "right rea-
 son," 36; *Constitution of Athens*, 63;
 40, 100, 143, 260, 355; on democracy,
 327; "Magnanimous man," 366
 Arius, 97
 Army, in revolution, 103, 193
 Arnold, Matthew, 280
 Arnoldists, 129
 Aryan race, 339
 Athanasians, 97
 Athenian revolutions, 63 f.
 Augustan Age, 86
 Average Man, egotism of, 326; economic
 intents of, 326
 Babbitt, Irving, *Rousseau and Roman-
 ticism*, 53 f.
 Babeuf, 55, 273
 Bacon, Roger, 128, 143
 Bakunin, 55, 281
 Baldwin, 121
 Ball, John, 130 f.
 Barbarian, 28 f.; invasion, 86, 100; and
 the Roman Empire, 91
 Barbarossa, 121
 Barebones Parliament, 194
 Bastille, 242 f., 245
 Beard, Charles A., *Outlines of Euro-
 pean History*, 278
 Beer, Thomas, *Social Struggles in the
 Middle Ages*, 126 f.
 Behavior, anti-social, 34
 Bembo, 145
 Benedict, 106
 Bernard of Clairvaux, 121
 Beza, *Life of Calvin*, 132; 145
 Bible, German version, 165; English
 version, 174
 Bill of rights, 40; American, 200; 355 f.;
 constitutional, 363; ends torture, 366
 Bismarck, rise to power, 285; 287, 291
 Blanc, Louis, 278 f.
 Blanqui, 291, 295
 Blatchford, 280
 Bolshevik party, 229, 260, 296, 301,
 306 ff.; outvoted, 311 f.; 313 ff.
 Book of Common Prayer, 195
 Boston, massacre, 216; Town meeting
 of, 214; Tea Party, 217
 Botticelli, 133 f., 136
 Bourgeoisie, 271, 281; ideas, 273; philos-
 ophy, 355
 Braddock, 212 f.
 Brandt, Sebastian, *The Ship of Fools*,
 149
 Breasted, James, 67, 91
 Brown, John, 283
 Brownists, 189
 Brumaire, 18th, 256
 Brunoleschi, 133
 Brutus, 77, 87, 99
 Burke, Thomas, and liberty, 356
 Butler, Samuel, 184
 Byronism, 51

INDEX

- Caesar, Julius, 64 f., 69 f., 74 f., 88;
made dictator, 76 f.; assassination, 77;
and secret societies, 95; dictatorship
of, 349
- Calhoun, John C., school of, 281
- Callas case, 234 f.
- Calvin, John, 145, 147, 151, 164, 186,
198
- Calvinism, Scotch, 174; American, 204 f.
- Capitalism, 154, 230
- Capitalist system, 44, 237, 279 ff., 300 f.,
355
- Carlyle, Thomas, 234
- Carolina, charter, 200; 204
- Carthage, defeat of, 68
- Casanova, 357
- Cathari, 129 f., 132; heresies, 149
- Catherine of Aragon, 146, 176
- Catholic, Christianity, 110, 154; church,
101 f., 146, in the Middle Ages, 105;
internationalism, 123 ff.; reformation,
108; religion, 97; theology, 160 ff.;
party, 194; counter-revolutionary con-
spiracy, 247; triumph of reaction in
Austria, 285
- Catholicism, official religion of Roman
Empire, 98
- Catiline, oration, 73 f.
- Cato, 87, 100
- Censorship, 33, 168, 193; in France,
254 f.; 265
- Change, cycle of, 23
- Charles I, 173 ff., 184 ff., 200
- Charles II, 147, 194 ff.
- Charles V, 138, 162
- Charles VIII, King of France, 135
- Charles X, 276 ff.
- Chaumette, 230
- Chicago, Century of Progress, 350
- Christian, church, 95; communism, 138;
culture, 111; sect, in Rome, 88; sedi-
tious, 94
- Christianity, Apostolic, 129; Hebraic,
95; Early, 349
- Church, barbarous influences on,
108 ff.; dictatorship of, 98 f.; in Mid-
dle Ages, 106 ff.; in France, 235, 246 ff.
- Church of England, 147, 186
- Cicero, 66, 70, 73 ff.; on dictatorship,
78 f., 87, 100, 355, 364
- Civil disobedience, encouraged by the
Popes, 115
- Civilization, arts of, 199; precariousness
of, 367
- Civil war, in England, 191; as class war,
293
- Clairmont, Council of, 119
- Class, in England, 197; debtor, 203; in
America, 207; in France, 256; of "new
rich," 275; business, 282 f.; in Russia,
307 f.
- Class struggle, 62, 263 ff.; 287
- Clement VII, Pope, 138, 142 f., 146
- Clergy, marriage of, 114 f.; ignorance of,
148 ff.
- Cluny, reforms, 108, 113, 141
- Colonial Office, 201 f., 212
- Colonies, population of, 208
- Commodus, 89
- Commune, of Paris, 252, 255, 262 f., 265,
272; of 1871, 287, 289 ff., 313
- Communism, conspiracy, 99; not the
only alternative, 46; in French Revo-
lution, 230, 232; 299; dilemma of,
352 ff.
- Communists, type, 30 f.; 187, adherence
to Marx's teachings, 231, 237, of Rus-
sia, 242, 294; 260, conspiracy, 296 ff.;
Revolution, 301 ff.; distrust of Parlia-
ment, 331; underestimate white col-
lar class, 334; materialist conception
of history, 333; German, 338
- Communist Manifesto*, 49, 55 ff., 229,
272 f.; utopianism of, 327
- Communist Party, 230, 266 ff.; coup
d'état, 308
- Comte, 274
- Concord, 218
- Congress of Vienna, 256, 273
- Connecticut, 212
- Constance, Council of, 131
- Constantine, 96 f.
- Constantius, 97
- Constitution, American, 200 f., 224; of
England, 201, 218; of France, 245, 247,
249; Russian, 273; of France, 277;
American, 363 f., 366
- Continental Congress, 218 f.
- Conventicle Act, 195
- Convention, 231
- Convention of Thermidor, 255
- Cooperative commonwealth, 127, 230,
275
- Cooper, Peter, 358
- Cooper Union, 326, 352, 358
- Cornwallis, 222
- Council of Workers and Soldiers and
Peasants Delegates, 304, 306, 309, 313
- Counter-revolution, defined, 323
- Couthon, 230, 244
- Coxey's Army, 120
- Cranmer, 151
- Crassus, 75
- Cromwell, Oliver, 174, 191 ff.
- Crowd, behavior, 83, 219, 225, 262; in
Middle Ages, 199; in English Revolu-

INDEX

tion, 172; egomania of, 37; homicidal tendencies, 37; mentality, 35; morality, 183 f.; movements in early Christianity, 95 f.; psychology, 62, 205, 296; patriotism, 223, 250; 226; dominance, 257; psychopathology, 271; revolutionary, 360; bigotry of, 366

Crusades, failure of, 33; 112, 166 ff., 133; children's, 122

Cults, in Middle Ages, 117 f.

Czarism, 301 ff.

Dante, 133

Danton, 249, 252, 254, 272

Darwinism, 24

de Bouillon, Godfrey, 120

Decembrist uprising, 273

Declaration of Independence, 115, 190, 219

Declaration of Right, 200

Deism, 206

de Jumonville, 212

Democracy, likely to destroy itself, 24; struggle for, 260; Marxian, 268; liberal, 270; weaknesses of, 271

Democratic Crusade of 1848, 171

Democrats, 268 ff.

de Montforte, Simon, 130

Despotism, in Florence, 137; in Rome, 85; plebeian, 321; in revolution, 330

Dictatorship, 27; Bonapartist, 284; 297; of proletariat, 328, tyranny, absolutist state, 353, of revolutionary crowd, 360

Dinwiddie, Governor, 212

Dominican, order, 126; doctrines, 128; 129 f., 132

Donatist heresy, 100

Diocletian, 92 ff., 109

Duke of Brunswick, 251, 288

Duke of Orleans, 242

Duma, 303 f.

Dumouriez, 254

Economic struggle, in America, 203

Economics, and psychology, 31 f.

Economy of abundance, 362

Edwards, Jonathan, 117

Egomania, 35, 37, 225

Einstein, exiled by Nazis, 337

Emergency, of 1933, 43

Engels, 55, 260; *German Revolution and Counter Revolution*, 267 ff.; 281, letters to the *N. Y. Tribune*, 285
See also Communist Manifesto

English Revolution, 170 ff.

English-speaking nations, 43 f.

Environment, pseudo-social, 36

Erasmus, 134, 143 ff., 150 f., 157, 159 f., 162; *In Praise of Folly*, 149; 198, 355

Estates General, 241 f., 245

Euripides, 100

Eusebius, 97

Evangelism, sociological results of, 117

Faction, 172; tyranny of, 262; spirit of, 344

Fanaticism, 37

Fascism, conspiracy, 39; 40; dilemma of, 352 ff.

Fascists, type, 30 f.; 187, 325; propaganda, 325; appeal to egotism of average man, 326; revolutionary propaganda, 326

Fawkes, Guy, 179

Feudal system, 148

Florentine Republic, 133, 135

Flourens, 291

Fourier, 273, 280 f.; Fourierists, 55

Fraina, L., *Papers on the Russian Revolution*, 264; *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia*, 313 ff.

Franciscans, 128 f.

Franco-Prussian War, 263, 284

Franklin, Benjamin, 199, 206, 213

Free Cities in Middle Ages, 369

Freedom, academic, 40; philosophy of, 370

Free speech, 356

Free spirit, 272

Free Thought, 206

French aristocracy, 239

French Revolution, 171, 202, 225 ff.; financial crisis led to, 237 ff.; and church, 247 ff.

Fundamentalism, 168

Galileo, 134

Garnet, 179 f.

Gaul, the church in, 107 f.

Gaxotte, 232; *The French Revolution*, 246; 248 ff.

Germanic culture, 111

German Reformation, 162

Germany, Nazi, 33, 37; after the Reformation, 165; Revolution in, 228, 323; national sentiment in, 338

Ghiberti, 133

Gibbon, 88, 96

Gibbs, Sir Philip, 365

Giotto, 133

Girondists, 234, 244, 251 ff.

Godwin, William, 55

Goths, 92, 100

Government, functions of, 28; ideas of,

INDEX

- in 19th century, 41 f.; dependence on, 45; revolutionary not responsible, 363
- Gracchi, 69
- Great Awakening, 205
- Great Charter, 171
- Great Remonstrance, 189 ff.
- Greece, ancient, 63 f.
- Greeley, Horace, 281
- Gregory VII, Pope, 113 ff., 122, 141, 349
- Grotius, 261
- Group behavior, 46; "all or none" principle in, 47
- Guizot, 277
- Gunpowder Conspiracy, 177 ff.
- Habeas Corpus Act, 195, 364
- Hadrian, 87 f.
- Hall, T. C., 131
- Hamilton, Edith, *The Roman Way*, 48
- Hampton, John, 187
- Hancock, John, 214, 217
- Hanna, Mark, spirit of, 368
- Hapsburgs, 285; House of, 341
- Hearst newspapers, 336
- Hébert, 230, 234, 243 f., 272
- Hegel, 56
- Henry of Navarre, 115, 146
- Henry the VIII, 146, 147, 175 f.
- Henry, Patrick, 217
- Heresy, in Middle Ages, 126, 129, 145, 149
- Hierarchy, in the early church, 96
- Hittler, Adolf, 61, 65; *Mein Kampf*, 37, 49; 284; on propaganda, 329; from *My Battle*, 330; and the seizure of power, 332; autobiography, 339 ff.; *My Battle*, 340; on Jews, 341; anti-Semitism, 343; rise to power, 343; "putsch," 343; "purged" Nazi party, 365
- Hobbes, Thomas, 53, 184, 361
- Holy Alliance, 256, 273
- Holy Roman Empire, 113 f., 148
- Homer, 100
- Homicidal wish, 337
- Hooker, Thomas, 181
- Horace, 64, 86
- Huguenots, 146, 188, 221
- Humanism, 145
- Humanists, 150, 157; of fifteenth century, 143 f.; scholars, 149; *Letterae Obscurorum*, 150; 236
- Hume, David, 53, 178 f., 181, 184, 194
- Huss, John, 131
- Hussites, 129, 131
- Ideology, 261
- Individualism, classic ideals lost sight of, 368; false, and laissez-faire, 368
- Indulgences, Sale of, 154 ff.
- Industrial Revolution, 274, 285, 355
- inferiority, feeling of, 35, 37
- Innocent III, Pope, 123 ff., 171
- Inquisition, 130, 193
- 'Invisible government,' 369
- Jackson, Andrew, 199 f., 290
- Jacksonian democracy, 200
- Jacobins, Party, 151; dictatorship, 192, 231; 223; clubs, 231 ff., 243; 251; revival of Jacobinism, 288
- James of Scotland, 176 ff.
- James I, 147, 173 f., 181, 184 f.
- James II, 196
- James, William, 47
- Jefferson, Thomas, 170, 199, 221
- Jesuits, 177, 179 f.; influence, 196, alliance with Charles X, 276
- Joachim of Floris, 126 f.
- John of Parma, 129
- Julian, Emperor, 97 f.
- Julian party, 64
- Julius II, Pope, 137, 142 f., 152
- Jung, C. G., word association test, 47
- Kenyon, George, 299
- Kerensky, 299, 301; signed "Order Number One," 309
- King John of England, 125
- Kingsley, Charles, 280
- Knox, John, 145, 147, 174
- Kremlin, surrender of, 303
- Kropotkin, 151
- Ku Klux Klan, 168, 180, 209; like Nazis, 337
- Labor, organized, 234; "produces all wealth," 275; unions, in Russia, 304; aristocracy of, 335
- Lafayette, 222, 244, 251 f., 277
- Laissez faire, 368
- Latimer, 151
- Lenin, N., 37, 61, 69, 230 f., 261 ff.; *The Paris Commune*, 263, 265, 272, 290; 293; *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia*, 313 f.; appeal to peasants, 334
- Leo X, Pope, 137, 142, 144 f., 152 f.
- Leonists, 129
- Lepidus, 77
- Lettre de cachet*, 235
- Levée en Masse*, 232, 254
- Levellers, 132
- Lexington, 218
- Liberal philosophy, 399 f.; corrupted by Rousseau, 350

INDEX

- Liberalism, 52, 196-234, attack on in 20th century, 270; vs. radicalism, 294; a middle-class philosophy, 328; hostility of contemporary revolution to, 331; Nazi revolt against, 337; vs. Revolution, 352 ff.; its program, 354; futility of, 356; our debt to, 357; and radicals, 357; not an economic creed, 358; its advocacy of liberty, 360; not dead, 367; radical opinion of, 368; pseudo-, 369
- Liberty, 27, 41, 54; Anglo-Saxon, 27; Mill on, 29; dead in Rome, 87; in Florence, 133, 135, 138; American, 199 ff., crusaders for, in France, 253; proletarian struggle for, 268, danger to, 324; economic or civil, 361 f.; definite statement of, 362, violation of its principles, 365; and mass action, 369; a cultural achievement, 371
- Licinian law, 69
- Liquidation, 37, 227, 264
- Locke, John, 53, 115, 170, 196, 200, 206, 261
- Lollardism, 131
- Lollard movement, the, 146
- Lollards, 129
- Long Parliament, 189
- Louis IX, 121 f.
- Louis XIV, 234 ff.
- Louis XVI, 191, 237, 240 ff.
- Louis XVIII, 233, 273, 276
- Louis Philippe, 277 ff.
- Lucian, 87 ff.
- Luther, Martin, 132, 149, 153 f., 156, 162 ff.; ninety-five theses, 157 ff.; address on the Catholic Theology, 160 ff.
- Lynchings, 209
- Machiavelli, 134, 136
- Machine production, 276
- Madness, collective, 32
- Malthus, 280; tradition vulgarized, 368
- Manic-depressive, 63
- Marat, 230, 249, 252 f., 272
- Marco Polo, 112
- Marcus Aurelius, 85, 88 f., 103
- Marius, 65, 68, 72 f., 292
- Marston Moor, battle of, 192
- Martin, E. D., *The Behavior of Crowds*, 35; *Liberty*, 54
- Marx, Karl, 37, 55; the *Critique*, 56, 59 ff.; 170, 231, 260; *Civil War in France*, 262 ff., 288 f.; Letters in the *N. Y. Tribune*, 267 ff.; see *The Communist Manifesto*, indictment of capitalist industrialism, 280; foreign contributor to *N. Y. Tribune*, 281; 286 f.; revolutionary strategy, 301. See also *Communist Manifesto*
- Marxian, dictatorship, 265 f.; doctrine, 268, economics, 300 f., program of insurrection, 301
- Maryland, 203
- Massacre, 37
- Masses, do not create progress, 25; revolt of, 20, 30, 222; dictatorship, 296; regimentation of, 350
- Materialist interpretation of history, 62, 174, 333
- Mazzini, 170
- Mechanism, 59 f.
- Mechanistic theories, 23
- Medici family, 133 ff., 137, 144, 152, 159
- Medici, Catherine de, 146
- Medici, Cosimo de, 133, 135, 138
- Medici, Lorenzo de, 133 ff., 162
- Medieval system, 105
- Melanchthon, 145
- Metternich, 274, 285
- Michelangelo, 134, 136
- Middle Ages, social unrest in, 105 ff.; reform in, 108; social abuses, 113; revolution in, 129 f.
- Milan, edict of, 96 f.
- Miliukoff, 299, 306
- Mill, John Stuart, "On Liberty," 29; 33; and liberty, 356; tradition vulgarized, 368
- Milton, John, 33, 97, 114, 181; *Areopagitica*, 193; 195, 355; and liberty, 356
- Mirabeau, 242, 245
- Mirandola, Pico della, *Oration on Man*, 52; 54, 134, 145
- Mob, 34; in Florence, 136; violence, 207, 209, 222; at Newport, 215; terrorism, 216, 219; in French Revolution, 233, 243, at Versailles, 244 f.; and revolution, 271; will is law, 293; and despots, 366
- Molasses Act, 210
- Monasteries, 106
- Monastic virtue, 99
- Monasticism, decline of, 108
- Money power, 203
- Monongahela, battle of, 212
- Montaigne, 144, and liberty, 356
- Montesquieu, 235, 261; tradition vulgarized, 368
- More, Thomas, 175, 355
- Muller, *The Secret and Power of the Jesuits*, 115
- Munich, in 1931, 338
- Mussolini, Benito, 61, 265; trained in techniques and philosophy of Socialism, 336; 345

INDEX

- Nantes, Edict of, 234
 Napoleon, 33, 233 f., 256, 273
 Napoleon III, 283 f., 287 f.
 Napoleonic Wars, 202, 230
 National Assembly, in France, 242 ff., 252 f.; in Frankfort, 286 f.
 National Socialism, 323 ff.
 Nazis, 180, 187, 260; of Germany not counter-revolutionary, 323; distrust of Parliament, 331; appeal to egotism of average man, 326. revolutionary propaganda, 326; revolt against liberalism, 337; exile Einstein, 337. Ku Klux Klan, 337
 Nazism, conspiracy, 39
 Neander, 93, 113, 116, *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 125
 Necker, 240, 242
 Nestorians, 100
 New England, civil strife in, 201 ff.; living conditions in, 203. Theocracy, 204
 New Hampshire, 204
 New Jersey, 204
 New Testament Christianity, 126 ff., 131 f., 152, 166
 Newton, analogy to laws of motion, 23; 196
 Nicaea, Council of, 97
 Nietzsche, 114, 280
 North, Lord, 218

 Occam, 143
 Octavian, 64, 74, 77 f.
 Odoacer, 100
 Oecolampadius, 145
 Opposition parties, suppression of, 40
 Ortega y Gasset, Jose, 20, 30, 370
 Otis, James, 201, 214
 Owen, Robert, 280
 Owenites, 55

 Paine, Thomas, 170, 206, 253
 Paleaologus, John, 133
 Papacy, conflict with secular powers, 109; in disrepute, 142, 143 ff.
 Papal indulgence, 153
 Paranoia, and revolution, 35, 37
 Parliament, 175 f.; vs. King, 186; in France, 240; distrusted by Nazi and Communist, 331
 Parliamentary institutions, criticism of, 44 f.
 Patriotism, of the workers, 334
 Pazzi conspirators, 135
Peace of God, 100 ff.
 Pennsylvania, 204, 212
 People, The, as sovereign, 41; 206 f., 242, 260
 Persecutions, 37; of Christians, 93 ff., 109; of Catholics, 177
 Peter the Hermit, 116 ff.
 Petition of Right, 188, 200
 Petrarch, 133
 Philip of Macedon, 64
 Piercy, 179
 Pillnitz manifest~~o~~, 250
 Planned economy, 44; revolutionary idea, 45
 Plato, *Parable of the Oracle*, 31; *Republic*, 88, 282, 64
 Plebeians, 65
 Pliny, 87 f.
 Plutarch, 87
 Poliziano, Poggio, 134
 Pompey, 75 ff.
 Ponafidine, Mme., *Russia My Home*, 308
 Poor of Lombardy, 129
 Praetorian guard, 89
 Pride's Purge, 192
 Progress, 25; through struggle, 360
 Proletariat, in Rome, 77, 83, 85, 260 ff.; dictatorship of, 287; Russian, 298 ff.
 Propaganda, 36, Communist, 39, 141, 309, 226, 237, 282, a weapon, 329; and 20th-century revolution, 331; vs. education, 357; patriotic, 371
 Protective tariffs, 42
 Protestantism, 145, 168
 Proudhon, 55, 280, 291
 Psychology, and economics, 31 f.
 Psychosis, 63, individual, 32
 Public opinion, cycles of, 33
 Punic Wars, 68
 Puritan party, 131, 171, 174
 Puritan revolution, 147
 Puritans, 146, 180 ff., 195; dictatorship, 196; migration to America, 198

 Quakers, 204
 Quincy, Josiah, Jr., 216

 Radetzky, 286
 Radical party, 269 ff.
 Radicalism, 44; contemporary, 270; vs. liberalism, 294
 Rainy, 93
 Reformation, 105, 116, 131 f., 141 ff.; popular support, 146; in Scotland, 147; German, 148 f.; as civil war, 163; social revolution in, 167; 196
 Reformers, 154, 163 f., 166, 168
 Regensburg, Council of, 164
 Reign of Terror, 22 f., 232
 Religion, revival of, 140; of the state, 168, 350

INDEX

- Religious toleration, 352
 Renaissance, 105, 112, 138, 143, 146 f., 168
 repression, 35 f.
 Reuchlin, John, 150 f.
 Revival of Learning, 133 f., 145, 156, 162, 195, 196
 Revivalist spirit, 205
 Revolt, in Saxony and Franconia, 132; of youth, 272; in literature and art, 274, in Moscow, 303
 Revolution, and cultural change, 24; definition of, 26; as crowd movements, 27; barbarism in, 28 f.; mob behavior, 31, 63; unconscious motive in, 34, and paranoia, 35; hatred in, 49 f.; and war, 68; in Middle Ages, 129 f.; and economic considerations, 138; and minorities, 138; drift to left, 150; symptoms of, 151; cycles in history of, 170; of 1642, 196 f.; futility of, 228, 347 f.; of 1848, 228, 272 f.; progress of, 256 f.; is a civil war, 258; in 19th century, 260 f.; and the mob, 271; of 1871, 272, 288 f.; in Germany and Austria, 284 f.; as civil war, 292; is minority movement, 295; cycle closed, 322; history of, 349, 352; cycles of, 349 f., hostile to progress of civilization, 351; vs. liberalism, 352 f.
 Revolutionary, mobs, 19, 221; ideas, romanticism of, 47; movements and paranoiac symptoms, 37, tribunals, 40, 266, in Florence, 137, in France, 252, 254; dictatorships, 192, army, 227; strategy of Marx, 301; propaganda of Nazis and Fascists, 326; slogans not remedies, 358
 Revolutionist, modern, 138 f.; Russian, 250
Rhenische Gazette, 272
 Ricardo, 280
 Richard Cœur de Lion, 121 f.
 Richelieu, Cardinal, 164, 188
 Rights of Man, 202, 227, 242, 245; friends of, 249; 273
 Robespierre, 51, 230, 233 f., 243 f., 253; fall of, 255; extravagance of, 273; 295
 Robinson, J. H., *Readings in European History*, 103, 155; *Outlines of European History*, 278
 Rochambeau, 222
 Rohan, Bishop, 246
 Rolland, 252
 Roman, psychology of, 48 f.; revolution, 64 f.; Senate, 66 f., law, 106
 Roman Empire, decline and fall of, 85; cultural decline under dictatorship, 86; financial depression in, 90; taxes in, 90
 Roman Republic, 29, 64 ff.; constitution of, 66; ruin of, 83 f.
 Romantic optimism, 24
 Romanticism, 49 ff., 59 f.; "steel," 48, 323; 270; and Revolution of 1848, 274 f.
 Rome, agrarian reforms in, 69; leadership in, 70; classes in, 65 f.; slave labor in, 68 f.; slavery in, 80 f., 89; forced labor in, 93; planned economy, 93, fall of, 100
 Rothenburg, 167
 Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 43, 49 ff., 59, 127 f., 170, 206, 231, 234 ff., 264; pseudo-liberalism derived from, 369; "noble savage," 370
 Rump Parliament, 192
 Russia, Communist, 33, 37
 Russian Revolution, 228 ff., 295 ff.; Communist conspiracy, 296 ff.; collapse of Czarism, 301; strikes, 302 ff.; poverty, 307; demoralization of Army, 309 ff.; insurrection, 311; counter-revolution, 316 ff.; attack on Winter Palace, 319
 Saint Francis, 122, 128 f.
 Saint Jerome, 96, 99
 Saint Just, 230 f., 244
 Saint Simon, 55, 273 f.
 Saint Thomas, 122, 128, 143
 Saladin, recaptures Jerusalem, 121
 Sallust, 70 f., 73
 Sansculottism, 230
 Savonarola, 117, 132, 134 ff.; tortured, 366
 Scholasticism wanes, 143
 Schopenhauer, 56
 Science, 17th century, 25, 60
 Scipio, 72
 Scotch Covenanters, 189
 Scotus, Duns, 128, 143
 Separatists, 189
 Servitus, 151
 Seven Years War, 71, 211, 222, 238
 Sextius IV, Pope, 142
 Shays's Rebellion, 200
 Shirley, Governor, 212
 Sicily, slave revolt in, 81
 Siegfried, André, 369
 Smith, Adam, 42, 280; tradition vulgarized, 368
 Smith, Preserved, *Erasmus*, 160
 Socialism, 278 f., 301; 19th-century illusions, 328
 Socialists, French, 263; Russian, 306;

INDEX

- German, 306; class-consciousness, 325
 Social change, 359
 Social Contract, 231, 264
 Social Democrats, 300
 Social peace, 354
 Social philosophy, 359
 Social problems, solution of, 26
 Social protest becomes religious movement, 146
 Social Revolution, 166
 Socrates, 64, 100
 Soderini, dictatorship, 137
 Sons of Liberty, 215
 Sorokin, 229
 Soule, George, *The Coming American Revolution*, 348
 Soviets, the, 305; Petrograd, 312, Congress of, 317
 Spartacus, revolt of, 82 f.
 Stamp Act, 215 f.
 State, the, in 19th century, 261; proletarian, 262; political, destruction of, 265
 Stuart Kings, 173, 193 ff.
 Suetonius, 87
 Suffolk Resolves, 218
 Sulla, 65, 68, 72 f., 292

 Tacitus, 79 f., 87; on the Christians, 95
 Tariff, 214
 Taxation without representation, 171, 187, 214, 239
 Taxes, in France, 239
 Tetzl, Johannes, 156
 Theodoric, 100
 Theodosius, 98
 Third Estate, 191, 229, 241 f., 244
 Thirty Years War, 176, 188
 Thomas à Kempis, 111
 Titus, 87
 Tolstoy, Leo, 128, 151
 Trajan, 87, 88
 Trent, Council of, 108, 144, 164
 Trotsky, 61, 65, 299; *History of the Russian Revolution*, 49, 297, 310 ff., 317 ff.; *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia*, 313 ff.
 Tudor Kings, 173
 Turgot, 240
 Tyler, Wat., 131

 Universities, medieval, 122
 Urban II, Pope, 116, 118 f.

 Valla, Lorenzo, 145
 Versailles, Treaty of, 338, 344
 Virgil, 64, 86; *Eclogues*, 87, 100
 Virginia, 204, 211 f.; House of Burghers, 217
 Voltaire, 33, 53, 151, 196, 206, 235 f., Essay on Toleration, 356; and Casanova, 357
 von Eck, 153 f., 159
 von Haynau, 286
 von Hutton, 150

 Waldensians, 129 f.
 Waldo, Peter, 129
 Wallenstein, 164, 188
 Ward, C. Osborne, *The Ancient Lowly*, 81
 War for Independence, 198 ff.
 Washington, George, 199, 211 ff., 221
 Westphalia, Treaty of, 108, 165
 Whitefield, 204 f.
 William and Mary, 196, 200
 William, the Norman, 146
 William of Occam, 128
 Williams, Roger, 181
 Wolf, victory at Quebec, 213
 World War, 43, 287, 292
 Writs of Assistance, 201
 Wyclif, John, 117, 131, 146, 198, 205
 Wyclifites, 114
 Wygall, A., xiv

 Yorktown, 222
 Young, *The Medici*, 134

 Zealots, 129
 Zwingli, Ulrich, 164

