

labour and the family, an old established “order of persons” (feudal or patriarchal) was eventually reconstituted as a field of activity “malleable to legislation”. In the light of Orren’s study, American history becomes somewhat less of a historical exception. In America, as in Europe, a reassessment of the historical role of Liberalism is central to the revision of social and political history.

Finally, Orren’s book sheds light on the general problematic of the transition from the Atlantic (not solely European) *Ancien Régime* to the modern world. While generally agreeing with her analysis, I would question her use of the term *feudal*, instead of the slightly weaker *feudalistic*. This might seem a vain quarrel over terminology, but it is not. Terms like “feudal” and “feudalism” refer to an interconnected set of social relations, centred in the political realm. Feudalism was essentially a mode of governance, encompassing justice, honour and military organization. The legal traditions discussed by Orren were only a part of the intricate social fabric that was feudalism. They survived long after the demise of the political, military and cultural practices of feudal society, mainly in legal learning and the practice of the courts. It was their rearticulation with entirely novel economic and political structures that enabled them to survive, as Orren so convincingly demonstrates. In the process of rearticulation, however, they inevitably absorbed some new, modern elements as well. The final product was hybrid and chameleonic, still “feudalistic” or “feudaloid” but no longer “feudal” in the full sense of the term.

Siep Stuurman

VINCENT, K. STEVEN. *Between Marxism and Anarchism. Benoît Malon and Reformist Socialism.* University of California Press, Berkeley [etc.] 1992. xiv, 193 pp.

K. Steven Vincent’s intellectual biography of Benoît Malon (1841–1893), the worker-communard who became the founding editor of *La Revue Socialiste*, is the first full-length, scholarly study of this important French socialist leader. Historians such as Madeleine Reberieux and George Lichtheim have noted the importance of Malon as an authentic proletarian who played a formative role in establishing the Parti Ouvrier, and as a reformist tactician who sought a middle ground between Marxist centralism and Proudhonist mutualism; but it has taken uncommonly long for Malon to receive the focused attention that he deserves. Vincent’s meticulously researched book is a fitting tribute to commemorate this year’s centenary of Malon’s death and raises timely and significant questions regarding the historical legacy of the French left.

Born to landless peasants in the Loire, and an industrial dyer by trade, Malon was an autodidact-opsimath who wrote over a dozen books, ranging from party propaganda tracts to his assiduously researched two-volume *Le Socialisme Intégral* (1890) that encompassed theories of political economy as well as philosophical and religious ideas. Vincent uses these texts, as well as correspondence drawn primarily from the IISH collections, to trace Malon’s political career: from his early years as a Parisian cooperatist, emissary for the French Workingmen’s International (A.I.T.) – when he met Mikhail Bakunin – and his election to the 1871 Paris Commune, through his mature years when he edited *La Revue Socialiste* from 1885 until his death.

The repression of the Commune led Malon to seek refuge in Switzerland, and there he allied himself with Bakunin's Jura Federation in dissent against Marx's control over the International. In Italy, however, where Malon also spent years in exile, he used his influence to steer socialist leaders like Andrea Costa away from anarchism and the politics of direct action, persuading them instead to accept electoral strategies.¹

Malon's return to France in 1880 coincided with the establishment of the Parti Ouvrier Français. He collaborated with Jules Guesde and Paul Lafargue, helping them to draw up the "Minimum Programme" – the party's revolutionary collectivist credo; but he soon found himself at odds with the Guesdists' doctrinaire attitudes and their reluctance to work towards ameliorative reforms. In 1882, he broke rank with them to work with the "possibilist" leader Paul Brousse. But such political oscillation proved untenable, and in the last phase of his career, Malon left the party to edit the *Revue*. He formulated an independent, eclectic approach to both theory and practice that he called "integral socialism": a humanistic doctrine that strove to reconcile revolutionary and reformist strategies and to compensate for the economic Marxism of the Guesdists by drawing on French idealist and utopian traditions. Integral socialism proved inspirational for Jean Jaurès, and it is through the latter's republican socialism and their shared emphasis on humanistic and voluntarist ideals that Malon's import can best be appreciated.

As suggested by its title, *Between Marxism and Anarchism*, Vincent's book captures well the political dualism of Malon's thought and the maverick nature of his political career. In response to revisionist scholars who have criticized the Jacobin authoritarianism of the French left, Vincent argues that reformists like Malon represent an important federalist tradition within the left that was libertarian and anti-statist in outlook. Moreover, Vincent suggests that this federalism enabled its proponents to take deliberative politics – and its concern with social and economic reform – more seriously than those claiming to pursue purely political goals.

Embedded in this thesis is a provocative argument about the plurality of socialisms and the multiple definitions of the term "collectivism" in the nineteenth-century French context. From the late 1860s, Malon declared himself to be a collectivist together with Eugène Varlin and other A.I.T. militants who opposed the individualist thrust of Proudhonian mutualism. A decade later, he supported the collectivist platform of the Parti Ouvrier. However, Vincent argues, Malon did not consider collectivism to be synonymous with Marxism as did the Guesdists; his understanding of the term drew from pre-Marxist conceptions, specifically those of the early nineteenth-century Belgian theorist Hippolyte Colins who believed in the collective appropriation of land and the tools of labor through a decentralized communal administration of municipalities and workers' cooperatives. Neither was Malon an anarchist in the strict sense of the term, as he repudiated violent tactics and recognized the need for state intervention to better the conditions of workers' lives.

This aspect of Vincent's argument is, in essence, a rebuttal to the work of scholars such as Bernard Moss, Maurice Moissonnier and Charles Rihs, who have

¹ Giuliana Procacci has stated that many Italian socialists were better acquainted with Malon's works than with those of Marx; see Procacci's "The Italian Working-Class from the Risorgimento to Fascism", Center for European Studies' *Monograph on Europe No. 1*, Harvard University, 1979.

seen the late 1860s in France as the moment of revolutionary collectivism's victory over Proudhonian mutualism. But here again, the prism-like nature of the word "collectivism" reveals itself as these scholars have emphasized the way in which the term was used by Bakunin's followers in the International to distinguish themselves from advocates of Marx's communism. Benoît Malon himself, writing in 1887, differentiated between seven types of collectivism: the Colinsien, "revolutionary", "industrial" (by which he meant the state socialism of Louis Blanc, Constantin Pecqueur and other quarante-huitard economic theorists), Marxist, anarchist, Internationalist, and reformist. From the late twentieth-century perspective, these distinctions may seem hair-splitting and largely irrelevant. It is the merit of Vincent's thesis that he has focused on the reformist side of this logohistorical debate to analyze in concrete detail what historical actors like Malon saw as the viable alternatives to authoritarian statism and free-market indifference to human needs.

Prominently featured in Malon's vision of reformist collectivism, for example, was the right of all children to a free education, including professional training, and the obligation of society to guarantee a viable existence for invalids and the handicapped. Such goals were to be achieved through a gradual appropriation by communes of financial and industrial monopolies, the election of workers to parliament, the shortening of working hours and measures such as a progressive income tax.

Vincent quite rightly emphasizes that – until his split with the Guesdists – Malon saw these reforms as being necessarily antecedent to revolution. One could go further, however, in exploring Malon's earlier militancy. He was, after all, a combatant in the Commune, the bloody experience of which instilled in him a negative attitude toward spontaneous uprisings, whether of a Blanquist or Bakuninist inspiration. But as a Parisian A.I.T. activist, he organized and supported strikes – most notably the 1870 "grande grève" at the Schneider iron works of Le Creusot. As a party member working with the Guesdists, he upheld the tenets of class struggle, not the class collaboration of French syndicalists from the 1870s. This more revolutionary side of Malon's lived experience could be highlighted more in contextualizing and assessing his later reformism.

Much else remains to be said of Benoît Malon's life and thought. In my own research, I am exploring the relationship between his literary formation and political practice. Malon's journalistic record from the 1860s when he wrote for both republican and socialist newspapers provides a fascinating example of an "organic intellectual" response to France's early industrial capitalism. His books may be read not only for their content, but also as a study in working-class autodidacticism and cross-class intellectual influences. His intimate relations with bourgeois radicals such as Elisée and Elie Reclus and the feminist novelist André Leo, with whom he lived in free union during their joint exile, is of exceptional interest in this regard.

There may, however, be reasons aside from left-wing ideological schisms that explain why hitherto historians have been reluctant to give Malon his due. One of these is certainly the charge of anti-Semitism that has been leveled against him, most recently by Zeev Sternhell² in connection with the latter's analysis of the

² Zeev Sternhell, *Ni droite ni gauche: L'Idéologie fasciste en France* (Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1983), pp. 27–28, 53.

proto-fascist orientation of the French left. While I strongly support Vincent's dismissal of Sternhell's profascism thesis, the issue of anti-Semitism remains a troubling one that, in my view, is not wholly resolved by Vincent's account.

Benoit Malon's main financial backers for his journalistic activities were Henri Rochefort and Rodolphe Simon – both confirmed anti-Semites. In *La Revue Socialiste*, anti-Semitic articles by writers such as Auguste Chirac and Albert Regnard appeared during Malon's editorial tenure. As Vincent points out, Malon distanced himself from such writers' racialist theories and condemned the fanaticism of Edouard Drumont in his review of Drumont's rabidly anti-Semitic *La France Juive*; but that Malon, like many better educated intellectuals of his epoch readily associated Judaism with the evils of capitalism and that he was not sensitive to the social discrimination experienced by this particular minority group cannot be denied.

Vincent argues that this insensitivity resulted more from Malon's anti-clericalism, his Enlightenment belief in assimilationism, and his need to forge anti-capitalist alliances. To equate such insensitivity with Drumont's brand of hatred, Vincent writes, "obscures precisely those aspects of the matter – especially the prevalence of hidden prejudice in assimilationist programs – that are of historical interest" (p.128). This is a subtle argument, as is his claim that for Malon the term "Semite" connoted the negative aspects of Judaeo-Christian civilization as opposed to the Republican embrace of Graeco-Roman ideals. Malon's fellow editors and closest associates at the *Revue*, Eugène Fournière and Gustave Rouanet became socialist deputies in Jaurès's camp and, like Jaurès, were ardent Dreyfusards. However, in the course of my own research on Malon, I have found enough evidence of his cultural and political prejudice against Jews to wonder whether Malon, had he lived to experience the Affair, would have been so ardent. The question remains to be explored; but Vincent's careful reasoning on this issue will ensure that it is examined with both care and conscience.

Eiko Fukuda

DONGEN, BAS VAN. *Revolutie of integratie. De Sociaal Democratische Arbeiders Partij in Nederland (SDAP) tijdens de Eerste Wereldoorlog.* Stichting Beheer IISG, Amsterdam 1992. 864 pp. D.fl. 75.00.

In Rotterdam on 11 November 1918, Pieter Jelles Troelstra, the leader of the Social Democratic Labour Party (SDAP), proclaimed to thousands of exultant workers, the takeover of political power by the Dutch proletariat. The following day, in The Hague, Troelstra addressed Parliament, again announcing the impending triumph of the Dutch proletariat. It was, he said, to be a non-violent revolution, and he appealed to the Dutch government to resign. The next few days showed Troelstra's proclamation to have been a dramatic error, however; neither the party leadership and rank and file, nor the rank-and-file members of the socialist trade unions, nor the military and the proletarian masses were willing to lead the SDAP to power. Furthermore, the Dutch government organized a "counter-revolution" and succeeded in mobilizing the army and thousands of protestant and catholic workers against the "red menace". So the "Dutch socialist revolution" perished before it had really even got under way, leaving the SDAP and the trade unions suspected of being an unreliable "alien" in Dutch society and condemning the SDAP to a position of political isolation.