

CHAPTER V

AUGUST BEBEL'S POPULARIZATION OF EVOLUTION

While Büchner and Lange had already established themselves as avid proponents of Darwinian theory in the 1860s, Bebel was occupied with other pursuits, devoting his time and energy to the organization and education of the working class. He did not even read Darwin's *Origin* until the early 1870s, though he had become acquainted with Darwin's theory earlier through reading Lange's *Arbeiterfrage*, and he knew about Büchner's popularization of Darwinism. Evolution became an integral part of his world view, though it never played the central role it did in Lange's and Büchner's works. Nevertheless, he may have contributed more to its dissemination in socialist circles than either of them. This was largely due to the immense success of his book, *Die Frau und der Sozialismus* (1879, translated as *Woman and Socialism* or *Woman under Socialism*), which went through fifty-three editions during Bebel's lifetime and was the most widely-read non-fiction book among socialists.

The publication of *Frau* marked the culmination of Bebel's development into a Marxian socialist. In the mid-1860s Bebel had been more concerned with the education of the working class than with its political organization, as he moved gradually from a liberal to a socialist political position. Before 1868-69, he was influenced more by Lange's social program than by Marx or Lassalle.¹ Because both Lange and Bebel were members of the standing committee of the League of German Workers' Societies, they had close personal contact. In his autobiography Bebel characterized Lange as "one of the kindest persons I have known, who captured one's heart at the first glance."² After 1868 Bebel began studying Marx's and Engels' works, and they impressed him deeply. In his 1870 manifesto, *Unsere Ziele* (*Our Goals*), Bebel cited and recommended Marx's *Capital, Critique of Political Economy*, and *Eighteenth Brumaire*, as well as Engels' *Condition of the Working Class in England*. His view of history by this time was thoroughly Marxist.³ Crucial for

Bebel's intellectual development was his prison sentence from 1872-75, during which he devoted considerable time to the study of Marx's and Engels' writings, including a second reading of *Capital*, as well as perusing other works on political economy and history.⁴ Bebel's interment in Hubertusburg also provided him the opportunity to study natural science, especially Darwinism. His reading list included Darwin's *Origin*, Haeckel's *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*, and two of Büchner's books, *Kraft und Stoff* and *Der Mensch und seine Stellung in der Natur*.⁵ Later, his study of Engels' *Anti-Dühring* (1878) firmly entrenched him in the Marxist camp, to which he remained committed for the rest of his life.⁶

At the same time that Bebel absorbed Marxian doctrine, he also became a staunch advocate of biological evolution. Lange's *Arbeiterfrage* may have been the first significant work he read expounding on Darwin's theory. Whenever Bebel explicitly mentioned Lange or *Arbeiterfrage*, he expressed admiration and approval. In the forward to the 1895 edition of *Frau* he recommended the reading of the first two chapters of *Arbeiterfrage*, which, he claimed, would clarify the relationship between Darwinism and socialism.⁷ Bebel's recommendation is astonishing in light of the fact that he diametrically opposed the central ideas of the first two chapters of Lange's book elsewhere in *Frau*. The influence of Lange, which remained with him even after he embraced Marxism, may have contributed some to Bebel's confusion over the relationship between humans and the laws of nature.

Throughout his career Bebel popularized biological evolution, incorporating it into his socialist world view and sometimes appealing to it as scientific proof against religion and in support of socialism. Evolution was an important and recurring theme in *Frau*, where he endeavored to synthesize it with his Marxian view of history and society. Despite his commitment to Marxism, he never fully overcame the influence of ideas propagated by Darwinists that were fundamentally contradictory to Marx's teachings. Residues of the views of Lange, Haeckel, and Büchner remained with him and received expression in *Frau*, especially in the earlier editions. In later editions of *Frau* some of the more blatantly contradictory passages were muted, but they were never entirely eliminated.

Many scholars characterize Bebel as a pragmatic politician with little theoretical aptitude.⁸ Bebel himself denied that he was a socialist theorist, and this rings true if one compares him with Marx and Engels, who were undoubtedly his intellectual superiors.⁹ However, such a view ignores the opinion of Bebel's contemporaries and underestimates the importance and influence of his ideas. Marx and Engels considered him a reliable ally with "theoretical clarity."¹⁰ Karl Kautsky, the most influential theoretician in the Second International after Engels, trusted Bebel's judgment in theoretical matters and characterized him as a "peculiar mixture of French revolutionary passion and English sobriety with a distinctive theoretical mind."¹¹ Lenin believed that "Bebel embodied in his development and his political activity an entire historical period of the life not only of German, but also of international social democracy."¹² Bebel rejected the notion that pragmatic politics could be divorced from socialist principles: "As soon as the question of principles is pushed to the background by our practical activity, or is perhaps simply denied, the party loses the firm ground on which it stands, and becomes a flag that is blown around by the wind."¹³

Whatever one's opinion of Bebel's contributions to socialist theory may be, there can be no doubt that he was one of the most important disseminators of socialist doctrine in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Bebel's *Frau* played a key role in propagating socialist theory, and not only because of its popularity. *Frau* was far more than an examination of women's position in society from a Marxian standpoint. It contained a complete picture of Bebel's world view, including significant glimpses of a projected future socialist society. Bebel repeatedly revised *Frau*, including revisions in 1883 and 1891 to incorporate Engels' views in *Anti-Dühring* and *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* respectively.¹⁴ Eduard Bernstein called Bebel's book "epoch-making" and claimed that it had a greater propagandistic effect than any other socialist writing in the late nineteenth century.¹⁵

Darwinism as Support for Socialism

Bebel continually emphasized the importance of educating the working class about natural science and believed that such knowledge would provide weapons for attacking the status quo and transforming society.¹⁶ In 1868 he requested Büchner to give copies of his new book on Darwinism to all German workers' associations.¹⁷ He considered Darwinism a revolutionary science, because it confirmed the transitoriness of present conditions: "Nothing is 'eternal,' neither in nature nor in human life; only fluctuation and change is eternal."¹⁸ In a speech to the Reichstag in 1878 he alleged that scientists were one by one moving closer to socialism, and further, "all of modern science (*Wissenschaft*) plays into our hands [and] serves our goals, [indeed] must serve them." Bebel then appealed to Darwinism as especially conducive to socialism. After alluding to Haeckel's rebuttal of Virchow's insinuation that Darwinism advances socialism, Bebel continued:

Gentlemen, according to my view Professor Haeckel, the resolute representative of the Darwinian theory, because he does not understand social science, actually has no idea of the fact that Darwinism is necessarily beneficial to socialism, and conversely socialism must be in harmony with Darwinism, if its goals should be right. . . . And thus it is similar in other areas of modern science, which go hand in hand with us, whose theories and consequences we acknowledge out of conviction and the knowledge of which we seek to disseminate and popularize.¹⁹

This speech shows how much of an impression scientism and biologism had made in socialist ranks.

In a later Reichstag speech Bebel maintained that his book, *Frau*, was based on Darwinian theory.²⁰ In *Frau* Bebel reiterated his agreement with the position popularly attributed to Virchow that Darwinism furthers socialism, and stated, "Darwinism is, like every real science (*Wissenschaft*), an eminently democratic science." He argued that socialism was a logical consequence of the Darwinian theory and that the Darwinists who were disputing this deduction, such as Haeckel, Oscar

Schmidt, and Friedrich von Hellwald, were influenced by class considerations, fear, or other base motives.²¹ Although Darwinists were ignorant of social science and socialism, Bebel maintained that socialist theorists had studied not only social science, but also Darwinism, and were thus on a higher level than the anti-socialist Darwinists.²²

Another way that Darwinism served the socialist cause was by destroying one of the props of the status quo--religion. Bebel, who was intensely anticlerical and waged a life-long campaign against religion, found the anti-religious implications of evolution especially appealing.²³ He and his socialist compatriots saw science and religion as antagonistic disciplines and looked forward to the day when the former would entirely supplant the latter. In the meantime, they would wage war on the side of science.

Bebel divulged his hostility to religion by translating a book attacking Christianity from French to German, as well as by speaking and publishing pamphlets of his own opposing Christianity and religion in general. He confided to Kautsky that the purpose of one of his pamphlets, *Die Mohamedanisch-Arabische Kulturperiode* (1884, *The Mohammedan-Arabian Period of Culture*), was to wipe out Christianity.²⁴

In this pamphlet, as well as in the book he translated, there is no explicit discussion of evolution, but both clearly express the idea that religion is the result of ignorance concerning nature; thus science is the proper antidote for religion. According to Bebel, "The religious ideas hang together in the closest way to the knowledge of nature."²⁵ In an 1872 Reichstag speech Bebel contrasted religion and science, claiming that both Catholicism and Protestantism stand in

contradiction to the most modern principles themselves, just as to actual science. . . . A man who . . . has acquainted himself with the researches and results of recent science, cannot possibly still believe in religious dogma . . . All religious dogma stands in contradiction to sound reason and science.²⁶

Evolutionary theory, of course, belonged to the "recent science" to which Bebel was alluding.

Elsewhere in his writings, Bebel explicitly appealed to evolutionary theory as a refutation of religion and a prop for atheism. In *Christentum* he wrote:

But I have occupied myself a little with cultural history and natural science and have thereby found, that for a brain capable of thinking and somewhat familiar with the research and discoveries of natural science, it must be quite difficult to believe in Christianity as the "best and most perfect." The facts alone, which recent natural science has established in an irrefutable manner about the origin and age of the earth, [and] about the origin and evolution of humans, remove from Christianity the ground on which it stands, and bring it down.²⁷

Bebel recommended Haeckel's, Büchner's, and Vogt's books as works scientifically demonstrating the untenability of religion, though he lamented that Haeckel and other Darwinists were not fully atheistic, which Bebel considered the only position consistent with their scientific evidence and theories.²⁸ What he especially appreciated about evolutionary theory was that it provided an explanation for the origins of organisms without resort to a creator. In *Frau* he stressed that science now provided a natural explanation of the creation and evolution of humans, so all supernatural explanations are invalid.²⁹

Education and the enlightenment of the masses were Bebel's solutions to the ills of religious "superstition," and evolution and natural science would play a prominent role in this. During the *Kulturkampf* Bebel called on the state to strip control of education from religious institutions and to increase educational expenditures; by these means rather than through religious persecution, Catholicism could be stamped out.³⁰ He later elaborated, "The school must become a secular institution, and, in order to remove the students from even the private influence of the clergy, the curriculum must be directed toward the highest enlightenment of the students about the essence of religion and the church, [and] about the position of humans in and to nature."³¹ The latter point is a not-very-thinly-veiled reference to the teaching of evolution. Bebel, like Haeckel and many other Darwinists, hoped to

see the day when natural science and particularly evolutionary theory would replace all religious instruction.³²

Confusion over Natural and Social Laws

The course of Bebel's intellectual development diverged significantly from that of Marx and Engels, and this had tremendous implications for his conception of the relationship between natural and social laws. Marx and Engels had both embraced left Hegelianism as young men and then moved to dialectical materialism. Bebel, however, had little understanding of philosophy and was influenced by scientific materialism at the same time he embraced Marxism. Already in 1870 Bebel was using the Marxian language of historical materialism and stressing the lawful development of human society. He repeatedly referred to social development as "natural" and viewed each stage of society as the necessary and unavoidable consequence of the previous stage of development.³³ When Bebel grappled with Darwinism a few years later, he accepted its depiction of the subjection of nature to natural laws as confirmation for his view that laws also govern all phenomena in the social realm. Both nature and society were under the sway of immutable and ineluctable laws.³⁴ Because of this, Bebel saw Marx's and Darwin's achievements as parallel:

Now one may think as one likes about Marx and Engels, but one thing is certain: What Darwin [was] for natural history, what Darwin established with reference to the laws which govern the evolution of organisms, Marx has accomplished for human society and its institutions.³⁵

Whether nature and society were ruled by the *same* laws, though, is a different question, for which Bebel provided two contradictory answers--one consistent with the Darwinian emphasis on the close relationship between humans and other animals or between nature and society; and another based on Marx's and Engels' sharp distinction between humans and the rest of the animal world.

Just as Engels considered both nature and society subject to overarching laws of dialectical development, Bebel pointed to a unitary law of development in both

realms. In the midst of a discussion of biological evolution, he asserted that "the laws of evolution are also valid for society."³⁶ Bebel, however, never referred to this evolutionary law as dialectical and placed little emphasis on the dialectical laws explained by Engels. Though he was heavily influenced by *Anti-Dühring*, in which Engels expounded the dialectic, he did not seem to consider it particularly important.³⁷ Even though he formally defended the Hegelian influence in Marxism against those socialists wanting to replace Hegel with Kant, his writings evince little or no concern with Hegel or the dialectic.³⁸

Bebel's insufficient grasp of the Marxian dialectic may have contributed to his openness to carrying biological explanations into the social realm.³⁹ In every edition of *Frau* he quoted with full approval the Darwinist who wrote:

*The human may no longer view himself as an exception from the laws of nature, but rather finally begins to seek lawfulness in his own actions and thoughts and strives to lead his life according to the laws of nature. . . . Politics, morality, principles of law, which are even now nourished from all possible sources, will be fashioned only in accordance with the laws of nature.*⁴⁰

Like most Darwinian biologists, Bebel often stressed the unity of humans with nature and made it clear that the laws governing biological evolution were as applicable to humans as they were to all other organisms:

Our natural scientists should acknowledge that the laws of their science are also fully applicable to humans. Inheritance and adaptation are valid for humans just as for every other natural being. Since the human is no exception in nature, so must the theory of evolution also be applied to him . . .⁴¹

While this latter passage could be interpreted as referring exclusively to the physiological nature of humans and not to the social side of human existence, in other places Bebel forthrightly applied Darwinian principles to social life. In a passage remarkably reminiscent of Lange's *Arbeiterfrage*, Bebel argued that the reason talented and capable women do not develop to their full potential and succeed in

present society is because of restrictions placed in their way. Women's potential is analogous to that of myriads of seeds produced by plants that are never able to develop because of unfavorable external conditions. Bebel then added, "The same laws as those in nature are valid in human life," thus clarifying that he was not just using an analogy. This discussion is obviously influenced by Lange's concept of the struggle for privileged position, which was a conscious application of Darwin and Malthus to social experience. It is not clear in this instance, however, whether Bebel viewed these laws of nature as eternally valid for humans or whether they were only in force under present conditions; for he slipped the word "today" into this explanation: "Today it is in the human world as in the plant world."⁴²

In earlier editions of *Frau* it was more apparent that Bebel was indeed referring in this passage to the subsumption of society under eternally valid natural laws, for he closed the discussion with the following: "From all this we recognize the great importance of the laws of nature for the evolution and social conditions of society."⁴³ In the tenth edition Bebel altered this sentence, shifting away from his earlier biologizing tendencies: "From all this we recognize the great importance which social conditions, from the standpoint of the laws of nature, have for the development of the individual."⁴⁴ In later editions Bebel provided an even less naturalistic explanation by placing greater emphasis on the effects of the material conditions of life (presumably including the mode of production) rather than natural laws on social development.⁴⁵ This placed Bebel closer to the materialist conception of history and illustrates Olaf Rehberg's contention that in early editions of *Frau*, Bebel gave equal weight to natural and socio-economic determinants of human development; but with the ninth edition he clearly emphasized the overriding importance of economic and social conditions.⁴⁶

Even in later editions of *Frau*, however, Bebel never fully separated himself from the tendency to biologize society. He maintained that in order to understand the characteristics of the sexes or even peoples (races or nations), we must use the same method as natural science. Just as Marx had done earlier, Bebel gravitated toward environmentalist rather than Darwinian explanations: "It is the material conditions of

life which impress on each living being to a great extent its character traits; it is required to adapt itself to the extant conditions of life, which adaptations finally become part of its own nature." Bebel continued by asserting that humans are no exception and are subject to natural laws just like all other organisms.⁴⁷ If Bebel had confined himself to discussing human physiology as subject to biological laws, he would have been on safe ground. However, by bringing character traits of whole peoples and thus societies into the picture, he contradicted the Marxian viewpoint that he elsewhere articulated. He was more consistent with his Marxian world view when he wrote, "If climate, condition of soil, and nutrition essentially affect the physical evolution of a people, so it is the economic and social forms that influence its mental evolution."⁴⁸

Despite his tendency at times to place humanity and society under the yoke of natural law, Bebel often rejected the application of natural laws to society.⁴⁹ This manifested itself most clearly when Bebel had to confront the arguments of anti-socialist Darwinists, whom Bebel considered incompetent and ignorant in the field of social science. In his review essay on Woltmann's book, *Die Darwinsche Theorie und der Sozialismus* (1899), Bebel castigated most Darwinists, including Darwin himself, for their social views:

Without Darwinism one can grasp the laws of development of society in its various stages of development, but as a Darwinian, one can never understand the laws of development of human society, if one does not know scientific socialism and the historical materialism underlying it. Otherwise, one remains stuck in the crude, purely mechanical conception of Darwinism, in which the Darwinians almost without exception have remained mired.⁵⁰

In attacking Woltmann and other Darwinians who transferred evolutionary laws to the social realm, Bebel drew a sharp distinction between humans and animals. The difference is that humans have a social being or essence, which arose through the advent of human labor and the invention of tools.⁵¹ Bebel was either oblivious to or else deftly side-stepped any discussion of Darwin's conception that human social

instincts are only different in degree--not in kind--from those in the animal realm. In any case, in his review of Woltmann and in *Frau*, Bebel declared it illegitimate to apply biological principles to social development. In *Frau* he identified the key characteristic setting humans apart from animals as the human brain, which enables humans to gain knowledge of nature and consciously apply this knowledge to transform political and social institutions according to goals in their minds. Bebel stated, "The difference therefore between the human and the animal is, that *the human is certainly a thinking animal, but the animal is not a thinking human.*" The consequence of this distinction is that humans are not subject to all the laws governing unconscious animals, such as the Darwinian struggle for existence.⁵²

The Lamarckian and Environmentalist Emphasis

The evolutionary theory that Bebel incorporated with such alacrity into his world view was essentially that of Darwin and Haeckel--with one big exception. Like Marx and Engels before him, Bebel could not tolerate Malthus' population theory, and he was horrified with the idea promoted by most Darwinists that humans could not escape the ineluctable struggle for existence. His dispute with Darwinists over this point pushed him toward a non-Darwinian explanation of human evolution that placed greater emphasis on environmental influences and the inheritance of acquired characteristics than on natural selection. The sharp distinction Bebel drew between humans and animals thus led him quite logically to adopt two different evolutionary theories--one for the non-human biological realm and another for humans. The former was Darwinian, while the latter more closely resembled a synthesis of Lamarck's and Büchner's pre-Darwinian theories.

Because Bebel was more concerned with society and humanity than with plants and animals, the Darwinian side of his evolutionary theory received little attention. He occasionally confirmed his belief in the Darwinian struggle for existence in nature; however, he usually expressed this in passages in which he was contending

against its applicability to humans. Emphasis thus lay on the non-Darwinian evolution of humans.⁵³

Bebel criticized Darwin and his followers for their adoption of Malthus' population principle, which was anathema to Bebel, who assaulted "this brutal theory" in *Charles Fourier* and in *Frau*.⁵⁴ Malthus erred, according to Bebel, by ascribing to overpopulation and the lack of food the misery that was actually caused by maldistribution. Bebel argued that there was a superabundance of food and that many more people could be supported on the earth if it were distributed equitably: "Everywhere it is the social institutions and the mode of production and distribution of the products connected with them that produce lack and misery and not the number of people."⁵⁵ He also identified two other errors of Malthus' supporters. First, they failed to recognize that as standards of living increase, population growth diminishes. More importantly, they forgot that humans are higher than animals and can control natural laws. Like Lange and Büchner, Bebel believed that human reason provided a means to govern nature rather than to be ruled by it.⁵⁶

Bebel's rejection of Malthus' population principle entailed a concomitant rejection of the necessity of a human struggle for existence in the Darwinian sense. Indeed Bebel admitted that primitive societies found themselves in a constant struggle for existence. However, he maintained that in some places the abundance of food has relieved people of this concern. He further conceded that the struggle for existence has occurred and still occurs in human societies, including his own, but maintained that it is the result of the relations of production and private property, not lack of subsistence. Because he upheld Marx's view of immiseration and thought the chasm between the bourgeoisie and proletariat was widening, he even believed the struggle for existence was intensifying in his time: "In our social life the struggle for existence is taking on ever more powerful dimensions."⁵⁷ The struggle in present society is not an individual struggle, though. It involves groups within society and has become a class struggle. Despite the past and present operation of the struggle for existence among and within human societies, Bebel's view of humanity nourished a hope within

him that in the future the struggle would be superceded by human intelligence and reason:

The Darwinian law of the struggle for existence, that in nature culminates with the more highly organized and stronger organism destroying and displacing the lower one, finds in the human world the end result that humans as *thinking and perceptive* beings continually alter, improve, and perfect their conditions of life, i.e., *their social conditions and everything connected with it, so that finally for all human beings equally favorable conditions of existence are present.*⁵⁸

Unlike Büchner and some social Darwinists, Bebel did not desire social and economic equality in order to intensify the struggle for existence and thus further human progress. Rather he believed that human reason could eliminate completely the struggle for existence and all economic competition.

Since Bebel rejected the struggle for existence and thus natural selection as the driving force behind human evolution, he came to embrace an environmentalist view. Knowledge of the mechanisms of heredity were not advanced enough in the late nineteenth century to refute Bebel's standpoint, and Darwin and Haeckel also believed in the influence of the environment on heredity. Indeed, Haeckel's evolutionary theory presented the inheritance of acquired characteristics as an important evolutionary mechanism operating in conjunction with natural selection. Bebel's conception of human evolution was thus derived by purging Darwin's and Haeckel's theory of those aspects offensive to him, not by studying non-Darwinian evolutionary theories.

The conception of human evolution that Bebel embraced was entirely consonant with Marx's doctrine of the malleability of human nature. Bebel believed that in human evolution, changes could come quite rapidly, a view contradicting Darwin's more gradualist approach. Bebel stated, "Heredity on the one hand, adaptation on the other, play a decisive role in human evolution as well as in the animal realm, and indeed the human is the most flexible and pliable of all creatures."⁵⁹

When Ziegler attacked Bebel for upholding the inheritance of acquired

characteristics, Bebel replied in his 1895 foreword to *Frau* that numerous biologists still believed in it, including Haeckel, Huxley, and Büchner. Weismann's anti-Lamarckian theory of evolution had not yet won the day in biological circles.⁶⁰

Bebel's Lamarckian emphasis went hand in hand with his environmental account of the origin of variations in organisms. Instead of appealing to the purposeful activity of individual organisms responding to the environment, as Lamarck did, Bebel stressed the direct influence of the environment--especially economic and social relations--on human evolution. Bebel drew the following correlation between natural science and social life:

If through the application of these natural laws to the evolution of the human being we press forward to the fundamental causes, we find that power relations, character and physical characteristics of individuals, as well as of classes and entire peoples, depend first and foremost *on the material conditions of existence*, thus on the social and *economic power relations*, which are again influenced through the soil formation, the fertility of the soil, and the climate.⁶¹

The materialist conception of history was thus extended to explain not only the development of various forms of society, but also to explain the course of human physical and mental evolution. This explanation, especially with its allusion to the influence of the soil formation on evolutionary development, seems to bear the imprint of Marx's receptivity to Trémaux.

Evolution and Women's Equality

Bebel's environmentalist conception of evolution along with his view of the malleability of human nature had tremendous implications for his discussion of the position of women in society, the primary topic of *Frau*. He appealed to evolutionary theory to justify his position on female equality and to lend scientific plausibility to his social program. However, few scientists in the late nineteenth century favored women's equality, so Bebel had to cite them selectively and develop his own ideas on how to apply science to this area of social concern.

Darwin and most Darwinians were by no means sympathetic to women's equality. On the contrary, they emphasized the differences between the sexes and perpetuated the traditional view of female inferiority. By massing empirical evidence in support of their view of women, many biologists effectively made nature responsible for social inequalities. Darwin not only emphasized male superiority in physical strength and courage, but also thought men had greater intellectual prowess and "inventive genius." He believed many character traits were biologically inherent and sex-specific. Men have more bravery and pugnacity, but women excel in tenderness and selflessness, in his view.⁶²

Darwin ascribed the differences between the sexes to the twin evolutionary mechanisms of natural and sexual selection. He held the latter responsible for the physical and temperamental disparities between men and women, which emerged as a result of competition between males for the most favored females. Natural selection, however, contributed to male intellectual supremacy, since smarter men would have an advantage in providing for themselves and their families.⁶³

Bebel agreed with Darwin that the differences between men and women are considerable, including not only physical and mental traits, but also inclinations, such as the tendency to gossip, envy, etc. Further, he admitted that all these kinds of traits can be transferred from one generation to the next through heredity. However, because he upheld an environmentalist form of evolution, he did not consider heredity a significant obstacle, since it could be manipulated by altering the conditions of life. For Bebel, evolutionary theory provided a way to escape the problem of female inequality, since it denied the fixity of biological traits.⁶⁴

While agreeing that biological inequalities between the sexes presently existed, Bebel vehemently disagreed with Darwin concerning their cause. He rejected Darwin's reliance on natural and sexual selection with their emphasis on the competitive character of society. Although he admitted that the struggle for existence is operative in contemporary society, he regarded it a product of socio-economic conditions and considered it a malevolent force contributing to the oppression of women.⁶⁵ Instead of being formed by natural causes, he argued that biological and

psychological sex differences had been produced by eons of social and economic inequities:

If one considers the long duration of all these incongruities [between men and women] through hundreds of generations, one will no longer be astonished, that in accordance with the natural laws of heredity and evolution these phenomena have taken on their present extreme form through the continual effect of the same causes.⁶⁶

Although these differences have become hereditary, this does not mean they are irreversible. In fact, it is only because the social inequities persist that the biological inequalities linger. If social conditions are equalized, women will thrive in a way they cannot presently and will even achieve greater biological equality. Therefore, Bebel considered socialism the solution to the problem of women's inequality, since it would produce the conditions for women to reach their full evolutionary potential.

While Bebel thought the environment affected evolution directly, he also believed it indirectly promoted evolution through the inheritance of acquired characteristics that developed in response to environmental changes. One example was his treatment of the difference between the brain size of men and women, which, he explained, is greater among civilized than among uncivilized peoples. Bebel's explanation for this is that among civilized peoples, men receive more education and thus exercise their brains more than women, and this trait is then passed on to the following generation.⁶⁷ This illustrates once again Bebel's conviction that equality between the sexes is greater in primitive societies and diminishes through adverse social conditions spawned by economic inequality. In this example, the fact that men received more education than women was, of course, the result of men's superior economic position. If women were given an equal opportunity, they could also expand their brains (literally).

Directing the Course of Human Evolution

The doctrine of eugenics did not start to become popular in Germany until after 1890, and Bebel had no desire to intervene in the discussion over what measures

were best to control the quality of the human population. He knew the young eugenicist, Alfred Ploetz, and was acquainted with his work, *Die Tüchtigkeit unserer Rasse und der Schutz der Schwachen* (1895, *The Fitness of our Race and the Protection of the Weak*), but he withheld judgment on it.⁶⁸ However, although he never formulated a definite agenda for eugenics, he laid the groundwork for socialist receptivity to eugenical thinking in *Frau* by advocating the conscious control of the laws of nature to determine the direction of human evolution. He averred that if science can select the characteristics of animals so well using artificial selection, then "applying the laws of evolution to the raising (*Erziehung*) of humans will finally lead to the bringing forth of definite physical and mental traits, to being able to harmoniously develop individuals."⁶⁹

Although his advocacy of eugenics stopped short of proposing specific measures, he clearly thought that the introduction of socialism would create conditions favoring the improvement of the human species. This makes sense in light of his environmentalist conception of human evolution. In the early editions of *Frau* he wrote:

If therefore poor and unworthy conditions of existence of humans-- thus the defectiveness of social conditions--are recognized as the cause of poor and deficient individual development, from this it follows with necessity, that the *improvement of the conditions of existence will likewise improve human beings. Again the conclusion of this is: The consistent application of the natural laws which have become known under the name of Darwinism to the human being produces other humans, but also requires correspondingly other social conditions and leads therefore to the Marxian theory--to socialism.*⁷⁰

In later editions he rewrote this passage and backed off from the explicit claim that Darwinism leads to socialism. However, he remained committed to socialism as a means to manipulate evolution for specific goals:

It is therefore a matter of shaping the social conditions in such a manner that each person has the possibility for the complete untrammelled development of his being (*Wesen*), that the laws of evolution and adaptation, which after Darwin are characterized as Darwinism, come to efficacy for all persons purposefully and with conscious goals. But that is only possible in socialism.⁷¹

Two aspects of socialism appeared to Bebel especially conducive to the future evolutionary progress of the human species. First, the improved social conditions in socialist society would benefit everyone physically and mentally, and these beneficial, acquired traits would be passed on to following generations and would steadily increase. Secondly, socialism would introduce the purposeful control of nature and thus consciously attempt to select physical and mental traits beneficial to humans. Because Bebel viewed socialism as "science applied to all areas of human activity," it would replace haphazardness with rationality:

Humanity in socialist society, where it is first really free and placed on its natural basis, will steer its entire evolution consciously according to natural laws.⁷²

What set Bebel apart from mainstream eugenical thinking in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was his view of heredity. Many eugenicists became convinced adherents of Weismann's theory of hard heredity, i.e., that the environment has no influence on heredity. Bebel's environmentalist view of human evolution led him to quite different conclusions. For example, many eugenicists argued that the propensity toward crime was inbred, and thus some advocated sterilization or capital punishment as measures to rid society of this evil. Haeckel had argued this in *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*, and Bebel censured him for it, asserting instead that crime is the product of social conditions, and the alleviation of social problems would sweep away all crime and immorality.⁷³ Bebel also had far greater faith in education than most eugenicists; as we have seen, he even thought it could increase the physical size of the brain.

Evolution and Socialist Tactics

Many socialists--especially those of a more radical bent--have argued that the introduction of evolutionary biological ideas into socialist theory in the late nineteenth century stripped Marxism of its revolutionary edge by replacing dialectical materialism and praxis with mechanical materialism, and by fostering gradualism.⁷⁴ The problem with the first allegation is that it does not adequately distinguish between Darwinism and scientific materialism. Indeed there is some overlap, and Darwinism did contribute to the popularity of scientific materialism, but they are not identical nor are they necessary concomitants. The main works of the leading scientific materialists--Büchner, Vogt, and Moleschott--were published before the appearance of Darwinism, and scientific materialism attained immense popularity independent of the Darwinian theory. Further, the adoption of Darwinism into one's world view did not necessarily entail the acceptance of materialist philosophy. We have already seen that Lange, a Neo-Kantian philosopher, fully accepted the Darwinian theory while simultaneously arguing against the scientific materialists. It was not so much Darwinism itself that contributed to the inculcation of non-dialectical materialism in socialist ranks, as the propagation of a scientific materialist world view by some of the leading proponents of Darwinism in Germany. Büchner and Vogt began promoting Darwinian theory early on. Haeckel also preached materialism in his popular works on Darwinism.

In Bebel's case, neither the first nor the second allegation apply to him, since Darwinism had little or no impact on his policy of "revolutionary waiting." Being situated between a powerful German state on the one hand and the workers, who wanted concrete immediate reforms to improve their conditions, on the other hand, left Bebel few practical options other than parliamentary activity.⁷⁵ His sympathy for the workers, a product of his own upbringing and experience in the working class, and his desire for the immediate amelioration of their conditions bred a reformist impulse in him. However, his antipathy for the status quo and his adoption of Marxian theory kept him firmly upholding revolutionary theory while pressing for reforms and

campaigning for a seat in the Reichstag. As Brigitte Seebacher-Brandt argues, he was both an insider and an outsider, a parliamentary representative and a revolutionary.⁷⁶

Before Bebel studied Darwin, he had explained his views on revolution, which remained fairly constant for the rest of his career. He did not think it was possible to foresee whether or not a violent revolution would be necessary to transform society from private to social production. If violence occurred, it would be due to the resistance of those in positions of power to the natural course of events, not because of the planning of socialists. He claimed that only the defenders of the status quo "have it in their control whether things develop peacefully, according to nature so to speak, or if catastrophes occur."⁷⁷ Although Bebel often spoke of the natural development of society, he did not always equate natural with peaceful or gradual change. Once he wrote, "Violence cemented the Reich together in its present form, only violence can maintain it against its enemies, *with violence it will also finally perish*; that is natural necessity."⁷⁸ However, while he upheld the possibility of violent revolution, he usually emphasized that revolution could occur peacefully, unless the present rulers initiate violence in a fruitless attempt to stave off the inevitable.⁷⁹

The two primary reasons Bebel consistently counseled against an immediate revolution had nothing to do with Darwinism. First, he considered it impractical and counterproductive. He wrote to Engels:

It has not occurred to anyone to say, in the future we will walk the "legal" way; we have left no doubt at all about it, that the natural course of development will deliver power into our hands; the how we have not addressed; we have only disputed that we have the inclination to make the acquaintance of the new semi-automatic rifle.⁸⁰

Bebel was never one to shrink back from government intimidation and spent several years in prison because of his outspoken opposition to Bismarck's regime. His speeches, especially early in his career, were peppered with inflammatory talk of revolution. However, during the period of the Anti-Socialist Law, Bebel counseled against violent agitation and for limited compliance, since he knew the socialist party was not strong enough to openly challenge the Bismarckian state. Bebel's

commitment to revolution rather than gradual reform became evident in his response to Bernstein's revisionism. He decisively rejected Bernstein's critique of revolutionary Marxism and urged Kautsky to denounce their erstwhile friend.

The second reason Bebel consistently resisted the urge to organize revolutionary activity was his belief in the Marxian tenet of immiseration. He clung to the belief throughout his life that the coming social revolution would be preceded by a widening cleft between a shrinking bourgeoisie and the burgeoning proletariat. Time would thus play into his hands, since his party would undoubtedly grow. Another aspect of the theory of immiseration that fostered a waiting mentality was the view that the social revolution would be precipitated by the imminent, inevitable collapse of capitalist economy.⁸¹ To initiate a revolution before the coming collapse, which Bebel always thought was just ahead, would be premature and impossible.⁸² Darwinian gradualism thus made no inroads into Bebel's view of social development, which stressed revolution--or rapid change--through catastrophe.

Conclusion

Like Marx and Engels, Bebel saw evolutionary theory as a confirmation, not only of his anti-religious philosophical materialism, but also of his social theory. He tried to maintain the Marxian distinction between natural and social laws, but he did not do this as consistently as Marx and Engels had. Largely due to the influence of evolutionary theory, he blurred the distinction between humans and animals that was central to Marx's and Engels' treatment of the relationship between nature to society. One reason for this is that he propagated a non-Darwinian environmentalist theory of evolution that was easier to harmonize with socialist theory than the strict Darwinian theory with its problematic Malthusian heritage. Marx, we recall, also blended natural and social laws when he adopted Trémaux's environmentalist explanation for human evolution. However, Marx never published anything espousing these views, and Engels in the writings published during his lifetime usually commented rather favorably on Darwin's theory.

Thus Bebel was one of the first socialist leaders to publicly harmonize Marxism with a non-Darwinian theory of evolution. Bebel sometimes transgressed against his own formal distinction between natural and social laws, though he usually kept them separate. However, by promoting evolutionary theory so zealously in socialist ranks and especially by calling on it to establish his social views, he left an ambiguous legacy that contributed to the infiltration of biological concepts into socialist thought (an impetus that would have been strong even without his contribution to it). Kautsky, who studied Darwinism to a much greater extent than Bebel, would continue this legacy and attempt a much more thorough synthesis of Marxism and biological evolution.

ENDNOTES

1. Werner Jung, *August Bebel, Deutscher Patriot und internationaler Sozialist. Seine Stellung zu Patriotismus und Internationalismus* (Pfaffenweiler, 1988), 22-23.

2. August Bebel, *Aus meinem Leben* (Berlin, 1946), 1:92; Bebel, *Ausgewählte Reden und Schriften*, 6:77; see also Bebel to Ellissen, 11 November 1889, in Archiv der Parteien und Massenorganisationen der DDR, Bebel papers.

3. Bebel, *Unsere Ziele*, in *Schriften 1862-1913*, ed. Cora Stephan (Frankfurt, 1981) 1:74.

4. Bebel, *Aus meinem Leben* in *Ausgewählte Reden*, 6:371; Ursula Herrmann and Volker Emmrich et al., *August Bebel. Eine Biographie* (Berlin, 1989), 153-55. Francis L. Carsten, *August Bebel und die Organisation der Massen* (Berlin, 1991), 251-53, erroneously claims that Bebel did not study Marx much.

5. Bebel, *Aus meinem Leben*, in *Ausgewählte Reden*, 6:371.

6. Heinrich Gemkow, "August Bebel--Freund und Schüler von Marx und Engels," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* 5 (1963): 641-44; Gemkow, *August Bebel*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1986), 54; Vera Wrona, "Die theoretisch-weltanschauliche Entwicklung August Bebels," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 16 (1968): 348.

7. Bebel, *Die Frau und der Sozialismus*, 25th ed. (Stuttgart, 1895), xiv; see also Bebel to Ellissen, 16 December 1889, in Archiv der Parteien und Massenorganisationen der DDR, Bebel papers; Bebel to Wilhelm Liebknecht, 14 September 1874, in W. Liebknecht, *Briefwechsel*, 1:573.

8. Carsten, *August Bebel*, 238-39, 249; William Harvey Maehl, *August Bebel: Shadow Emperor of the German Workers* (Philadelphia, 1980), 2-3, 115.

9. Bebel, *Frau*, 25th ed., ix.

10. Marx to Engels, 16 September 1882, *MEW*, 35:95; Engels to Laura

Lafargue, 20 September 1882, *MEW*, 35:363; Engels to Johann Philipp Becker, 15 October 1884, *MEW*, 36:218.

11. Karl Kautsky, quoted in Heinrich Gemkow and Angelika Miller, eds., *August Bebel--". . . ein prächtiger alter Adler": Nachrufe - Gedichte - Erinnerungen* (Berlin, 1990), 55; Kautsky to Bebel, 14 February 1885, IISH, Bebel Nachlass, 113/14, 16 (also in Karl Kautsky, Jr., ed., *August Bebels Briefwechsel mit Karl Kautsky* [Assen, 1971], 28).

12. V. I. Lenin, quoted in Gemkow and Miller, eds., *August Bebel*, 17.

13. Bebel, *Ausgewählte Reden*, 1:520.

14. Fritz Staude, "Die Rezeption der Arbeit Friedrich Engels' 'Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staates' durch August Bebel und Clara Zetkin," *Mitteilungsblatt der Forschungsgemeinschaft "Geschichte des Kampfes der Arbeiterklasse um die Befreiung der Frau"* (1984, no. 3): 13-14; Herrmann and Emmrich, *August Bebel*, 218.

15. Gemkow and Miller, eds., *August Bebel*, 39.

16. Bebel, *Ausgewählte Reden*, 1:7; Bebel, "Die Nothwendigkeit der Gründung einer allgemeiner Partei-Bibliothek," *Vorwärts* 21 (20 February 1878) (also in *Ausgewählte Reden*, 1:481); *Frau*, 10th ed. (Stuttgart, 1891), 223-24.

17. Bebel to Büchner, 18 July 1868, in Archiv der Parteien und Massenorganisationen der DDR, Bebel papers.

18. Bebel, *Frau*, 25th ed., 10; 50th ed. (Stuttgart, 1910), 11.

19. Bebel, Reichstagsrede, 16 September 1878, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Deutschen Reichstages*, 4. Legislatur-Periode, I. Session 1878, (Berlin, 1878), 1:47-48 (also in *Ausgewählte Reden*, II/1:30-31).

20. Bebel, Reichstagsrede, 20 March 1884, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Deutschen Reichstages*, V. Legislatur-Periode, 4th Session. 1884 (Berlin, 1884), 1:168.

21. Bebel, *Die Frau in der Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft* [title of *Die Frau und der Sozialismus* during the Anti-Socialist Law], 8th ed. (London, 1890), 108-9; *Frau*, 10th ed., 195-97; 25th ed., 246-48; 50th ed., 258-60.

22. Bebel, "Die Darwinsche Theorie und der Sozialismus," *Die neue Zeit* 17,1 (1898-99): 484-86; *Frau*, 25th ed., viii-ix; Herrmann and Emmrich, *August Bebel*, 227.

23. Helmut Hirsch, ed., *August Bebel. Sein Leben in Dokumenten, Reden und Schriften* (Cologne and Berlin, 1968), 133; see also Vernon L. Lidtke, "August Bebel and German Social Democracy's Relation to the Christian Churches," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 27 (1966): 253-57.

24. Bebel to Kautsky, 31 January 1884, in Kautsky, Jr., ed., *August Bebels Briefwechsel*, 10.

25. Bebel, *Die Mohamedanisch-Arabische Kulturperiode*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart, 1889), 2; Yves Guyot and Sigismond Lacroix, *Die wahre Gestalt des Christenthums*, trans. August Bebel, 4th ed. (Berlin, 1898), xx-xxi.

26. Bebel, Reichstagsrede, 17 June 1872, *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Deutschen Reichstages*, I. Legislatur-Periode, III. Session

- 1872 (Berlin, 1872), 2:1080 (also in *Ausgewählte Reden*, 1:211).
27. Bebel, *Christentum und Sozialismus* (Hottingen-Zurich, 1887), 7.
28. Ibid, 11; *Frau*, 8th ed., 110; 10th ed., 197-98; 25th ed., 250-51; 50th ed. 262-63.
29. Bebel, *Frau*, 8th ed., 180; 10th ed., 8, 314; 25th ed., 9-10, 399-400; 50th ed., 10-11, 445-46.
30. Bebel, Reichstagsrede, 17 June 1872, 2:1082.
31. Bebel, "Das Papstthum und die soziale Bewegung," *Die neue Zeit* 4 (1886): 98.
32. Herrmann and Emmrich, *August Bebel*, 227.
33. Bebel, *Unsere Ziele*, in *Schriften*, 1:41-43.
34. Reiprich, *Philosophisch-naturwissenschaftliche Arbeiten*, 101; Wrona, "Theoretisch-weltanschauliche Entwicklung" 348, 358; Herrmann and Emmrich, *August Bebel*, 163; Olaf Rehberg, "Die weltanschauliche Entwicklung August Bebel und deren Widerspiegelung in seiner Schrift 'Die Frau und der Sozialismus' in den Jahren 1879 bis 1909. Probleme der Aneignung und Entwicklung der materialistischen Geschichtsauffassung durch Bebel" (diss., University of Leipzig, 1984), 5.
35. Bebel, in *Protokoll über die Verhandlungen des Parteitag der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands*, Hannover Congress (Berlin, 1899), 96-97 (also in *Schriften*, 1:434).
36. Bebel, *Frau*, 25th ed., xiii.
37. Lidtke, "August Bebel," 260; Gemkow, *August Bebel*, 43, 54; Bebel to Johann Philipp Becker, 20 November 1883, IISH, Bebel Papers, B 5/14.
38. Bebel, "Darwinsche Theorie," 487.
39. Rehberg, "Weltanschauliche Entwicklung," 31.
40. Bebel, *Frau*, 8th ed., 195; 10th ed., 341; 25th ed., 432-33; 50th ed., 479-80 (emphasis in original). Bebel was citing Friedrich Ratzel, who in turn cited Haeckel for this quote.
41. Ibid, 8th ed., 106; 10th ed., 188; 25th ed., 240; 50th ed., 256.
42. Bebel, *Frau*, 8th ed., 101; 10th ed., 182; 25th ed., 229-30; 50th ed., 243.
43. Ibid, 8th ed., 102.
44. Ibid, 10th ed., 184.
45. Ibid, 50th ed., 145.
46. Rehberg, "Weltanschauliche Entwicklung," 25, 12.
47. Bebel, *Frau*, 8th ed., 59; 10th ed., 113; 50th ed., 145.
48. Bebel, *Mohamedanisch-Arabische Kulturperiode*, 2.
49. Peter Jäckel, "Die Wirkung der philosophisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Arbeiten von Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels und den Führern der deutschen Sozialdemokratie auf die Arbeiterbewegung (1870-1900)" (diss., University of Dresden, 1972), 66.
50. Bebel, "Darwinsche Theorie," 486-87.
51. Ibid.
52. Bebel, *Frau*, 8th ed., 109-10, 211; 10th ed., 197, 368-69; 25th ed., 249,

- 459; 50th ed., 261, 504-5.
53. Bebel, *Frau*, 8th ed., 108, 211; 10th ed., 195, 368-69; 25th ed., 249, 459; 50th ed., 261, 504.
54. Bebel, *Charles Fourier. Sein Leben und seine Theorien*, 3rd ed. (Stuttgart, 1907), 184, 189.
55. Bebel, *Frau*, 8th ed., 208; 10th ed., 364; 50th ed., 501.
56. *Ibid*, 8th ed., 199-201, 211; 10th ed., 352-55, 368; 25th ed., xiv, 443-47, 459; 50th ed., 489-93, 504.
57. *Ibid*, 8th ed., 6-7, 14, 131, 211-12; 10th ed., 228, 369; 25th ed., 249, 293, 459-60; 50th ed., 261, 320, 505.
58. *Ibid*, 8th ed., 108; 10th ed., 195. See also 8th ed., 211; 10th ed., 368-69; 25th ed., 459; 50th ed., 504.
59. *Ibid*, 50th ed., 244.
60. *Ibid*, 25th ed., xv-xvi.
61. *Ibid*, 8th ed., 107-8; 10th ed., 194. See also 25th ed., 151-52; 50th ed., 154-55.
62. Darwin, *Descent*, I:257-58, 272, II:316-29; Cynthia Eagle Russett, *Sexual Science: The Victorian Construction of Womanhood* (Cambridge, MA, 1989), 2, 15, 40-43, 205-6.
63. Darwin, *Descent*, II:382-83.
64. Bebel, *Frau*, 8th ed., 59; 10th ed., 113; 25th ed., 142; 50th ed., 145.
65. *Ibid*, 8th ed., 42; 10th ed., 84; 25th ed., 107, 121, 147; 50th ed., 109, 124, 151.
66. *Ibid*, 8th ed., 61; 10th ed., 116.
67. *Ibid*, 8th ed., 105-6; 10th ed., 188; 25th ed., 240; 50th ed., 256; Russett, *Sexual Science*, 36.
68. Bebel, "Kritische Bemerkungen zu Katzensteins kritischen Bemerkungen über 'Die Frau und der Sozialismus,'" *Die neue Zeit* 15,1 (1896-97): 331; Alfred Ploetz to Karl Hauptmann, 31 August 1897, in Akademie der Künste zu Berlin, Karl Hauptmann papers; Peter Emil Becker, *Zur Geschichte der Rassenhygiene. Wege ins Dritte Reich*, part 1 (Stuttgart, 1988), 78.
69. Bebel, *Frau*, 8th ed., 110-11.
70. *Ibid*, 8th ed., 108; 10th ed., 195 (emphasis in original).
71. *Ibid*, 50th ed., 258; see 25th ed., 246.
72. *Ibid*, 8th ed., 214; see also 10th ed., 372; 25th ed., 462-63; 50th ed., 508.
73. *Ibid*, 8th ed., 133, 183; 10th ed., 231; 25th ed., 295-96; 50th ed., 322, 456-57.
74. See Introduction, n. 18.
75. Maehl, *August Bebel*, x.
76. Brigitte Seebacher-Brandt, *Bebel: Kunder und Karrner im Kaiserreich*, 2nd ed. (Bonn, 1990), 9-10, 86; Maehl, *August Bebel*, ix-x, 2-3. Carsten errs by underemphasizing Bebel's revolutionary side and his Marxist views (see *August Bebel*, 251-53), while Marxist-Leninist scholars often ignore his reformist and parliamentary side.

77. Bebel, in *Protokoll über die Verhandlungen des Parteitages der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands*, Jena Congress (Berlin, 1905), 297; *Unsere Ziele*, in *Schriften*, 1:49; Bebel, in *Protokoll*, Hannover Congress (Berlin, 1899), 121.

78. Bebel, *Die parlamentarische Tätigkeit des Deutschen Reichstages und der Landtage und die Sozialdemokratie von 1871 bis 1874*, in *Die Sozialdemokratie im Deutschen Reichstag. Tätigkeitsberichte und Wahlaufrufe aus den Jahren 1871 bis 1893* (Berlin, 1909), 44.

79. Bebel, *Akademiker und Sozialismus* (Berlin, 1898), 12.

80. Bebel to Engels, 11 March 1895, in Werner Blumenberg, ed., *August Bebel's Briefwechsel mit Friedrich Engels* (The Hague, 1965), 795-96.

81. Seebacher-Brandt, *Bebel*, 8, 11.

82. Hirsch, ed., *August Bebel. Sein Leben*, 318; Bebel, speech in *Protokoll*, (Erfurt, 1891), 172.