LAWRENCE GRONLUND AND AMERICAN SOCIALISM

By CHUSHICHI TSUZUKI

Werner Sombart wrote a book asking Why there is no Socialism in the United States in 1906 when American Socialism was still in its heyday. Nearly half a century later people wondered why there were any Socialists left in America, and Daniel Bell for that matter seemed quite satisfied that as a political and social fact Socialism had become 'a notation in the archives of history' in his country.\(^1\) Indeed history, if we look at it in its drab and uninspiring aspects, does appear to be composed of these notations, but this particular one is characteristic even of American idealism which is commonly and sometimes with ironies traced back to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. In fact, another notation in history recorded the days when 'Americanizing' was identified with 'democratizing' and as such was feared by the European upper classes.\(^2\) With the growth of industries after the Civil War which antiquated the Jeffersonian ideal of rural democracy, Socialism which had been brought over and constantly nourished by the European immigrants struck root and began to influence various currents of native idealism and produce a new economic radicalism. This article is an attempt to examine such economic radicalism propagated by Lawrence Gronlund, the first popularizer in the English language of Marx's Capital across the Atlantic.\(^3\)

* * *

Gronlund was born in Denmark on 13 July 1846. His education was interrupted by the Danish-German war of 1864 in which he participated, and in the following year he received an M.A. at the University of Copenhagen. There is little evidence available to illuminate Gronlund's social background and the reason why he emigrated to America. Probably he was not a political emigré like Louis Pio, his compatriot and a supporter of the First International, who in 1871 formed the International Labour Union of Denmark and after a period of imprisonment emigrated to America in 1877. Gronlund himself came over in 1866, was soon admitted to the bar in Chicago, and practised law there till 1879, when according to his own later account he became 'a full fledged Socialist'. 'I really started on the road to Socialism in 1876 by reading Pascal's Pensées, and formed gradually a scheme of my own, which in 1879 I found out was plain Socialism'.\(^4\) In this year he wrote a dialogue entitled The Coming
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Revolution which was followed by his major work The Co-operative Commonwealth in 1884. There is not much to be added to this autobiographical note, though it has been stated that Gronlund actually came to America in 1867, secured a position as a teacher of German in a Milwaukee public school and was admitted to the Chicago bar in 1869 as a practising attorney. These ambiguities, however, do not obliterate the fact that Gronlund studied Socialism largely under American conditions.

With the growth of industrial combinations on the one hand and land speculation on the other, the end of frontier, the safeguard of American democracy, was now fast approaching. The farmers' discontent found a vent in their social protest such as 'Greenbackism', the Farmers' Alliances, and Populism, and the workers' grievances led to the rise of trade unionism, Socialism and Anarchism. With these signs of popular unrest before his eyes, Gronlund carefully studied Marx's Capital which may have in fact been his Pensées.

The Co-operative Commonwealth in Its Outlines: An Exposition of Modern Socialism has been described as the first attempt by an American Socialist to write in English 'a comprehensive yet simplified analysis of Marxism for the man in the street'. In this book American phenomena and American conditions were examined against the background of Capital by a writer possessing 'the American bias for the practical', and perhaps for this reason or for some other he referred to Marx only once as a 'noble Jew' who fought against capitalist Judaism in our 'Jewish Age'.

In the way of illustration the author heavily relied on the 1880 U.S. Census, from which it was calculated that the employer paid the worker on an average $346 per capita in wages and exploited from him the sum of $324. Gronlund went on to define capital as the employer's original little wealth plus 'accumulated fleecings—accumulated withheld wages'. It is true, he continued, that the shortcomings of the capitalist or profit system had been perceived one way or another by various groups, and various cures had been suggested. Yet even trade unionism for which he predicted a great future was a poor remedy against the evils of an unrestricted private enterprise especially at a time when concentration of industries became 'the order of the day' and rendered the workers more dependent on their masters. He had no great faith in the half-hearted attempts to regulate the conditions of work by legislation such as an eight-hour day introduced for the Federal employees. The Greenbackers' demand for a lower rate of interest, he argued, would simply intensify the system of fleecing.

Gronlund for himself believed in 'a necessary link in the chain of progress' and the New Order that 'lies in the womb of time'. The remedy therefore was simply the question of how to help the birth of this future society. After this, however, he parted company with his own master, and his non-Marxist view of a revolution could largely be explained by the American conditions. The working-class, he now argued, was but a fraction of the entire population while the 'autocrats of our industrial affairs' dictated the whole government.
apparatus: therefore Socialism, if it were to succeed, could not remain as a class movement which had regard to this fraction only.\(^9\) It is true that Gronlund never doubted the existence of a rigid class line, exceptions to which, he said, could be cited only to mock the working-men. But he ruled out the head-on collision of the two hostile classes for his revolution. What he had in mind was the embryo of a higher synthesis, i.e. the minority of all classes who were socialist-minded and willing to help the advent of his new social order. He even regarded this minority as the vanguard of a classless society. Maybe his dialectic was peculiar and faulty; possibly he was under the influence of Proudhon whose own dialectic also transcended the distinction between the bourgeoisie and the working-class. At any rate his Socialism was to become a minority movement, itself a not very encouraging omen for his future activities.

Furthermore, Gronlund’s state was conceived as a social organism: it embodied ‘a corporate oneness’ and ‘a corporate individuality’. Every nation had its own spirit, and this spirit, he wrote, ‘generally lies deep, hidden, unsuspected until such a moment arrives as that with us, when Fort Sumner was fired upon; then rising as it were, out of an abyss it urges thinkers and actors resistlessly on to pursue, unwittingly, the loftiest ideal of the race’.\(^10\) This conception of the state as an organism led Gronlund to put duty in the foreground and relegate the rights of man to a secondary place. This, together with his view of Socialism as a national minority movement, would explain such salient features of his Socialism as his support for Bellamy’s Nationalism and a special emphasis placed on the ethical elements in society.

Gronlund’s ‘American bias’ for the practical now led him to describe the set-up of his Co-operative Commonwealth. Private profit will disappear when the means of production have been socialized. All land used for agriculture and industry will become part of a collective plant, but the land for the individual purposes will yield rent to the Commonwealth which derives its revenue solely from this rent and a percentage on every article sold. The Co-operative Commonwealth will be the sole merchant, and will establish great permanent bazaars. Money in the form of gold and silver will be replaced by the labour-ticket. Labour as such will become respectable as it performs public functions. Every branch of industry, agriculture, and also professions will form a distinct body as a trade union or a guild, and the chiefs of these bodies constitute the National Board of Administration. The Commonwealth as ‘Statistician’ will adjust supply to demand, and as a universal insurer will bear the cost of maladjustment. A political change will follow these alterations in economic conditions. The whole system of representation, particularly the party system, will be unfit for higher civilization, being a rude device for securing power to ruling classes with the aid of the lawyers. There will be only competent administration of things, a system of industrial democracy as he called it.—

The Co-operative Commonwealth was not a mature work of an original thinker. Yet it was unique in that the author sought the basis for his future Socialist state in the growth of industrial combinations in America as well as ‘the reflective minds of all classes’. The book seems to have been a great success in view of Gronlund’s later claim that at least 100,000 copies including the second and third editions had been sold. It helped to convert several prominent people to Socialism, such as J.A. Wayland, ‘a reincarnate Tom Paine for American
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radicalism’ as he was called, whose *Appeal to Reason* became by far the most widely-read Socialist publication in America by 1900, and Eugene Debs, the leader of the Railwaymen. It also exerted considerable influence on Bellamy’s *Looking Backward*, a popular Socialist literature.

* * *

In 1884 Gronlund went to England where his book and its latent anti-parliamentarianism recommended him to those Socialists who dissented from Hyndman’s political Socialism and who were soon to set up the Socialist League for themselves. Gronlund seemed much esteemed among them, was elected to the Council of the League at its first General Meeting, and worked for the League as a lecturer.

An English edition of his book was being edited by Bernard Shaw who had been authorized to ‘alter spelling, phrases &c.’ ‘By God,’ exclaimed Shaw, ‘I never read [such] English!’ The book was reviewed by Edward Aveling, the son-in-law of Karl Marx who complained of ‘insufficient acknowledgement’ given to Marx, but fresh from a struggle with Hyndman, he commended ‘the admirable attack upon Parliamentarianism’. Gronlund somehow did not like this edition which according to Aveling ‘knocked out’ the original dedication to the wife of the author. He managed to publish a rival ‘authorized’ English edition in 1885 in which the dedication was duly restored, and he declared in its preface that the coming revolution in England ‘will be brought about through the House of Commons’. England apparently bewitched him with its comparative stability and orderliness, and he was led to alter his critical views of parliamentary politics. This would perhaps explain the reason for his second English edition and also his sudden estrangement from the Socialist League in which Anarchist elements became dominant. He later openly regretted that ‘the great poet William Morris, who has done so much for Collectivism in Great Britain, despises political action’.

In 1886 he crossed the Channel and spent three months in an establishment called the *Familistère* at Guise in northern France. Jean Baptiste André Godin, the founder of this institution was a follower of Fourier and had a moral aversion to the industrial revolution and its consequences. In 1859 he turned his factory producing heating apparatus into a ‘palace’ for the workers, the *Familistère*. He established an aid-fund in order to secure decent minimum wages for all the workers employed and a reserve fund by which Godin’s own property would gradually be handed over to an association formed on the basis of cooperative partnership. Gronlund, however, came to abhor the ‘palace’ which he called ‘an immense, scrupulously clean tenement-house’. ‘It is just when I imagine the United States divided into 23,000 such “Familistères” that I shudder…. Intellectually and, moreover, socially,
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it is a failure'.

Gronlund seems to have attended a Congress of the French Co-operators held at Lyon in 1886, which was opened by Charles Gide, professor of political economy at the University of Montpellier, who became his life-long friend. He was asked by Gide to explain the paradox 'particularly surprising for the disciples of the school of Bastiat', i.e. how it was possible that Socialism had made such progress and development in America where the wages were high enough to permit wage-earners to become independent. He wrote an article for his friend, in which he stated that it was the standard of living that was high and this together with the stagnant rate of wages had contributed to the growth of Socialism. He also stressed the constructive side of American Socialism which in his view had been promoted by trade unions and the Knights of Labor and especially by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Gronlund had been preparing a new book entitled Ça Ira! or Danton in the French Revolution which was published in 1887 in Boston after he had returned to America and which now set forth his mature thought on a social revolution for his American readers. As the French Revolution had started with the intellectual activities of the philosophes, so the coming revolution, he declared, 'will, first and foremost, be a mental revolution, and be made by books'. Indeed, a conscious revolution would be achieved only by a determined minority, because there were so many selfish and indolent people. 'Danton knew this. This is the reason why revolutions are legitimate'. Marx devoted only a few lines in his Capital to the nature of the new social order, but now 'Anglo-Saxon Collectivism' would fill the gap left by Marx and finish the mental preparation for the coming revolution. Of course, 'Anglo-Saxon Collectivism' was essentially practical and experimental, and now in America, Gronlund entered upon a long and eventful career as a missionary advocating practical steps for a revolution.

The depression from which America suffered in the middle of the 1880's was accompanied by the 'Great Upheaval' as it was called, which centred around the eight-hour strike of 1 May 1886 and Henry George's Mayoralty campaign in New York in the autumn of the same year. As the Volkszeitung put it, the Socialists supported George 'not on account of his single-tax theory but in spite of it', and after the election at which George was defeated the uneasy co-operation came to an end. The United Labor Party which had sponsored George now concentrated upon the land problem and the single-tax remedy. Gronlund now wrote, as a warning to its members, a pamphlet entitled Insufficiency of Henry George's Theory. He merely stated that the value of both land and capital was created by labour, and that it was not capital and labour that were twin-sisters as George claimed it was, but land and capital as the means of production. He went on to declare that George's single-tax remedy would be a failure even as a fiscal policy. It would not yield such enormous revenue as he
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expected simply because of a likely shrinkage in land-value, the greater part of which was then purely speculative. Instead, he proposed such practical measures as the government control of telegraphs and railroads as the programme of the United Labor Party.24

The Standard, Henry George's weekly organ, repeated the editor's old criticism of State Socialism,25 and the General Committee of the United Labor Party, under the overwhelming influence of the single-taxers, decided to exclude Socialists, mostly the members of the Socialist Labor Party. Gronlund wrote an answer to George in which he declared that it was George himself who exploited and usurped the party which had been founded by the Socialists in conjunction with various labour organizations. Moreover, George turned out to be an extreme Free Trader, wrote Gronlund, and 'positively in love with the wage-system'.26

Another political campaign in New York in 1887 resulted in a crushing defeat for the United Labor Party which had nominated George for Secretary of the State. Probably the trade union elements became disappointed and lost interest in political action as the party had almost been wrecked by the factional struggle between the single-taxers and the Socialists.

* * *

Shortly after his return from Europe Gronlund joined the Socialist Labor Party, a Marxist body strong especially among the German immigrants in New York, which nevertheless was disowned by Engels for its narrow dogmatism. Although Gronlund became a member of its National Executive Committee, he soon found it difficult to co-operate. 'They certainly were as intolerant as now', he later recalled: 'they could speak only German at the meetings of the national committee, even when matters from English branches were pending, and when they resolved to lease a whole building for their business—devoting the basement to a saloon from the profits of which to defray expenses, I resigned'.27 He became increasingly concerned with moral aspects of a Socialist movement as he disapproved of the intolerance and dogmatism of the New York Socialists.

He then moved to Boston where he joined Bellamy's Nationalist movement and wrote a series of articles entitled 'Our Destiny' for their organ, the Nationalist. These articles which were soon edited as a book formally put an end to the 'Marxist' Gronlund, for the main theme of the book was to prove that Socialism was eminently ethical. The essence of morality, he now asserted, lay in our co-operation with the 'Universal Order', while the world of that order or what he called the 'Empire of Necessity' was revealed to us by science both in the sphere of mind and of matter. Morality in its complete form would be 'Collective Conscience' or the consciousness of our social self.28 This collective conscience would lead to Nationalism as well as to Socialism. It was the role of Nationalism to raise family interests one step higher by converting them into 'collective egoism'. American Socialists, he said, had every reason to foster patriotism, because 'we need only point to our Constitution, our Declaration of Independence, and the foundation laid by the Puritans'.29 Morals and patriotism were now
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placed in the foreground of Gronlund's Socialism. In fact, he was amplifying the arguments he had begun in his *Co-operative Commonwealth* by presenting Christian Socialism and Nationalism as the two hopeful signs of the mental or intellectual revolution. These movements, he maintained, would make the dividing line between the two contending forces vertical instead of horizontal, thereby dividing all classes so that we have still on one side the poor, the suffering, but also the noble, the progressive and patriotic, opposed to the ignorant and the selfish who find their advantage in the present social anarchy.

In 1889 when the Rev. W.D. Bliss organized the Christian Socialist Society in Boston, Gronlund urged him to secure the friendship of the working-class leaders by helping them in an eight-hour struggle scheduled for 1 May 1890. In Nationalism he was more deeply involved: he once wrote that 'the happiest effect' of his *Co-operative Commonwealth* was that it had led 'indirectly and probably unconsciously' to Bellamy's *Looking Backward* which preached the gospel of nationalization in a pleasing story. In this story a young Bostonian was made to wake up in the year 2,000 to find that the last vestige of human serfdom had disappeared as a result of the profound social change in which the industry and commerce of the whole country was entrusted to a single syndicate representing the people: thus the nation became the sole capitalist and the epoch of trusts ended in that of the Great Trust. This is what Gronlund constantly preached in his various writings. Now he declared that *Looking Backward* was to the educated classes simply what the German Socialists had been to the average working men—a mirror in which those who were dissatisfied with the status quo saw their own ideas reflected and thus became self-conscious. For him Nationalism was a cover for Socialism especially among the intellectuals, and towards the end of 1888 when the First Nationalist Club of Boston was set up for the study of Bellamy's ideas, Gronlund joined it and even showed great friendliness to Bellamy by ordering the sale of his own work to be stopped so as to accelerate the sale of the utopian novel. The Second Boston Club which was organized in the autumn of 1889 was more interested than its predecessor in putting some of Bellamy's utopia into practice and advocated the nationalization of telegraph and telephone and also of the coal mines. For a while after 1889 their movement gained a certain following, and 14 Nationalist clubs were set up in various parts of the country. Yet it faded away almost as suddenly as it had come into existence, when Bellamy dissociated himself from the Theosophists who had begun to exert considerable influence on the Nationalist movement. Through his brief co-operation with Bellamy, Gronlund must have come to realize the weaknesses of a predominantly intellectual movement, but he clung to it, for after all it was the only kind of movement that could provide a conscious minority committed to his commonwealth.

Gronlund secured a position in the office of Carrol D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor Statistics in Washington, D.C., where he seems to have worked from 1890 to 1893 and is said to have done most of the work of preparing statistical reports. Then overwhelmed by
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'a cruel sorrow', possibly a personal bereavement, he wrote, 'I might not have believed any longer that the life is worth living, if not to dedicate it to propagate in my country the Socialist gospel'. He was then living a life of extreme poverty, and his missionary tour became a tour of privation. He frequently slept in city parks and on more than one occasion slipped out of a lecture hall to crawl under the steps of the same building for a night's rest.

His tour brought him to a number of cities in the East and the Midwest, and he visited most of the colleges on his way, hoping to impress the students and organize them. 'As I proceeded towards the West', he recalled, 'I found the people more and more radical, and I would say more and more revolutionary, while the students and professors appeared to be animated curiously enough with a spirit more and more conservative'. He was duly shocked when a professor at the University of Colorado protested that 'none of us are so poor as to have an interest in turning to Socialism'.

In the meantime, a financial crisis in 1893 left in its wake one of the most severe depressions suffered in the United States, and another great upheaval of the discontented classes ensued. Eugene Debs's Pullman strike of 1894 has been described as 'the only attempt ever made in America of a revolutionary strike on the Continental European model', and Gronlund was rejoiced at the solidarity of labour displayed in it. Meanwhile, agrarian discontent grew into the Populist movement, and what was called 'Free Silver virus' increasingly affected their movement especially as President Cleveland sought to reduce silver as an act against the threat of inflation. When Gronlund visited Topeka, Kansas, the heart of the movement, he was greeted by Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Lease, the fiery orator for the Populist cause, with whom he exposturated on the errors of Greenbackism. He stayed at Denver for several months while writing a series of articles entitled 'What to do?' for the Populists. He looked upon the People's Party as 'the moral American party' which would accomplish for America what the Republican Party did in the Civil War, a salvation this time by means of the nationalization of railroads, telegraph and banking, which constituted part of their own programme. Gronlund now called for a close co-operation between the workers and the farmers and between the Socialists and the agrarian radicals, and ended his agitation with an appeal to form a Plebian party, 'the National party'. It is not surprising that the People, the organ of the Socialist Labor Party, made a malicious remark on 'the picture of Lawrence Gronlund in his present physical and mental decline trotted about by hurrah reform papers'.

Gronlund, however, was determined to carry on his missionary tour at all costs. At Denver he formed a fellowship similar to the English Fabian Society. It was reported that he was also organizing some Fabian groups in California where he found the people 'nearer ripe for the co-operative commonwealth' than anywhere else in the country. His activities

---

94 Gronlund, 'Une Tournée Missionnaire Socialiste à travers les États-Unis', Revue d'économie politique X (1896), 687.
95 Frederic Heath, op. cit., 101.
97 Selig Perlman, History of Trade Unionism in the United States (New York 1950), 137.
98 Gronlund, 'What to do?' Twentieth Century, 26 July 1894.
99 Ibid., 5 July 1894.
100 Ibid., 7 June 1894.
101 Ibid., 6 Dec. 1894.
102 People, 16 Dec. 1894.
103 Commonwealth, 2 March 1895.
as a Fabian organiser extended further to the State of Washington. He now preached solidarity, the cause of labour, which he said should replace the respect for business as our social ideal. In the Midwest he met Debs and found in him the most promising labour leader. Debs, however, was in a hurry, and in the new year issue of the Railway Times, 1897, he published a manifesto declaring that ‘we have been cursed with the reign of gold long enough’. At the special convention of the American Railway Union held in Chicago in June, Debs proposed to colonize several western states with those who believed in a co-operative enterprise. Gronlund now mildly remonstrated with Debs, saying that colonization must be a secondary affair, only ‘a stepping stone to the co-operative commonwealth, covering the whole United States’. Again in 1898 he wrote an article entitled ‘Socializing a State’, in which he declared that it was possible to bring a state to the threshold of Socialism by political action demanding state productive work for the unemployed, effective trade unions and obligatory arbitration. Debs himself soon abandoned his utopia and devoted himself to political action in conjunction with the newly formed Social Democratic Party.

* * *

Gronlund’s last book New Economy came out in 1898, but he was still leading a desperate life of dire poverty, literary work giving him but the poorest living. In the autumn of 1898 he wrote from his temporary dwelling in Chicago to Henry D. Lloyd, the well-known social reformer and the author of Wealth against Commonwealth, a critical study of the Standard Oil Company: ‘The next 3 months will be a serious time to me. I think a man has a right to commit suicide... when he cannot procure the means of living and thus can be of no further use. That unfortunately is the prospect with which I am threatened’. Lloyd asked the editor of the Chicago Tribune, with which he had formerly been associated, to boost the sale of Gronlund’s new book by a favourable review of it; he also gave Gronlund some pecuniary assistance. Jane Adams at the Hull House, too, called attention to his need for serious help. About this time he obtained a job as an editorial writer on the New York Journal, but he was not to hold this position for long. ‘Having spent many years in planning to lighten the burdens of his fellow men, Lawrence Gronlund put aside a well-worn pen and lay down to pleasant dreams of realization. He died unexpectedly early Sunday (October 15, 1899) morning of dropsy’, read an obituary note published in this journal. Physical decline and mental pressure, aggravated by his chronic state of penury and successive disappointments, apparently hastened the end of a missionary of Socialism. Yet he deserves more than a notation in an obscure journal. Indeed, it was with him that the term ‘Co-operative Commonwealth’ really entered the vocabulary of Anglo-American thinking, and his economic radicalism clearly showed Marxist origins, though it became increasingly ethical and national as time went on.
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