

which, despite its insistence, does not militate in favor of their own best interests, has its literary roots in the fiction of Charles Dickens (whose *Oliver Twist* Parr cites in the bibliography) rather than in that of Lucy Maud Montgomery (whose *Anne of Green Gables* she also cites). It is a book that ends rather than concludes. At the risk of being accused of asking for one of those up-beat endings usually insisted upon by editors of women's magazines, I would have liked a conclusion comparing the lives of these children with those of their Canadian contemporaries and with the lives they might have expected to live had they remained in Britain. Parr does, in her first chapter, give an outline of the type of life working class British urban children would live assuming that their families held together; she does not expand on what type of life they might have led had this not been the case, had there been no homes of refuge to take them in and had their been no child migration movement.

Labouring Children is a good read. It is also meticulously researched (from documentary and quantitative data) and intelligently written. Unfortunately the wide readership which such a description might imply is likely to be limited by the price of the volume—an appalling \$25.95 for a neat, nicely illustrated package of 181 pages. Although hard-core academics have brought themselves around to paying these prices to get useful information onto their shelves, it is not something that is likely to go over with the reading public. Nor is it something that can be asked of students. Fortunately, Parr has produced a practical solution to this last problem in the form of “The British Child Migration Movement,” volume 33 of the National Museum/National Film Board series, *Canada's Visual History*. Although, because of limitations of medium, not as rich as *Labouring Children*, this set of slides and its accompanying text offer a

satisfactory way of getting the material to the students. Screening it for your undergraduates, however, does not constitute a valid excuse for skipping the book yourself.

Janice Dickin McGinnis
Concordia University

COMRADE AND LOVER: Rosa Luxemburg's Letters to Leo Jogiches.

Edited and translated by ELZBIETA ETTINGER.

Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1979.

Comrade and Lover gives a spontaneous inside glimpse into Rosa Luxemburg, a woman of impressive public accomplishments. She climbed to a position of international leadership in the European socialist movement, reached thousands of people with her articles, speeches and brochures, and is still, sixty years after her death, to be found on most Marxist bookshelves. She fought for her beliefs with courage. She stood up in a world of men and outshone them. Her letters show the strength, clarity and tenacity which put her in that position. They also reveal a woman divided by internal conflict, doubt and low self-esteem.

Rosa Luxemburg was born in 1870 in Poland. She grew up at a time when her country was going through a process of rapid industrialization under Russian domination. She saw the desperate poverty of the working class, the new wealth of the leisure class, and the brutality of the Czarist police as they put down strikes and nationalist demonstrations. By the

time she graduated from high school, she was active in the socialist movement, and two years later, fled the Czarist police by moving to Switzerland. There, in 1890, she met Leo Jogiches, a political exile from Lithuania. He recognized her ability and became her mentor, critic and lover. He pushed her on to the path which took her into the top rank of European socialist leadership. They also entered into a struggle with one another, a conflict of hate, love, dependence and independence, which lasted the rest of their lives.

A year after meeting, they founded the Social Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland, the Polish Marxist party which was the forerunner of the modern Polish government. They lived within walking distance of one another in Zurich. At the age of 23, Luxemburg spoke at the Third Congress of the Socialist International and created a sensation. A year later she became editor of the Social Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland's journal and went to Paris to work on it and her doctoral dissertation. At the age of 28, her dissertation completed and in process of publication, she moved to Berlin to be at the centre of the socialist movement, leaving Jogiches behind in Zurich. The pain of this decision shows through in the letters. She knew that her rising career and the separation would endanger the relationship with the jealous and ambitious Jogiches, but she was determined to continue the work which drew her so strongly.

Within six months, Luxemburg had made a name for herself in the German Social Democratic Party and began her rise to international fame. Meanwhile she struggled with Jogiches' harshness and jealousy, her mother's death, her father's failing health, her own overwork and frequent illness. Finally, after much urging from Luxemburg, Jogiches joined her in Berlin in 1900 and, for the first

time, she had a taste of the settled home life she craved. It was not happy. Both were relieved when the 1905 revolution in Russia took Jogiches to Poland to work in the underground of the Polish Social Democratic Party. Again, his jealousy of Luxemburg was obvious. He would tell her nothing of what he was doing although she implored him to share it with her. He guarded "his" territory from her interference. When she paid him a surprise visit in Poland, he was furious. In March, 1906, they were arrested together while on vacation. She spent three months in prison, then returned to Berlin, free on bail. Jogiches was sentenced to eight years hard labour. He escaped a year later and returned to Berlin, but Luxemburg had broken with him and taken another lover.

Letters during the period of this split are business only, even avoiding personal pronouns. The 1905 revolution had created a split between Luxemburg and the German Social Democratic Party. She became very isolated. In 1907, she accepted a position teaching economics and spent two months in prison for "inciting the German people to violence," a result of her urging the German working people to follow the Russians' example. From 1908 to 1914, she wrote two books and hundreds of pamphlets, speeches and articles. She became the founder of the German Communist Party.

Her most urgent concern was the rise of militarism in Germany during those years. She accused the German government of dragging its people into a war which would benefit only the wealthy industrialists. Her fondest hope was that the working people of the European nations would see that the war was not in their interest and refuse to be turned against one another. She worked hard to reach thousands of people with this message. In February 1914,

she stood trial for inciting to public disobedience. She was not imprisoned, but stood trial again in June 1914 for accusing the army of mistreating soldiers. More than one thousand soldiers came forward to speak for the defense.

When war broke out, the German Social Democrats supported it, the people of Germany were swallowed with war fever, and Luxemburg's dream of a united European proletariat died. From 1915 to 1918, she was imprisoned for her own protection. She continued to write, and Jogiches came back into her life, taking care of her needs and giving her personal support through the bars of her prison. In November, 1918, she was freed. She and Jogiches lived and worked together, although her previous energy was gone, until she was murdered two months later. Her killers were members of a group which a short time later became part of Hitler's storm troops. Her body was thrown into a canal. Thousands came to see her empty coffin to the grave. Jogiches, determined to bring her murderers to trial, was assassinated himself two months later.

None of the return letters from Jogiches to Luxemburg have survived, but he comes through Luxemburg's letters as a harsh, unbending man. He was in his element in Lithuania and later in Poland, smuggling, conducting secret meetings, and sponsoring cloak and dagger activities. In exile, he was bored and restless. This, combined with a tactless sense of superiority, isolated him from other political exiles and made him a bitter person. In one letter, Luxemburg accuses him of: "behaviour . . . unbecoming to a strong, high-minded person—it fits an 'embittered all-time loser' . . . Everybody who turns to you gets the same treatment on principle—mockery, 'spitting and slapping' as you yourself put it."

She suffered much of his harsh treatment herself. In 1900 she wrote: "You feel called upon to preach at me and to play the role of my mentor always, no matter what. Your current advice and criticism of my 'activities' go far beyond a close friend's comments—it's just systematic moralizing. God knows, all that's left for me to do is to shrug my shoulders and cut my letters to minimum lest they provoke further disgusting sermons." An ascetic person, who believed that any happiness or love was time wasted which could have been spent on the revolution, Jogiches returned his lover's gifts and withheld affection. He seems to be a type of person whom one finds all too often on the left—a humourless, controlling man who manages to convince people that revolution would simply be dictatorship by such men.

On the other hand, Luxemburg was lively, emotional, practical and warm. She saw her own search for happiness as a natural outgrowth of her wish for a social system which would bring satisfaction to everyone. She said to him: "I keep harping on the worn out tune, making claims on personal happiness. Yes, I do have an accursed longing for happiness and am ready to haggle for my daily portion with the stubbornness of a mule."

She railed against his lack of feeling. In 1894 she wrote: "Your letters contain nothing but nothing except for the *Workers Cause* . . . I want you to write me about your personal life." And again in 1899: "I'm sorry about the bitter tone, but, my dear love, it hurt that you wrote only of business. Not a single loving word, and I was feeling rotten. I still do." Sometimes she tried to force what she wanted out of him: "I'll terrorize you without pity till you soften and have feelings and treat other people as any simple, decent man would. . . . So remember and watch out. I've gotten myself a rug beater and will start to beat you

the minute I get home.” But more often, she blames herself and belittles herself for her emotional, live-loving nature:

I know you don't get much pleasure out of our relationship, with my scenes that wreck your nerves, my tears, with all these trivia, even my doubts about your love It's too painful to think that I invaded your pure, proud, lonely life with my female whims, my unevenness, my helplessness. And . . . I cry over it, bitterly, but I do not know what to do or how. Sometimes I think it would be better to see you as little as possible but then I can't help myself: I want to forget everything and throw myself into your arms and have a good cry. And again this cursed thought creeps in and whispers, leave him alone, he is enduring it all out of kindness.”

The two of them seem badly mismatched. Why did the affair last so long? One reason was the common commitment to socialism. Another is simply dependence. Luxemburg leaned on Jogiches for support, direction, even content for her speeches and articles. She said early in their relationship: “Just give me a few ideas . . . writing is no problem for me.” And later: “Help, for heaven's sake, help! . . . The pieces I wrote are the dough (half baked) . . . we need. If only I knew what to write, the form would take shape then and there.”

She lived to please him, thrived on his occasional praise: “How you delighted me with your letter. I kept reading and re-reading it from beginning to end. At least six times. So, you really are pleased with me! And you know, don't you, that everything I do is with you in mind. Always. When I write an article my first thought is you'll be thrilled by it. And on days when I doubt my strength and can't work, one thought nags me, how will it affect you? Will I

be letting you down? Disappointing you?” Whenever Jogiches showed a little crack in his emotionless nature, Luxemburg rushed to pour some tenderness through the gap: “You ask, do I love you? In short, yes, yes, yes. I do love you, yes, ‘with a little passion’ too.”

Luxemburg often watched ‘normal’ people and longed to be that way. Her dream was of settling into a conventional relationship with Jogiches:

Oh Dyodyo, my golden one, if only you keep your promise Our own small apartment, our own nice furniture, our own library, quiet and regular work, walks together, an opera from time to time, a small, very small, circle of friends who can sometimes be invited for dinner; every year a summer vacation in the country, one month with absolutely no work! . . . And perhaps even a little, very little baby? Will this never be allowed? Never? . . . Oh Dyodyo, won't I ever have by own baby? And we will never fight at home will we? Our home must be quiet and peaceful, like everybody elses.' But you know, what does worry me—somehow I feel so old and homely. You won't have a handsome wife to take out for a walk in Tiergarten.

Rosa Luxemburg lived too early to see women, blacks and Third World peoples put emotion and full life into revolution. She did not live to see Chilean exiles singing and dancing, laughing and drinking as a statement of hope when all have lost loved ones to gunfire and the torture chamber. She tried to talk the Socialist International into supporting women's suffrage and was crushed when they refused, but she did not live to see women grouping together to insist that our emotions, intuition, openness and caring are necessary to revolution. She lived out her life apologizing

for exactly those qualities, not only to Jogiches, but to all the serious, bearded gentlemen who surround her in the photographs of Socialist International congresses.

Luxembourg belonged to three oppressed groups. She was Polish, a woman and Jewish. She did not discount these oppressions the way many of her male colleagues did, but she subordinated the liberation struggle of these three groups to the struggle for socialism. By doing so, she cut herself off from a critique of sexual and racial politics which worked against her again and again. Had she understood her oppression as a woman, she might have been more conscious of her dependence and longing for "normalcy," her apology for her emotional, intuitive, practical nature. She might have enjoyed herself more for what she was, instead of measuring herself against the ideals of Jogiches and the society she lived in.

Yet today, Rosa Luxemburg remains a model for us, a woman who spoke out clearly and courageously. Her thinking has lasted sixty years and influenced the course of history. And because of her letters, she has also survived as a woman struggling constantly with her socialization, her doubts and depressions. She died defeated and discouraged, and yet very hopeful. She reminds us that inner conflict and lack of confidence are the measure of oppression that a person has experienced, not of a person's power to bring about change!

Anne Bishop
Edmonton

WOMEN AND STATE SOCIALISM: Sex Inequality in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

ALENA HEITLINGER.

*Montreal: McGill - Queen's University Press,
1979. Pp. 241.*

The work under review, a revised Ph.D. dissertation written by a sociologist, is a welcome addition to growing literature on the status of women in socialist countries. The theme is the position of women in two socialist states, the USSR and Czechoslovakia. The approach, sociological in essence, does not omit the historical and the political. And rightly so. Because the writer has concentrated on two countries and included extensive statistical data, the study has the advantage of providing the reader with much factual knowledge not easily obtainable. The thirty-three tables contain data on issues ranging from "Percentage of time and hours spent on housework in Vancouver," to "New Dwellings in Czechoslovakia." An attempt is made, wherever possible, to draw comparison with women's position in Western societies. Often comparative statistical data is given for Canada, a welcome feature in particular for Canadian readers. The comparative approach adds scope to the work, thus helping one to see the question discussed in a broader perspective.

The book is divided into four parts. In Part I, entitled "Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Women," the three theoretical perspectives that analyse social relationships between males and females are discussed: the sociological approach of structural-functionalism; Marxist theory of domestic labour and reproduction of labour power; and Marxist theory of women's oppression. Part II, "Socialism and the Women's Movement,"