The Esperanto Movement

The Esperanto Movement

Peter G. Forster

MOUTON PUBLISHERS · THE HAGUE · PARIS · NEW YORK

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Forster, Peter G. (Peter Glover), 1944-
The Esperanto movement.
(Contributions to the sociology of language; 32)
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
1. Esperanto. I. Title. II. Series.
PM8205.F6 499'.992 81-22427
ISBN 90-279-3399-5 AACR2

ISBN 90 279 3399 5
 Typesetting: Grestun Graphics, Abingdon. – Printing: Krips Repro, Meppel. – Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer Buchgewerbe GmbH, Berlin.
Printed in The Netherlands

Jacket design by Jurriaan Schrofer

Contents

List of Tables

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations used in the text are also widely used in Esperantist publications. They are therefore mostly abbreviations of the Esperanto titles of the institutions concerned. Both English and Esperanto titles are given here, and further information can be obtained by looking up the English titles in the Glossary (p.395).

BEA *Brita Esperantista Asocio*
British Esperanto Association

CED *Centro de Esplorado kaj Dokumentado*
Research and Documentation Centre

CO *Centra Oficejo*
Central Office

D *Delegito*
Delegate

EANA *Esperanto-Asocio de Norda Ameriko*
Esperanto Association of North America

ELNA *Esperanto-Ligo por Norda Ameriko*
Esperanto League for North America

ICK *Internacia Centra Komitato*
International Central Committee

IEL *Internacia Esperanto-Ligo*
International Esperanto League

IPE *Internacio de Proletaj Esperantistoj*
International of Proletarian Esperantists

KKK *Konstanta Kongresa Komitato*
Permanent Congress Committee

KR *Konstanta Reprezentantaro*
Permanent Representatives

LK	*Lingva Komitato* Language Committee
MEM	*Mondpaca Esperantista Movado* World Peace Esperanto Movement
SAT	*Sennacieca Asocio Tutmonda* World Association of Non-Nationalists
SEU	*Sovetlanda Esperantista Unuiĝo* Soviet Esperanto Union
TEJO	*Tutmonda Esperantista Junulara Organizo* World Esperantist Youth Organisation
UEA	*Universala Esperanto-Asocio* Universal Esperanto Association

Introduction

Esperanto is often thought of as a marginal phenomenon in relation to society as a whole, yet it is a more interesting subject of study than might appear at first sight. In particular, it is generally seen by its supporters as 'more than a language'. The definition given in the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, i.e. 'name of an artificial language invented for universal use' will probably represent the limits of most people's knowledge of the subject. In Britain, at any rate, the reaction to hearing the name 'Esperanto' is often that it represents a lost cause, a dead or dying movement. Yet, such comments apart, Esperanto is of interest because of the widespread organisational implications postulated for the language; likewise the millenarian ideals which some of its supporters think can be realised through Esperanto. The 'Hymn' quoted on page vii is a good example of the latter.[1]

It is hardly surprising that the Esperanto movement is little known to the outside world. In the first place, although there is extensive documentation on the subject, the bulk of such printed material is written in Esperanto. As Esperanto is widely thought to be marginal, if its continued existence is even admitted, few outsiders have troubled to learn enough Esperanto to penetrate such literature. But in any case, as will be shown, Esperanto organisations represent a unique phenomenon and are difficult to categorise sociologically. It is hoped in the present work to indicate the features of the Esperanto movement which make it worthy of serious scholarly attention. The perspective adopted is sociological, but it is hoped that those of a wider range of interests will profit from consideration of the subject. It will be apparent that Esperanto provides interesting material for students of comparative linguistics, international politics, peace and conflict re-

search, and contemporary European history. In the same way, material in this study has been drawn from other disciplines. However, no claim is here made to specialist knowledge of any field but the sociological.[2] But my principal aim has been to *translate*, in an anthropological as well as a linguistic sense,[3] so as to present the history of Esperanto (interpreted sociologically) to a wider public than is presently aware of it. This study is based on a close investigation of the Esperanto movement from its inception in 1887 to the present day. The principal source material has been printed documents, which are abundant whether in the form of pamphlets, periodicals, booklets, or full-length volumes. But these have not been used in isolation, since contrary to many people's belief the Esperanto movement continues to exist. Advantage of this fact has been taken, and participant observation and questionnaires have been used to supplement documentary sources. For the purpose of collecting material I have attended a number of Esperanto meetings in Yorkshire and Humberside, plus two national and two international Esperanto congresses. I have also made a comprehensive survey by questionnaire of the membership of the British Esperanto Association.[4] It is worth putting on record that, with very few exceptions, Esperantists have shown themselves to be highly cooperative in a venture of this kind.

Within this framework, the more specific problem to be investigated will be the way in which Esperanto is linked to certain value orientations. The question of the wider claims made for Esperanto will be central throughout this study. This will lead to consideration of issues such as the Esperantists' self-conception as an 'Esperantist people' in its own right as well as the problem of the definition of 'neutrality'.

A study of a social movement cannot be undertaken satisfactorily without a declaration of the author's own involvement in it. I must declare that I am in basic sympathy with (though not uncritical of) the aims of the Esperanto movement. I have myself been a member of the British and the Universal Esperanto Association since 1959 (approximately), but I was not particularly active in the movement before commencing this research in 1968. I did attend meetings of the Manchester Esperanto Society in a purely personal capacity between 1962 and 1966, but was not otherwise very active. Yet this admission inevitably gives rise to questions about

the degree of objectivity possible. The question can be debated as to whether the believer or the disbeliever is in the best position to study religion,[5] or whether an anthropologist who is a total outsider is at an advantage or disadvantage compared with someone who has been brought up in the society concerned. It is, however, my belief that such debates have little fruitful outcome. Those who wish to investigate a given problem will do so anyway. The *difference* between an insider's and an outsider's report must be acknowledged, but it is impossible to say that overall the one is superior to the other. It has, too, been recently suggested in certain quarters that orthodox academic sociology has displayed a conservative bias and must be replaced by a critical/radical/insurgent/partisan approach to the study of society.[6] I should like to stress that, although my sympathies undoubtedly lie with the people about whom I am writing, and though my value judgements will have inevitably intervened in the present investigation, I do not see this work as part of such a tradition. It is true that in recent years there has been much debate about the question of 'value-free' sociology. Yet however interesting the questions might have been for clarification of the philosophy of sociology, the sociology of knowledge, and the status of 'theory', remarkably few guidelines have been given for an alternative tradition of empirical investigation: indeed, the possibility of such investigation has at times been denied. This work should therefore be judged as an exercise in academic sociology. It is, however, hoped that it can help to inform value judgements about Esperanto.

Esperanto can be summarised grammatically in its 'sixteen rules' (see Appendix I). As such it might appear to resemble a technical aid, analogous to devices such as shorthand and the Morse Code. Yet many of its supporters make much wider claims for Esperanto. A quasi-religious fervour is often associated with the language, and Esperanto is frequently linked by its speakers with the cause of world peace. Particular significance has been attached to the annual World Esperanto Congresses as a means of contributing to solidarity across national frontiers. There is also noticeable a remarkable veneration for Dr. Zamenhof, the inventor of Esperanto and initiator of organised support for it.

The perspective here employed is sociological, yet it is at once apparent that Esperanto fits uneasily into established sociological

categories. Various possibilities suggest themselves, especially 'voluntary association', 'sect', 'cult', and 'social movement'. Organised support for Esperanto contains features of all such types, though none of them fits the bill exactly. Organised support for Esperanto indeed contains many features of the voluntary association. Esperanto associations might simply be conceived of as clubs, with expressive functions predominating. Many local Esperanto associations describe themselves as clubs. Yet Esperanto is appealed to in wider terms, and its supporters mostly wish it to have a considerable influence upon the course of history. The evangelical, conversionist fervour of many members suggests something more than a mere club. Esperanto might alternatively be seen as having some sectarian characteristics. A sect is defined by Wilson as 'the small religious group in which membership is voluntary and conditional upon some mark of merit.'[7] Yet membership in an Esperanto organisation is not conditional upon some mark of merit: it is not even a requirement to be able to speak Esperanto, though it is an advantage for effective participation in the movement to be able to do so. And although the founder of Esperanto wished to associate it with his own religious ideals, this interpretation has not proved popular and Esperanto organisations have emphasised their religious neutrality. On the other hand, organised support for Esperanto resembles the broader conception of sectarianism adopted by Wallis. Wallis suggests that the concept of sect 'has to do with groups, organised around a common ideology, which in a variety of ways cut themselves off from, or erect barriers between themselves and the rest of society.'[8] Broadly speaking this definition would fit the Esperanto movement as interpreted by certain of its members, though others would reject it. Indeed, since 1957 it has been a deliberate policy of leaders of the Esperanto movement to avoid any suggestion of sectarianism.

In some respects, the sociological category of 'cult' is applicable. Yinger[9] suggests that the chief characteristics of such bodies are small size, search for a mystical experience, lack of organisational structure, and presence of a charismatic leader. As such, he points out, the cult represents a sharper break than does the sect from the dominant religious tradition of a society, and it also tends to be unstable. This type bears a resemblance to the early stages of organised international support for Esperanto, while still under

Zamenhof's leadership. At the beginning of the twentieth century the founder of Esperanto wished to associate it with a universal religion. This was derived from certain intellectual currents in Judaism, but was transposed into the much broader cultural context of international relations in Europe. In the event, however, Zamenhof's attempts to obtain substantial support for his religious ideals were completely unsuccessful, and the mainstream Esperanto movement quickly became secularised.

The Esperantists themselves refer to their organisations collectively as the Esperanto 'movement' (*movado* in Esperanto). This term will be employed here, while recognising that some sociologists have adopted a narrower definition. Smelser,[10] for instance, regards social movements as worthy of detailed consideration only when they become part of the conventional social order: when they are successful. This is a view followed by Banks, who refers to social movements as 'self-conscious and successful attempts to introduce innovations into a social system'.[11] Others, such as Heberle,[12] treat social movements strictly within the framework of political sociology; yet others, such as Kornhauser,[13] refer to 'mass' social movements. The Esperanto movement is in no sense a mass movement, it has a highly ambiguous attitude towards politics, and its aims have not been achieved in an instrumental sense. Many who emphasise the expressive component of the movement – the intrinsic value of its social relationships – would claim it to be successful, but this is a different matter from saying that its aims have been achieved. In one respect, however, sociological categories derived from the study of social movements are very clearly applicable. The perspectives of the Esperanto movement can be clearly articulated in accordance with Smelser's distinction between norm- and value-oriented movements.[14] While some Esperantists emphasise its advantages for trade, conferences, travel, and the like (norm-oriented), others emphasise an idealistic attitude, seeing Esperanto as contributing to world peace, justice, and brotherhood of mankind (value-oriented). This distinction is suggested here as an analytical one, and some Esperantists refuse to draw the distinction. It does, however, have an important basis in the history of Esperanto. The diffuseness of the aims of the Esperanto movement constitutes an important source of difficulty in assigning it to a sociological type. In particular there is the problem of identifying the distinc-

tive variant of innovation that Esperanto represents. An answer is therefore needed to the question, 'What is wrong with the world for which Esperanto is put forward as a solution?'.

A movement to support any given cause derives from a situation of strain. This notion implies that there are certain social situations which predispose a group of individuals to come together to propose some resolution or at least mitigation of a problem that has been identified. The question arises as to who suggests that there is such a strain, and how such an innovator succeeds in recruiting a following.

There are differing views on the subject of the nature of strain in a society. One dogmatic Marxist view is committed to the standpoint that it has been scientifically established that the only significant source of strain can be related to the class struggle. From such a point of view, any other position can be relegated to the category of 'petty bourgeois',[15] at best a distraction from the revolutionary cause. An alternative viewpoint might argue that it is highly debatable whether the course of history would develop in such an obvious way with such certainty. Various areas of strain might be perceived in a social system, but it cannot be said automatically that one is objectively valid and others not. As Aron points out:

> In the first place, it must be recognised that the idea of an immediate apprehension of objects, of an authentic reality, is itself an illusion which could only apply to a type of life mechanically adapted to its environment, either by instinct or by omniscience. Man, who is neither animal nor god, and who conceives real objects and values, can only interpret the world in terms of the meaning he attributes to his own existence. The notion of "fleeing from existence" has only a psychological, not a logical sense. The *petit bourgeois* who refuses to be a proletarian, because he regards culture and sentiments as more important than the amount of his wages, may be cowardly or blind in the view of Marxists, but from the standpoint of logic he merely has a different scale of values. The proletarian who transforms his situation by religious faith, and looks forward to a future life, may be resigned and stupid in the eyes of the unbeliever, but the criticism is just as metaphysical as the belief. Logically, it is a matter of different conceptions of the world. All self-awareness, and consciousness of one's own situation, implies a metaphysic and a moral theory, and what Marx regarded as authentic reality is only the expression of a particular philosophy.[16]

Esperanto is in any case not incompatible with some versions of Marxist philosophy, as seen by its vitality in many Communist countries. But even a different kind of radical view can reveal the complexities of social reality. In his useful discussion of power, Lukes draws attention to the problem of the dimensions involved:

> The one-dimensional view of power offers a clear-cut paradigm for the behavioural study of decision-making power by political actors, but it inevitably takes over the bias of the political system under observation and is blind to the ways in which its political agenda is controlled. The two-dimensional view points the way to examining that bias and control, but conceives of them too narrowly; in a word, it lacks a sociological perspective within which to examine, not only decision-making and non-decision-making power, but also the various ways of suppressing latent conflicts within society.[17]

Lukes aims to provide a solution to the problem which he outlines. His three-dimensional view

> . . .allows for consideration of the many ways in which *potential issues* are kept out of politics, whether through the operation of social forces and institutional practices or through individuals' decisions.[18]

Yet despite social controls, it is possible for strain to be pointed out. Becker suggests that this is the province of the 'moral entrepreneur'. The latter's function is to create rules in a given social situation (or to enforce existing ones); he can articulate grievances and propose solutions. As Becker puts it,

> Even though a practice may be harmful in an objective sense to the group in which it occurs, the harm needs to be discovered and pointed out. People must be made to feel that something ought to be done about it. Someone must call the public's attention to these matters, supply the push necessary to get things done, and direct such energies as are aroused in the proper direction to get the rules created.[19]

As well as leaders, a movement also requires followers. In his discussion of charismatic leadership, Worsley points out the need for a leader to have a relevant message. He cites the example of speakers in Hyde Park:

What these people lack, however, is a *relevant* message. It is not that they lack any message at all, for they often have quite definite messages, including some very radical ones. But they are in fact figures of entertainment, even fun, rather than serious potential leaders of movements and organizations, precisely because they possess only the technical trappings of personal leadership rather than the content. . . . Without the message, there can be no serious content to the communication. And it cannot be *any* message; it must, firstly, speak to unsatisfied wants in the hearers, and, secondly, offer them some promise of eventual fufilment.[20]

Likewise, Friedland points out: 'it is only when the message conveyed by charismatics to social groups is relevant and meaningful within the social context that authority emerges'.[21]

The question remains as to what constitutes the definition of social relevance. This admittedly is problematic when theoretical frameworks originally devised for the study of political social movements are employed, since the term 'social movement' is frequently reserved for those which are successful, i.e. have become part of the conventional social order. As already noted, this is the view taken by Banks, based on similar strictures by Smelser. Discussion might, however, centre on a movement which may not have become part of the established social order, such as the Esperanto movement here considered. The term 'social movement' is sometimes considered inadequate for treatment of such phenomena, but it has been retained here for convenience. As already noted, strain of any kind needs to be articulated by someone; the Marxian notion of 'class consciousness' recognises this. But rather than implying that there are 'objective' conditions of strain, it might be more accurate to consider the extent to which any given situation is perceived of as problematic. It is necessary to ask, 'by whom is this situation regarded as problematic?'. If the matter of 'relevance' is to have a part to play in the discussion, it is useful to consider the extent to which a given situation is thought of as one of strain, and how far a given solution to the problem is forthcoming. Billington proposes the useful notion of 'perceived strain'.[22] This incorporates a subjective element, the actors' definition of the situation, and avoids any overtones of 'objective' or 'true' solutions.

This perspective will be adopted here so as to enable consideration of a movement which has succeeded in perpetuating its

existence but has not, apart from spasmodic successes, become part of the established social order. A movement of this kind can often be regarded by outsiders with contempt or at least amusement, and supporters of it are frequently labelled as 'cranks'. The concept of a crank will be taken up in the conclusion, but at this stage it can be noted that even Lukes's three-dimensional view of power might be extended further. If the three-dimensional view points to the ways in which potential issues are kept out of politics, the analysis of power might be extended further to consider the ways in which the *radical agenda for change* is drawn up. Thus if Lukes's three-dimensional analysis is a radical view, it is even possible to conceive of a four-dimensional analysis which would be a 'cranky' view. In the latter view could be included anarchists and pacifists, for instance, and it will be seen that if interpreted in a value-oriented manner Esperanto would qualify for inclusion here.

Esperantists have tended traditionally to have a lukewarm, even hostile, attitude to governments as sources of support (though this has not invariably been the case). The emphasis has been on recruiting individuals, so that the movement would eventually become an effective force in the world. The practice of converting individuals to the cause is typical of religious organisations, which see every individual soul as worthy of salvation. Yet there also exist a number of nonreligious movements: vegetarianism, pacifism, and more recent currents of opinion which have striven to create 'alternative' societies.[23] These represent a distinctive form of subversive activity which stands apart from the more obvious kind of political action. Its adherents may not totally reject politics, but will have greater faith in other means of changing the world. It might be suggested that, by the side of the dominant value system, there exist established forms of deviance. By the side of capitalism there are established ways to oppose capitalism through socialist organisations. While one set of dominant values exists, there frequently exists a tradition of radical thought which indicates what it is important to oppose and how to set about it. Yet by the side of political radicalism, there remain the 'cranky' organisations. Such organisations have, not surprisingly, proved elusive for the sociologist. Killian[24] has already pointed out that little emphasis has been placed in modern sociology upon social movements of any kind, and Banks[25] further suggests an explanation of such

neglect in terms of the functionalist domination of twentieth-century sociological thought. This has made for a concentration on static phenomena, to the neglect of problems arising from the study of social movements, involving a dynamic perspective. If this is true for politically radical movements, which are relatively easy to identify, then it must be even more true of the study of the alternative subversive tradition here outlined.

Esperanto can be seen to be easily associated with this tradition. Vegetarianism, cooperative communities, nudism, pacifism, and similar causes have been linked by various individuals and groups to Esperanto. Yet at the same time there is nothing intrinsically subversive about Esperanto, and by no means all of its supporters would consider it in any way radical in implication. Yet the more subversive interpretation of Esperanto remains a significant feature among some of its supporters. In the succeeding chapters an examination will be made of the variations in orientation of Esperantists during the history of the organised movement, and a general assessment of the tradition of thought to which Esperanto belongs will be made in the conclusion.

NOTES

1. The 'Hymn' is reproduced in numerous places. See, for instance, L.L. Zamenhof, *Originala verkaro*, 1929, p.586. *Originala verkaro* will be referred to hereinafter as OV.
2. On the desirability of a certain amount of naivety about other disciplines, the approach adopted here follows that of M. Gluckman (ed.) *Closed Systems and Open Minds; The Limits of Naivety in Social Anthropology*, 1964.
3. For the notion of 'translation' in anthropology see J. Beattie, *Other Cultures*, p.31.
4. See Chapters 11–12.
5. See, for instance, R. Horton, 'Ritual man in Africa', *Africa*, 1964, pp.85–104.
6. I have stated my own position on such questions in a different context. See P. Forster, 'Empiricism and imperialism: a review of the New Left critique of social anthropology', in *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, ed. by T. Asad, 1973.
7. B.R. Wilson, *Sects and Society*, 1961, p.3.
8. R. Wallis, *Sectarianism*, 1975, p.5.
9. J.M. Yinger, *Religion, Society and the Individual*, 1957, pp.154–155.
10. N.J. Smelser, *Social Change in the Industrial Revolution*, 1959.
11. J.A. Banks, *The Sociology of Social Movements*, 1972, p.17.
12. R. Heberle, *Social Movements: An Introduction to Political Sociology*, 1951.
13. W. Kornhauser, *The Politics of Mass Society*, 1959.

14. N.J. Smelser, *Theory of Collective Behavior*, 1962, Ch. IX, X, and *passim*.
15. The term is used rather loosely; strictly speaking, 'bourgeois socialism' is the term actually applied by Marx to the kind of movement here considered:
'A part of the bourgeoisie is desirous of redressing social grievances, in order to secure the continued existence of bourgeois society.

'To this section belong economists, philanthropists, humanitarians, improvers of the condition of the working class, organisers of charity, members of societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals, temperance fanatics, hole-and-corner reformers of every imaginable kind. This form of socialism has, moreover, been worked out into complete systems'. K. Marx and F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, 1848, reprinted in *Marx and Engels: Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy*, ed. by L.S. Feuer, 1959.
16. R. Aron, *German Sociology*, 1964, pp.63–64.
17. S. Lukes, *Power: A Radical View*, 1974, p.57.
18. *Ibid.*, p.24.
19. H.S. Becker, *Outsiders*, 1963, p.162.
20. P. Worsley, *The Trumpet Shall Sound* (second edition) 1968, pp.xii–xiv.
21. W.H. Friedland, 'For a sociological concept of charisma', *Social Forces* 43, October 1964, pp.18–26.
22. R.H.C. Billington, 'The women's education and suffrage movements, 1850–1914: innovation and institutionalisation', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Hull, 1976, pp.19–21.
23. On this subject see particularly A. Rigby, *Alternative Realities*, 1974.
24. L.M. Killian, 'Social movements', in *Handbook of Modern Sociology*, ed. by R.E.L. Faris, 1964, pp.426–455.
25. Banks, *op. cit.*, p.43.

PART I

The World Esperanto Movement

1

Size and Spread of the Esperanto Speech Community

In order to introduce the subsequent discussion of the developments in the history of Esperanto, an attempt will be made in this chapter to assess the scale and geographical distribution of support for the language. This task is beset with difficulties. In the first place, sociological studies tend to concentrate in practice upon a social movement as it exists within the confines of a single society, or at most a small number of societies. Although many social movements are international in scope, it still makes perfect sense in most cases to examine them within the confines of a given society. Yet in the case of Esperanto, the whole *raison d'être* of the movement is international contact of some kind. The organised movement to promote Esperanto is itself international, and it conducts its business in Esperanto. This does not preclude the formation of national organisations to promote the language; yet the focus of attention for Esperanto tends to be the annual World Esperanto Congress,[1] and particular stress is placed upon the social relations which the movement facilitates within an international context.

The Esperanto movement, therefore, has to be considered within the general framework of international relations. This is a difficult exercise, since a wide range of detailed historical and sociological knowledge of many societies would be required in order to look at Esperanto in every country into which it has penetrated. This task has been lightened by various procedures.

In the first place, as will soon become apparent, although Esperanto is intended as a world language, for a long period of its history its base has tended to be European. Nearly all world Esperanto congresses have been held in Europe, and the headquarters of international organisations to promote Esperanto have always been in that continent. Thus particular attention will be

focused upon the context of international relations within Europe, and the consequences of European relations for the Esperanto movement. It will be apparent that, since Esperanto is expected to help to promote peaceful international relations, the two world wars will be of particular significance for the development of Esperanto.

In the second place, attention will be focused, for the international movement, not so much upon the relationship between Esperanto and the wider society in each country in the world, as upon the internal dynamics of the international movement. The way in which the organised Esperanto movement developed, from one World Congress to the next, will be a particular area of concern. It will however be recognised that such development has taken place within the broader context of European relations, and this will be noted where relevant. Thus the significance of the two world wars, the League of Nations, the Third International, the United Nations, and the 'Cold War' will be considered in their relation to the organised world Esperanto movement.

Third, the case of the Esperanto movement in relation to one particular society will also be investigated in relation to the dominant values and general recent history of that society. For convenience, Great Britain will be the society in which such questions are examined in particular detail.

Part I will therefore deal with the dynamics of the international Esperanto movement, and Part II with Esperanto in Britain. The British movement has, of course, played its part in the international movement, and this will be noted where relevant.

As an appropriate background for the examination of such questions, certain statistical information will be presented in this chapter about the scale and spread of adherents of Esperanto. Many observers have already noted the difficulty of such an exercise. Durrant remarks that

> Figures cannot be given with the same degree of definiteness as, say, for the number of motor-cars licensed for the road, where the existence of a motor-car, and payment for the right of use, are complete and finite facts. In dealing with an acquired language there is no such simple standard. This will be obvious if, instead of taking Esperanto, we consider some other language, such as French, and try to assess how many people speak it. Are we to take

for our conclusions the number of people living in France and her colonies? If so, this would not be realistic, as the majority of the inhabitants of the overseas territories speak only their own native tongues. Or should we also take into account everyone in other countries who has had French lessons in school? This would be equally misleading. In any event the number would be difficult to establish; further, the majority would have forgotten their lessons in which their degree of proficiency was often too dubious. It is similarly impossible to arrive at any authoritative figures for people knowing any system of shorthand, or, as another example, the Morse Code.

These difficulties beset anyone attempting to gather statistics of the number of Esperantists, where an overwhelming proportion of instruction and use has been the outcome of private initiative, of which no national society could be expected to secure and maintain up-to-date details. Of those who have participated in courses, some have emerged proficient and joined their national or sectional societies, some have remained unaffiliated – and these constitute the greatest number – while others have been less bright or diligent and have consequently not advanced far in their study.[2]

It is also important to exercise caution in relation to claims made by the Esperantists themselves. As Bodmer remarks:

> We should accept figures about its [Esperanto's] spread and popularity, when given by Esperantists themselves, with the caution we should adopt towards data about the vitality of Erse or Gaelic when those who supply them are Celtic enthusiasts.[3]

This stricture is particularly important in relation to the number of 'unorganised' Esperantists. Esperanto supporters are always at pains to point out that the number of Esperanto organisations is only the 'tip of the iceberg': that there are many more speakers of Esperanto who are outside the movement. That some such speakers will exist cannot be denied. Not all or even most of those who take Esperanto courses or teach themselves Esperanto through generally available textbooks end up joining the movement. There are also many competent speakers who lapse in their membership. However, the degree to which it is possible to use Esperanto without being a member of the organised movement is severely limited. It is possible to buy and borrow Esperanto books, or to maintain personal contacts already established through Esperanto; but it is not possible to form new contacts effectively without being a

member of some kind of association. There is hardly anywhere where it is possible simply to use Esperanto in the course of everyday activities. This assertion needs to be modified for one or two countries, especially in Eastern Europe, where command of the language is comparatively widespread, but on the whole the *effective* number of Esperantists is that of organised supporters. There are various kinds of organisation to promote and/or use Esperanto; some of these are small and loosely structured, while others are firmly established with a degree of bureaucratisation. In most countries there are local Esperanto groups in many centres of population. Most countries have national associations to promote Esperanto. There is also a world Esperanto association. There are in addition various specialist associations, for groups such as Catholics, railwaymen, scientists, chess-players, and several others. It is possible to be a member of any such group without belonging to any other Esperanto association.

It is true that since the Second World War attempts to consolidate a unified world Esperanto association have on the whole been successful; but at other times this has not always been the case. There have been disagreements on matters such as whether a world Esperanto movement should be based on national representation or not; and problems have arisen in relation to political neutrality. There are also formidable difficulties about the reliability of published statistics. Even in recent times, many figures seem to be rounded, suggesting that they are estimates rather than accurate counts. Other factors making for unreliability of statistics include internal disputes, bringing into existence rival national associations; exchange control problems; disputes between national and world organisations; political disapproval of Esperanto in certain countries; and the practice of certain national associations of returning separate figures for their youth movement. There are also problems relating to divided countries such as Ireland, Germany, and Korea. It has not always been clear, for instance, whether recent figures for 'Germany' include both East and West. Membership of the international movement can suddenly increase dramatically from one year to the next simply because a pre-existing national body in the country concerned has become affiliated to the world movement. Similarly, it can suddenly decline if an affiliated national association fails to submit full statistics.

Despite these reservations, some assessment of the state of Esperanto in various countries will be made for various periods in history. Nothing more than a general overview is here attempted. An exhaustive sociography of Esperanto would go further, would examine each national collectivity of Esperantists and assess the available statistics. This would be the subject of a book in itself, so here an attempt is made only to examine the scale on which the activities analysed in subsequent chapters are operating.

The founder, Zamenhof, originally issued a list of addresses (*Adresaro*) of those who had successfully passed a simple test of Esperanto in the first available textbooks. This was issued continually until the beginning of the twentieth century. The list was not cumulative, so the figures presented in Table 1 refer only to *new* Esperantists. Four different series are taken:[4]

1. Nos. 1–1,000, issued 1889.
2. Nos. 3,001–3,602, issued 1896 (covering 1/1/93–1/10/95).
3. Nos. 4,661–5,025, issued 1900 (covering January 1899–January 1900).
4. Nos. 9,261–11,199, issued 1905 (covering 1/1/04–1/1/05).

Table 1. *Statistics derived from Zamenhof's* Adresaro

(a) The first thousand recorded Esperantists. These were distributed nationally as follows; percentage in parentheses, as a proportion of total number of names recorded in the list.

Russia	925	(93%)	Britain	9	(1%)
Germany	26	(3%)	France	5	(1%)
Austria-Hungary	19	(2%)	Sweden	5	(1%)

Less than 1% (actual number in brackets): United States (4), Turkey (2), Spain (2), China (1), Rumania (1), Italy (1).

(b) 1 January 1893–1 October 1895

Russia	486	(81%)	Germany	13	(2%)
France	60	(10%)	Austria-Hungary	4	(1%)
Sweden	18	(3%)	Portugal	4	(1%)

Less than 1%: Argentina (3), Bulgaria (2), United States (2), Belgium (2), Britain, Turkey, Algeria, Egypt, South Africa, Australia, Denmark, Netherlands (1 each).

Table 1 (continued).
(c) January 1899–January 1900

Russia	209	(57%)	Austria-Hungary	8	(2%)
France	72	(20%)	Brazil	4	(1%)
Bulgaria	36	(10%)	Switzerland	3	(1%)
Belgium	12	(3%)	Spain	2	(1%)
Rumania	10	(3%)	United States	2	(1%)

Less than 1%: Britain, Sweden, Netherlands, Chile, Tunisia (1 each).

(d) 1 January 1904–1 January 1905

Russia	520	(27%)	Germany	31	(2%)
France	491	(25%)	Sweden	24	(1%)
Britain	308	(16%)	Mexico	24	(1%)
Austria-Hungary	211	(11%)	Belgium	21	(1%)
Bulgaria	81	(4%)	Switzerland	19	(1%)
Algeria	65	(3%)	United States	11	(1%)
Spain	44	(2%)	Netherlands	10	(1%)

Less than 1%: Tunisia (8), Malta (7), Brazil (7), Turkey (6), Canada (5), Denmark (5), Australia, India, New Zealand (3 each), Rumania, South Africa, Indochina, Dominica (2 each), China, Argentina, Portugal, Chile, Tahiti, Syria, Tonkin, Philippines, Ceylon, Guadeloupe, Cape Verde, Dominican Republic, Norway (1 each).

There was, in the late nineteenth century, no organised association of Esperantists on an international scale, though from the start the movement began to recruit internationally. Apart from figures derived from the list of addresses already mentioned, another source of statistical information is found in subscriptions to the official organ of Esperanto, called *La Esperantisto*. Table 2 gives an indication of the national distribution of such subscriptions; percentages (to the nearest whole number of percentage points) are out of the total number of subscribers.[5]

Even though some subscriptions were collective rather than individual, the total number reached by *La Esperantisto* can be seen to be small. The figures of 335 and 373 are scarcely large in relation to the vast population of the Russian empire. Taking these

Table 2. *Subscriptions to* La Esperantisto

	December 1892		December 1894	
	N	%	N	%
Australia	–	–	1	0
Austria	–	–	4	1
Belgium	1	0	–	–
Brazil	1	0	–	–
Bulgaria	3	1	7	1
Finland	–	–	8	1
France	10	2	27	5
Germany	124	23	92	15
Great Britain	1	0	1	0
Italy	4	1	5	1
North America	6	1	4	1
Norway	–	–	1	0
Portugal	1	0	13	2
Russia	335	62	373	63
Spain	2	0	4	1
Sweden	56	10	55	9
Switzerland	–	–	1	0
Total	544		596	

figures together with those derived from the list of addresses, it can be seen that the overwhelming majority of supporters, from the beginning, resided in Russia. This proportion diminished as Esperanto gradually spread to other countries, but the Russian contingent still remained substantial. Up to the mid-1890s Germany also seems to have been an important source of recruits, though by the turn of the century German recruitment was much reduced. The strength of support for Esperanto in Sweden until the mid-1890s is also significant: as a proportion of the population of the country concerned, it would rate higher than Russia.

From the early 1890s onwards, particularly significant was the growth of support for Esperanto in France. French recruitment steadily increased in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As French recruitment increased, so too did the strength of Esperanto in Bulgaria initially, and later in Britain and Austria-

Hungary. By 1904 Esperanto was steadily spreading to ever more countries.

The number of Esperanto clubs and groups in various countries can give some indication of the strength of Esperanto in various parts of the world. Stojan presents the information shown in Table 3 for 1912 and 1926.[6]

Table 3. *Figures for Esperanto groups*

	Number of Esperanto groups	
	1912	1926
Country		
France	226	101
Germany	273	441
Slavic countries	165	475
Britain	152	144
Spain	76	47
Hungary	42	47
Netherlands	31	51
Japan	26	181
United States	150	47
Continent		
Europe	1,245	1,492
Asia	39	191
The Americas	247	76
Africa	16	6
Oceania	28	11
Total	1,575	1,776

Stojan's figures for 1926 are derived from a survey by Dietterle,[7] in what appears to be the only systematic attempt to present a general statistical overview of the Esperanto organisations. This survey was conducted from Germany and almost certainly reflects better access to German information. Dietterle attempted to avoid exaggeration, but his procedures did not necessarily eliminate double-counting. Tables 4 and 5 are based on Dietterle's research. Table 4 indicates the number of Esperantists and Esperanto groups

Table 4. *Esperanto in European countries, 1928 (Dietterle's statistics)*

Country	Groups	Individuals	Density (individuals)	Base population (millions)
Albania	0	6	7.2	0.837
Austria	96	7,696	1,184.0	6.5
Belgium	26	3,359	447.9	7.5
Bulgaria	35	1,744	317.1	5.5
Czechoslovakia	116	8,967	622.7	14.4
Denmark	17	990	291.1	3.4
Estonia	16	784	712.7	1.1
Finland	15	825	229.2	3.6
France	101	5,237	128.6	40.7
Germany	441	30,868	488.4	63.2
Gibraltar	0	4	193.8	0.020638
Great Britain	144	7,855	173.8	45.2
Greece	3	1,968	298.1	6.6
Hungary	47	3,052	359.1	8.5
Iceland	0	24	235.2	0.102
Ireland	1	343	114.3	3.0
Italy	43	5,341	131.9	40.5
Latvia	10	1,498	832.2	1.8
Liechtenstein	0	1	93.3	0.010716
Lithuania	18	780	339.1	2.3
Luxemburg	0	2	7.7	0.261
Malta	0	7	30.8	0.227
Monaco	0	1	45.1	0.022153
Netherlands	51	6,649	886.5	7.5
Norway	5	380	135.7	2.8
Poland	51	4,690	158.4	29.6
Portugal	2	79	13.2	6.0
Rumania	15	1,912	109.9	17.4
San Marino	0	1	77.2	0.012952
Spain	47	3,591	168.6	21.3
Sweden	28	1,436	235.4	6.1
Switzerland	39	1,821	455.3	4.0
Turkey	0	49	3.6	13.6
USSR*	95	5,726	40.0	147.0
Yugoslavia	30	1,994	166.2	12.0
Total Europe	1,492	109,680		

* Dietterle's figure for the Soviet Union is an underestimate, according to Drezen.[8] In 1926 the Soviet Esperanto Union claimed 527 groups and a total of 16,066 organised Esperantists. This would produce a density of 109.3.

Table 5. *Non-European countries with at least 100 Esperantists, 1928 (Dietterle)*

Country	No. of individual Esperantists	Density	Base population (millions)
Japan	6,903	109.6	63.0
United States	4,845	41.4	117.1
Brazil	1,182	29.6	39.9
Australia	1,087	175.3	6.2
Argentina	445	43.2	10.3
Uruguay	416	244.7	1.7
China	393	1.2	318.7
New Zealand	324	249.2	1.3
Palestine	252	284.1	0.887
Cuba	207	57.5	3.6

World total: 126,575
European total: 109,680
Percentage of Europeans: 87%

for each European country, while Table 5 indicates the principal sources of strength outside Europe. The figures for 'density' are arrived at by dividing the number of Esperantists reported for the country concerned by its population in millions (*pro rata* for countries of less than a million population). The population figures are based on the nearest available census to 1926, and are drawn from the *Statesman's Yearbook*.

Taken in absolute terms, these figures suggest consolidation, and in most cases expansion, of Esperanto in the larger European countries – and in some smaller ones too, such as The Netherlands. The French contribution appears to be slightly weaker than at the turn of the century. German and Russian support for Esperanto has increased considerably. Esperanto remains an overwhelmingly European movement, the only strong non-European contingent (in terms of total numbers) being Japan.

In the interwar years, problems arose in the organisation of the world Esperanto movement, on the kind of structure to be adopted. The dispute was as to whether this should be a federation of national associations, or whether it should recruit members inde-

pendently of nationality. By 1922 a unified, 'umbrella' committee had been set up, though it operated in addition to, rather than instead of, the existing organisations. In Table 6[9] figures for various national societies are presented together with the total number of

Table 6. *Membership of national societies, 1923–1931*

National society	Number of members			Density		
	1923	1927	1931	1923	1927	1931
Argentina	357	338	300	34.7	32.8	26.3
Belgium	700	570	900	93.3	76.0	111.1
Brazil	210	290	250	6.8	7.3	6.2
Bulgaria	600	2,000	500	109.1	363.6	90.9
Catalan	450	600	300	(included with Spain)		
Czechoslovakia	1,100	500	300	154.7	90.3	68.0
Czechoslovakia (Sudetenland)	1,127	800	700			
Denmark	200	240	250	58.8	70.6	69.4
Estonia	378	382	350	343.6	347.3	318.2
Finland	620	220	70	172.2	61.1	18.9
France	800	1,292	1,587	19.7	31.7	38.8
Germany	3,531	2,230	2,114	55.9	35.3	33.4
Great Britain	1,500	1,200	1,957	33.2	26.5	42.4
Hungary	200	450	650	23.5	52.9	74.7
Italy	1,825	1,825	950	45.1	45.1	23.1
Japan	2,100	2,100	2,100	33.3	33.3	32.1
Latvia	–	110	150	–	61.1	78.9
Lithuania	500	1,115	1,195	217.4	484.8	497.9
Netherlands	295	325	1,300	39.3	43.3	164.6
Norway	200	100	100	71.4	35.7	35.7
Poland	700	689	–	23.6	23.3	–
Spain	425	300	400	41.1	42.3	30.6
Sweden	439	281	800	72.0	46.1	131.1
Switzerland	270	459	650	67.5	114.8	158.5
Yugoslavia	–	860	1,118	–	71.7	80.4
Total	18,527	19,276	18,982			
Universal Esperanto Association	6,352	9,100	8,835			

members of the Universal Esperanto Association (UEA), which recruited on a supernational basis.

The list is not complete, since not all national associations made their membership figures available. For 1923 and 1927 figures for density have been based on the same figures for base population as were used in Tables 4 and 5. 1931 figures for density have used as their base the population figures shown in the 1932 *Statesman's Yearbook*.[10]

The figures for total number of members represent a fairly steady support for Esperanto internationally during the period considered in Table 6. There is overall neither a dramatic increase nor a dramatic decline; there are, however, numerous local fluctuations, which are often quite substantial. For all the years under consideration, Germany represents the strongest support for Esperanto in numerical terms. A non-European country, Japan, comes in second place.

Figures for total number of members are of considerable significance to the extent that they determine which nations contribute most members to the international movement. Yet it can be seen that certain other nations have a particularly strong movement *as a proportion of their total population*. In order to elucidate this matter, figures for density will be examined. Tables 7 and 8 indicate the ten nations where density of penetration of Esperanto has been strongest, using figures already presented in Tables 4 and 6.

Table 7. *Density of penetration of Esperanto, 1926 (Dietterle's statistics)*

1. Austria	(1,184.0)	6. Germany	(488.4)
2. Netherlands	(886.5)	7. Switzerland	(455.3)
3. Latvia	(832.2)	8. Belgium	(447.9)
4. Estonia	(712.7)	9. Hungary	(359.1)
5. Czechoslovakia	(622.7)	10. Lithuania	(339.1)

A number of interesting features are revealed by these tables. It appears that, despite the relatively better information available for Dietterle for the German figure, this was not sufficient to put Germany in first place for density of penetration. It seems, too, that had figures for Austria been available for Table 6, this country

would also have been in a fairly high position in Table 8. From a general overview of these figures it is evident that the density of penetration of Esperanto was particularly high during the period

Table 8. *Density of penetration by membership of national societies, 1923–1931*

1923		
1.	Estonia	(343.6)
2.	Lithuania	(217.4)
3.	Finland	(172.2)
4.	Czechoslovakia	(157.4)
5.	Bulgaria	(109.1)
6.	Belgium	(93.3)
7.	Sweden	(72.0)
8.	Norway	(71.4)
9.	Switzerland	(67.5)
10.	Germany	(55.9)
1927		
1.	Lithuania	(484.5)
2.	Bulgaria	(363.6)
3.	Estonia	(347.3)
4.	Switzerland	(114.8)
5.	Czechoslovakia	(90.3)
6.	Belgium	(76.0)
7.	Yugoslavia	(71.7)
8.	Denmark	(70.6)
9.	Finland	(61.1)
10.	Latvia	(61.1)
1931		
1.	Lithuania	(497.9)
2.	Estonia	(318.2)
3.	Netherlands	(164.6)
4.	Switzerland	(158.8)
5.	Sweden	(131.1)
6.	Belgium	(111.1)
7.	Bulgaria	(90.9)
8.	Yugoslavia	(80.4)
9.	Latvia	(78.9)
10.	Hungary	(74.5)

1923–1931 in those countries which established or re-established their independent existence immediately or shortly after the First World War. One consequence of this had been the officialisation of a number of what were previously minority languages, some of which (Finnish, Estonian, and Hungarian) were also not Indo-European. Such minority language communities have provided a fruitful field for the development of Esperanto. A further factor is noteworthy. Apart from Germany and Austria, all nations represented in Tables 7 and 8 are either (a) other countries speaking minority languages (Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Bulgaria) or (b) countries divided internally by language (Belgium and Switzerland). Recruitment to the movement has continued to be stronger than average from those countries which speak minority languages.

Towards the end of the 1930s the number of Esperantists in the world was much diminished by Nazi and Stalinist pressures. The world movement recovered slowly after the Second World War, though a unified international movement was consolidated for the first time. This simplifies presentation of statistics, since the Universal Esperanto Association now constitutes an amalgam of representation through national associations and direct membership. Members of affiliated national associations become 'associate members' of the Universal Esperanto Association. On the whole, membership continues to be predominantly European, and until very recently European preponderance tended to increase. This change appears to stem partly from a conscious campaign by UEA to widen the basis of recruitment outside Europe, and partly from a decline in European membership. Table 9 shows some recent figures for European predominance.

In Table 10, each European country is considered separately. Those with no Esperantists recorded for any of the years under consideration are omitted. Figures for number of members refer to UEA membership, counting full and associate members together.[11] In the case of figures for density, however, if membership of a national Esperanto association as recorded in the UEA yearbook for the year concerned (whether or not affiliated to UEA) is higher than the recorded total UEA membership figure for that country, this figure is the one used to calculate density. To save space the base population is given only for 1964.

Table 9. *Membership of UEA, in Europe and rest of world*

	1954		1964		1974		1979	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Europe*	12,738	75	27,336	85	28,631	88	25,402	82
Rest of world	4,263	25	4,851	15	3,802	12	5,408	18
Total	17,001		32,187		32,433		30,810	

* 'Europe' in the sense here considered excludes the Soviet Union and Turkey; as membership in both of these countries is very small, this should not make for difficulties in comparing with data which include them.

Table 11 shows the ten countries with the highest density of penetration, in the manner employed in Table 8. Figures are presented for each of the four years under consideration.

The trend shown seems fairly clear. Luxemburg, Monaco, Vatican City, and possibly Iceland may perhaps be seen as freak results, since their small size has the effect that the national association rather than the local group is the unit of allegiance, with the effect of swelling the figures for national membership. In other respects it can be seen that penetration of Esperanto is highest in those European countries which speak minority languages: Scandinavian countries, The Netherlands, and, increasingly, the smaller East European countries. Lifting of Stalinist pressures has helped the latter considerably in re-establishing their movements. A great increase in membership can be seen for Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland in this connection. Yet this trend is not universal, and it is useful to examine some European countries with a noticeably *low* penetration of Esperanto. Table 10 shows no members at all for isolationist Albania, except in 1979. Also in Rumania, where Esperanto continued to meet with official disapproval (on linguistic, not political grounds) membership of UEA is negligible.

Weakness is evident also in a number of capitalist countries. In Portugal, where Esperanto organisations were virtually illegal until Spínola's *coup d'état*, membership has been very low. Ireland, Spain, and Greece also show low membership. In the larger European countries (Britain, Italy, West Germany, and France) the

Table 10a. *Membership of UEA in European countries, 1954-1979*

	1954	1964	1974	1979
Albania	0	0	0	1
Austria	580	306	380	384
Belgium	433	618	664	679
Bulgaria	4	4,719	5,184	4,208
Cyprus	2	1	1	0
Czechoslovakia	31	103	1,231	1,257
Denmark	1,200	1,021	546	470
Finland	317	270	498	637
France	1,064	2,040	1,435	1,263
Germany (D.R.)	0	2,413[b]	15	530
Germany (F.R.)	446[a]		1,565	1,444
Gibraltar	1	0	0	0
Gt. Britain and N.I.	1,585	1,367	1,379	1,124
Greece	9	13	431	14
Hungary	5	3,382	3,239	3,237
Iceland	38	24	22	40
Ireland (Republic)	23	7	34	7
Italy	1,321	1,310	1,575	1,438
Luxemburg	1	1	3	102
Malta	0	2	0	46
Monaco	0	26	35	2
Netherlands	1,174	1,299	1,152	842
Norway	864	613	507	469
Poland	5	3,392	4,361	4,266
Portugal	56	43	31	175
Rumania	1	6	13	36
Spain	523	721	742	485
Sweden	1,847	1,573	1,497	1,682
Switzerland	344	363	393	394
Vatican	0	0	0	1
Yugoslavia	864	1,703	1,698	169
Total	12,738	27,336	28,631	25,402

[a] For 1954, figures for Saarland were enumerated separately. These have been added to the West German figure.
[b] West and East German figures were not indicated separately, but most of this figure relates to West Germany.

Table 10b. *Base figures for density where different from those in Table 10a*

	1954	1964	1974	1979
Austria	–	–	–	1,863
Belgium	–	–	–	1,400
Czechoslovakia	–	3,270	–	3,600
Denmark	–	–	–	600
France	–	–	–	1,287
Germany (D.R.)	–	–	1,600	1,100
Germany (F.R.)	3,098*	–	–	1,500
Great Britain	–	–	–	1,256
Greece	–	–	–	400
Iceland	204	204	204	50
Ireland (Republic)	–		–	25
Italy	–	–	–	1,600
Luxemburg	–	–	120	–
Malta	–	–	15	–
Norway	–	–	–	500
Poland	1,100	–	–	4,621
Spain	–	–	–	550
Sweden	–	–	–	1,700
Yugoslavia	3,300	3,500	–	1,500

* Includes figures separately returned for Saarland.

tendency has been one of decline. UEA appears to be increasingly relying on smaller European countries for recruits; even here, some traditional areas of strength (Denmark, Norway and The Netherlands) have declined, and only the large influx from Eastern Europe seems to have saved UEA from a decline in membership. As will be seen, this has created certain tensions relating to the definition of 'political neutrality'.

In order to illustrate the European predominance in UEA, Table 12 shows the number and density of UEA members in those non-European countries with at least 100 members of UEA.

New Zealand forms an interesting exception to the trend for Esperanto to be more popular in countries speaking a minority language.

Table 10c. *Density of Penetration in Europe, 1954–1979*

	Density				Population
	1954	1964	1974	1979	1964 (millions)
Albania	0	0	0	0.4	1.6
Austria	84.1	43.1	50.7	248.4	7.1
Belgium	49.2	66.5	67.8	142.9	9.3
Bulgaria	0.5	575.5	595.8	483.7	8.2
Cyprus	3.9	1.7	1.6	0	0.574
Czechoslovakia	2.3	224.6	86.1	241.6	14.1
Denmark	279.1	212.7	107.1	117.6	4.7
Finland	75.5	58.7	106.0	135.5	4.6
France	24.9	41.9	27.6	24.2	48.7
Germany (D.R.)	0	(?)	94.1	65.5	17.0
Germany (F.R.)	58.2	41.7	25.2	24.4	62.0
Gibraltar	41.7	0	0	0	0.024
Gt. Britain and N.I.	31.2	25.3	24.6	22.5	54.1
Greece	1.2	1.5	49.0	43.5	8.5
Hungary	0.5	334.9	308.5	302.5	10.1
Iceland	1,307.6	1,090.9	940.1	227.3	0.187
Ireland (Republic)	7.7	2.5	11.3	7.8	2.8
Italy	27.8	25.9	29.1	28.4	50.5
Luxemburg	3.3	3.1	340.0	286.5	0.323
Malta	0	6.2	47.2	150.8	0.321
Monaco	0	1,300.0	1,521.7	87.0	0.020
Netherlands	109.7	108.3	84.7	61.0	12.0
Norway	254.1	165.7	126.8	125.0	3.7
Poland	40.0	108.0	129.4	133.5	31.4
Portugal	7.1	5.2	3.8	19.9	8.3
Rumania	0.1	0.3	0.6	1.7	18.8
Spain	17.9	24.0	21.9	15.4	30.1
Sweden	256.5	207.0	182.6	207.3	7.6
Switzerland	73.2	67.2	62.4	61.6	5.4
Vatican	0	0	0	1,000.0	0.001
Yugoslavia	195.3	189.2	82.8	69.1	18.5

In 1964 a survey of local groups was carried out by UEA.[12] This provides a useful complement to figures for UEA membership since many local group members are not members of their national association and thus do not appear in UEA membership figures.

Table 11. *Density of penetration of UEA membership by nation, 1954–1979*

1954		1964		1974		1979	
1. Iceland	(1,307.6)	1. Monaco	(1,300.0)	1. Monaco	(1,521.7)	1. Vatican City	(1,000.0)
2. Denmark	(279.1)	2. Iceland	(1,090.1)	2. Iceland	(940.1)	2. Bulgaria	(483.7)
3. Sweden	(256.5)	3. Bulgaria	(575.5)	3. Bulgaria	(598.5)	3. Hungary	(302.5)
4. Norway	(254.1)	4. Hungary	(334.9)	4. Luxemburg	(340.0)	4. Luxemburg	(286.5)
5. Yugoslavia	(195.3)	5. Czechoslovakia	(224.6)	5. Hungary	(308.5)	5. Austria	(248.4)
6. Netherlands	(109.7)	6. Denmark	(217.2)	6. Sweden	(182.6)	6. Czechoslovakia	(241.6)
7. Austria	(84.1)	7. Sweden	(207.0)	7. Poland	(126.8)	7. Iceland	(227.3)
8. Finland	(75.5)	8. Yugoslavia	(189.2)	8. Norway	(126.8)	8. Sweden	(207.3)
9. Switzerland	(73.2)	9. Norway	(165.7)	9. Denmark	(107.1)	9. Malta	(150.8)
10. Germany (F.R.)	(58.2)	10. Netherlands	(108.3)	10. Finland	(106.0)	10. Belgium	(142.9)

Table 12a. *UEA membership in non-European countries (with at least 100 members), 1964*

Country	Members N	Density	Base population (millions)
Argentina	357	17.0	21.0
Australia	272	24.5	11.1
Brazil	1,094	15.4	71.0
Canada	178	9.3	19.2
Israel	190	79.2	2.4
Japan	1,454	95.1	15.3
New Zealand	319	118.1	2.7
United States	407	3.4	192.0

Table 12b. *Non-European membership (as above), 1979*

Country	Members N	Density	Base population (millions)
Argentina	378	16.2	23.4
Australia	251	18.6	13.5
Brazil	1,094	9.9	110.1
Canada	261	11.3	23.0
Israel	253	81.6	3.1
Japan	1,475	13.0	113.1
Korea (South)	277	8.0	34.7
Mexico	127	2.0	62.3
New Zealand	206	66.5	3.1
United States	711	3.5	203.2

Table 13 presents the number and membership of local groups, together with a figure for density based on group membership. Most figures for base population are not presented, as they already appear in Tables 10 and 12. Where the base population has not already been given, this is indicated in parentheses after the figure for density. The survey was not as complete as could be wished, as many did not reply in certain countries, especially the Soviet Union.

Table 14 is based on the same figures, but presents a rank ordering of the ten countries with the highest density of penetration by local group membership.

There are a few differences in detail, but generally the figures for group membership substantially confirm the picture that is presented by UEA figures. The European predominance is still noticeable; 86% of local group members reside in Europe.

Table 13. *Local group membership, 1964*

(a) Europe Country	No. of groups	No. of group members	Density
Austria	38	573	80.7
Belgium	13	550	59.1
Bulgaria	139	6,025	734.8
Czechoslovakia	101	3,280	232.6
Denmark	40	923	196.3
Finland	9	191	41.5
France	52	1,693	34.8
Germany (F.R.)	122	2,034	32.8
Great Britain	59	1,443	26.7
Hungary	101	2,418	230.2
Italy	44	1,237	24.5
Malta	1	5	13.6
Monaco	1	40	2,000.0
Netherlands	68	1,593	132.8
Norway	25	504	136.2
Poland	69	3,493	111.2
Spain	30	1,710	56.8
Sweden	59	1,553	204.3
Switzerland	14	258	47.8
USSR	1	?	—
Yugoslavia	84	1,614	87.2

Table 13 (continued).
(b) Outside Europe

Country	No. of groups	No. of group members	Density
Argentina	11	730	42.9
Australia	3	270	11.0
Brazil	41	510	33.1
Canada	7	185	9.6
Congo (Leopoldville)	1	15	1.1 (13.6 m.)
Ethiopia	1	20	0.9 (21.5 m.)
Indonesia	12	?	–
Iran	1	8	0.4 (22.5 m.)
Japan	75	2,148	22.6
Korea (South)	5	243	22.1 (11.0 m.)
Mexico	2	50	1.3 (38.4 m.)
Morocco	1	22	1.9 (11.6 m.)
Mozambique	1	25	3.8 (6.6 m.)
New Zealand	24	424	157.0
South Africa	1	24	1.4 (17.5 m.)
United States	41	435	2.3
Uruguay	1	70	26.9 (2.6 m.)
Venezuela	1	30	3.7 (8.1 m.)
European total	1,070	31,137	
World total	1,299	36,346	

Table 14. *Rank ordering of density of penetration of Esperanto, by local group membership*

Country	Density	Country	Density
1. Monaco	2,000.0	6. Denmark	196.3
2. Bulgaria	734.8	7. New Zealand	157.0
3. Czechoslovakia	232.6	8. Norway	136.2
4. Hungary	230.2	9. Netherlands	132.8
5. Sweden	204.3	10. Poland	111.2

SPECIALIST ASSOCIATIONS

It is worth noting that, in addition, a number of associations exist for the purpose of linking Esperanto to special interests, whether ideological, recreational, occupational, or otherwise. These hold conferences of their own, often within the framework of the world congresses of the general movement. The following lists have been taken from the UEA handbook for 1954, 1964, 1975, and 1979. In the case of the latter three years the number of members was usually also recorded and this information has been reproduced here. The omission of an association does not necessarily mean that it has ceased to exist, merely that it has ceased for one reason or another to be listed in UEA returns.

1954

Catholics, Christians (Protestant), doctors, Quakers, railwaymen, science, Scouts, stamp-collectors, teachers, Universal League (an association linking Esperanto with world federalism).

1964

Architects and builders (137), authors, blind (591), Buddhists, Catholics (1,320), chess players (700), Christians (Protestant) (1,300), geography (340), journalists (316), lawyers (112), medical (250), nudists (250), photo, cinema, and tape amateurs, Quakers (160), railwaymen (2,500), science (680), Scouts, students (300), teachers, Universal League (13,634), veterans (671).

1974

Biblical and Oriental scholars, blind (550), car drivers (850), Catholics (1,100), chess players, Christians (Protestant) (1,250), journalists (350), medical (350), musical (80), ornithologists (220), philatelists (80), post and telecommunications (600), Quakers

(180), railwaymen (2,852), science (604), Scouts, tourism (356), veterans (763).

1979

Baha'i (175), Biblical and Oriental Scholars, blind (572), Buddhists, car drivers (1,150), Catholics (1,200), chess players, Christians (Protestant) (1,250), journalists (350), mathematicians (90), medical (350), musical (90), nudists (94), ornithologists (300), philatelists (60), philologists (151), post and telecommunications (700), Quakers (300), radio amateurs, railwaymen (2,816), Rotary, science (604), Scouts, teachers, tourism (302), veterans (910).

The number of members of the Universal League in 1964 was large because membership could be obtained by paying a single subscription. The veterans comprise an association of long-standing members, who learnt Esperanto at least 40 years ago.

THE WORLD ASSOCIATION OF NON-NATIONALISTS

The above figures do not include the non-nationalists (*Sennacieca Asocio Tutmonda*, SAT), a broad socialist Esperantist body which has at times discouraged its members from cooperating with the neutral movement. Table 15 indicates its strength for various years.[13]

It is intended that statistics presented in this chapter should serve as an introduction to the extent and distribution of support for the organised Esperanto movement. In the succeeding chapters the movement will be related to its social context in the principal countries where events took place that had repercussions for the international movement.

2

The Background of the Esperanto Language

The publication of Esperanto and the gathering of its earliest followers will be examined in both its intellectual and its political context. The intellectual context is that of a tradition of advocacy of constructed languages for both philosophical and more practical purposes. Although in popular usage 'Esperanto' and 'international language' are treated as practically synonymous, Esperanto is in fact only one of a large number of such proposals. Guérard[1] lists 97, and his list is complete only up to 1921. There is, however, a wide variation of extent of development of such languages. Whereas some authors have merely presented certain guidelines about how such a language is to be constructed, others have prepared detailed grammars and vocabularies. Yet Esperanto has undoubtedly acquired both the largest following and the most extensive development as a language. This has included the development of a wide range of literary work, both original and translated.[2]

Thus attention will be concentrated on Esperanto (and off-shoots from it). In view of this it will also be necessary to examine the political context in which Esperanto was developed. Esperanto was published in Poland in 1887, in the part which formed a section of the repressive Tsarist Russian empire. Thus supporters of Esperanto were liable to receive unfavourable attention from the Censorship, and eventually formally organised bodies to promote Esperanto were suppressed in Russia entirely. This situation of conflict with dominant powers has had important consequences for the ethos of Esperanto organisations.

The earliest known philosophical statement on the subject of universal language appears to be that of René Descartes. This appears in a letter dated 20 November 1629,[3] written to Father Mersenne. Descartes referred here to a proposal for a constructed

language which Mersenne had sent him, but did not say who the author was. Descartes made favourable remarks on the proposal, and outlined certain desirable principles on which a constructed language would be based. The new language would be devoid of grammatical irregularities, but would be designed for philosophical rather that everyday purposes. It would provide a system of universal symbols for things and notions, in a manner analogous to numbers. These would be easy to learn, write, and pronounce. Although designed as a philosopher's language initially, it would have a democratising effect on philosophical knowledge: '*les paysans pourroient mieux iuger de la vérité des choses que ne font maintenant les philosophes*'. Descartes did not sketch how this scheme would work in practice. The earliest writers to do this were two British scholars, Dalgarno and Wilkins.

George Dalgarno (1626?–1687), an Aberdeen schoolteacher, was interested in various linguistic innovations such as deaf and dumb language and shorthand. His proposal for a philosophical language was published as the *Ars Signorum*,[4] in 1661. It consisted of a logical classification of 'notions'. All knowledge was placed within 17 divisions, and to each of these was assigned a capital letter, thus A (beings and things); H (substances); E (events); K (political matters). Subdivisions were indicated by a small letter, from either the Roman or the Greek alphabet (Ke = judicial matters; Ku = war). Two further divisions could be made, thus words were formed with a total of four letters.

Dalgarno's proposals never had a wide circulation, but they influenced John Wilkins, Bishop of Chester (and brother-in-law of Oliver Cromwell) to produce his own scheme.[5] Wilkins (1614–1672), like Descartes, drew the analogy with numbers and also with mathematical and astronomical symbols. His scheme, published in 1668, was also based on classification of human thought, with 40 different basic classes, which in turn had their subdivisions. These could be expressed either as a pasigraphy – a system of ideographs analogous to Chinese characters – or by Roman and Greek letters in a manner similar to Dalgarno's system. Unlike Dalgarno, Wilkins also devised means of indicating parts of speech, such as distinction of object and adverb, and an ending was provided for the plural.

Dalgarno and Wilkins did not appear to obtain any disciples for their own schemes. These depended for their validity upon the

philosophical systems of the authors concerned, neither of which gained popularity in its own right. Quite different was the idea of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1716). Leibniz's proposals for a universal language have remained influential, though much of his work on this subject was not published until after his death. Leibniz early developed an interest in the subject of philosophical language and published some of his first thoughts on the matter at the age of 20.[6] He later became acquainted with the work of Dalgarno and Wilkins, and with Descartes's letter already referred to. He found that the proposals by Dalgarno and Wilkins were insufficiently philosophical. At various times he became interested in the idea of a language which, rather than being read as words, would consist of signs which would remind users of the thing or the idea signified. In accordance with this proposal, he developed an interest in ideographic languages such as Chinese and ancient Egyptian. He presented a 'logical calculus' based on the notion that all concepts were combinations of simple ideas. In this scheme, prime numbers are taken as symbols of simple ideas, and multiples of these as symbols of combinations of concepts.

Leibniz discovered that the problem of working out a scheme of this kind was more complicated and difficult than he had originally thought. Accordingly he developed a significant shift of interest away from a language constructed totally from elements represented by arbitrary symbols (an *a priori* language). He did not reject such a scheme as an ultimate aim, but until this was realised he saw that a provisional auxiliary universal language would still be useful. This was to be based upon the existing living languages, or rather Latin, the language of scholarship. Leibniz proposed to analyse grammatical and lexical complications into their simplest elements. There would be only one declension and conjugation, and these in turn would be made as simple as possible. Inflections would be reduced to the minimum, as in most cases they merely repeat information already supplied by prepositions or pronouns. Leibniz also reduced the number of parts of speech. Every noun is equivalent to an adjective accompanied by the word *ens* [being] or *res* [thing]. Thus *idem est homo quod ens humanum* [man is the same thing as human being]. Likewise every verb can be reduced to the single verb *to be* and an adjective, thus *scribit* [writes] becomes *est scribens* [is writing].

Leibniz merely made suggestions for a language of this kind, rather than compiling a detailed grammar and vocabulary. Yet his shift of interest from an *a priori* philosophical language to an *a posteriori* simplification of Latin (albeit reshaped for philosophical use) was a development of considerable importance. Proposals based on *a priori* principles depended for their validity on the author's philosophical system, and thus were unlikely to develop a following beyond that of their author. They were in addition very difficult to memorise. But *a posteriori* languages would be based on languages already in existence. They could claim to be simpler and more philosophically sound than natural languages, but need never make the claim of absolute perfection. Thus proposals of this kind were able to obtain wider support. In addition, the use of Latin as the sole medium of scholarly discourse was beginning to wane in the seventeenth century, leaving a gap to be filled. The role of a universal auxiliary could be particularly easily filled by a simplified version of Latin, with which scholars were still familiar. As will be seen, various proposals for reformed Latin continued to have their followers.

Yet proposals for a neo-Latin language for philosophers have not gained widespread support. The group for whom they have been intended is small and has consisted of people who would be unlikely to agree with any one scheme in all its details. Thus support was larger for proposals for which the inventor was prepared to organise a more broadly based following, consisting of those who would be more likely to accept the proposed scheme uncritically.

Thus a remarkable amount of support was obtained for a completely arbitrary scheme by Jean Sudre (1817–1866). Sudre, who was also a pioneer of telephony, proposed an artificial language derived from the seven basic notes of the sol-fa musical scale.[7] This scheme was known as Solresol. As well as being spoken in the ordinary way, this language could also be played on a musical instrument. If the seven notes were replaced by the seven basic colours of the spectrum, the language could be made specially suitable for signalling messages. A method was also devised by which the seven notes could be transformed into seven movements of the hand, in order to make the language suitable for the deaf and dumb. Sudre originally publicised the scheme at the age of 20, though he continued to perfect it until his death, after which his

widow continued to promote it. Sudre was active in promoting his system and had some measure of success in England and especially France. Victor Hugo expressed his approval of Solresol, and Sudre was presented to the court of Napoleon III. Sudre's widow formed a society for promoting Solresol in Paris, which still existed at the beginning of the twentieth century. The language was totally arbitrary, depending neither on *a priori* philosophical systems nor on *a posteriori* simpification of Latin or modern languages. It serves as an interesting example of how even a bizarre scheme can gain *some* supporters, provided that it is treated not only as a book to be published but also as a cause to be promoted.

A much larger following was obtained for a proposal by Johann Schleyer (1832–1912) of Konstanz, Germany, published in 1878.[8] This was the first scheme to be used as a spoken language and to develop a formal organisation of any size. Schleyer was a Catholic priest who, especially in later life, saw his work as divinely ordained. He was also inspired by philanthropic motives for the brotherhood of mankind. The scheme was known as Volapük [world speech]. Schleyer claimed that the idea of Volapük came to him as a revelation during a sleepless night. Schleyer also edited the journal *Sionsharfe*, concerned with Catholic poetry, and began to use this as a forum for popularisation of his idea. He published the scheme as a book in 1880,[9] which he destined to 'all educated people the world over' (*aller Gebildeten der ganzen Erde*). In 1881 Schleyer began to issue the newssheet *Volapükabled*. The number of supporters grew steadily, mostly in German-speaking countries. The first Volapük society was founded in Alberweiler, Württemberg, in 1882. By 1889 there were 283 Volapük clubs or societies throughout the world, and 25 Volapük journals (seven of which appeared entirely in Volapük). The number of Volapükists was estimated in that year to be one million, though this is almost certainly a wild exaggeration. It is also not clear whether a Volapükist was someone who was proficient in the language or merely a supporter of the idea. Yet Volapük developed the paraphernalia of an international language movement (such as identification badges), which Esperanto was later to acquire.[10]

Schleyer wished to develop Volapük so that it could translate the most subtle and complex meanings, and emphasised the richness of its vocabulary. His followers were proud of his talents as a poet

modifications of Volapük, whilst retaining the basic feature of mixed *a priori* and *a posteriori* elements.[11] These schemes differed considerably not only from orthodox Volapük but also from one another, and their sole supporter tended to be their author. A second possibility was to support Esperanto instead, and many did this, notably Leopold Einstein and, under his influence, other supporters of Volapük in Nuremberg.[12] *La Esperantisto*, the first Esperanto periodical, contained a series of articles criticising Volapük, during the period 1889–1890.[13] These were printed as a parallel text in German and Esperanto, so they could be understood by non-Esperantists.[14]

There remained a third option. Some ex-Volapükists continued to support the idea of an international language but for various reasons were unwilling to support Esperanto (one reason possibly being the Esperantists' reluctance to consider reforms). Rosenberger did try to recruit Zamenhof to the remains of the Volapük Academy shortly after the break with Schleyer, and again in 1894 (when Zamenhof proposed some reforms in Esperanto). Zamenhof refused to join, though he was originally prepared to consider doing so if the name was changed to 'Volapük–Esperanto Academy'. Rosenberger refused to do this and there was no cooperation with Esperantists.[15] The Volapük Academy now turned its attention to the principal viable alternative to Esperanto, a reformed version of Latin. Rosenberger initiated discussion on this question, and on the election of a new Director (the Rev. A.F. Holmes, an American) in 1898, this commitment was strengthened by a change of name to *Akademi internasional de lingu universal*.[16] The new project was known as Idiom Neutral. A vocabulary of this project appeared in 1902, in German,[17] but attracted little support since by this time Esperanto had become firmly established. Also there was disagreement among supporters of Idiom Neutral. After the schism in the Esperanto movement in 1908, some transferred their allegiance to the new project, Ido. In 1908, too, Holmes was succeeded in the directorship by the Italian logician, Giuseppe Peano. Peano had since 1903 been working on the idea of simplified Latin, *Latino sine Flexione*. After his attention was drawn to Leibniz's discussion of the subject he developed this interest further and in 1908 read a paper on reformed Latin to the Turin Academy of Sciences. This began in standard Latin, but suggestions for simplifications were

proposed, and immediately incorporated as Peano continued. The speech ended in *Latino sine Flexione*, or Interlingua. After Peano was elected to the ex-Volapük Academy, it became the *Academia pro Interlingua*. The new Academy did not confine itself to Peano's project, being concerned with a wide range of neo-Latin proposals in the hope of producing an eventual synthesis.

Thus when Zamenhof was confronted with the problem of strife between ethnic groups distinguished by language, there already existed a recognisable tradition of thought on the subject of international language; indeed, Volapük had received widespread support in German-speaking countries. Yet it presented a number of difficulties, especially to the non-German-speaker. The dissent that followed the 1889 Volapük congress made for irretrievable loss of authority for Schleyer's scheme, and no unified opposition to Esperanto was possible: indeed, there is evidence of some support for Esperanto from disillusioned Volapükists.

Zamenhof had been aware of some earlier attempts at construction of world auxiliary languages: but it appears that he found all previous projects that he was aware of unsatisfactory. Zamenhof investigated Volapük while a student; although Volapük had the advantage of being designed as a fully constructed language for all the needs of everyday life, not merely those of philosophical disquisitions, Zamenhof found it unsuitable. He objected to its many arbitrary features, to its pronunciation, and to its general difficulties for the beginner.

If there were general factors in nineteenth-century Europe favourable to the development of world language projects, there were also some factors quite specific to the development of Esperanto by Zamenhof in nineteenth-century Poland. Such conditions will also be seen as relevant to the religious and quasi-religious value orientations associated with Esperanto. Zamenhof's family background is also relevant to such questions.[18] Ludwig Lazar[19] Zamenhof was born in 1859, the eldest son of a Jewish family; he eventually had four brothers and three sisters. Zamenhof was born and brought up in Bialystok (Byelostok in the Russian form), where the family resided until 1873, moving to Warsaw in that year. A characteristic feature of Bialystok[20] was considerable strife between ethnic groups. A number of factors contributed to this. Poland was partitioned between 1795 and 1914, and originally

Bialystok had been assigned to the Prussian section. In 1807 the town was transferred to Russian control. Bialystok had also been a centre for Jewish settlement since the eighteenth century, settlement having originally been encouraged by manorial overlords. Although the status of Jews declined after Bialystok passed to Prussia, and then to Russia, it was still possible to engage in trade. Throughout the nineteenth century Jewish settlement continued; in 1856, out of a total population of 13,787, there were 9,547 Jews (69%). The four main ethnic groups – Jews, Russians, Poles and Germans – displayed considerable hostility towards one another. Language was the most obvious point of difference between them. Religion was also a factor: the Jews were religiously distinct; while the Russians were Orthodox, the Poles were Catholic, and the Germans Protestant. This situation evidently made a strong impression on the young Zamenhof, who early looked for a solution to the problem. He was impressed by the Bible story of the Tower of Babel, and at the age of ten wrote a five-act tragedy on this theme, with the scene set in Bialystok. In this manner Zamenhof conceived of the idea of a need for 'mutual understanding'; if the ethnic groups could understand one another, he hoped that tension would be reduced.

Zamenhof was also able to find intellectual justification for his ideas. This came from various sources. Firstly, the Bialystok Jews were a group among whom *Haskalah*[21] had become influential, by virtue of German connections. *Haskalah* was the particularly Jewish version of the Enlightenment. It derived from the general Enlightenment in eighteenth-century Europe but also had its own specific objectives relating to Jewish problems. It was assimilationist and stressed the value of secular education, especially languages. It was rationalistic in outlook, stressing Reason as the measure of all things. In common with other Enlightenment ideas, it was deistic, and rejected the claims of any religion to absolute truth. The Russian government could be seen as a supporting force in the realisation of these ideals. A further influence was undoubtedly Positivism.[22] After the quelling of the 1863 rising against foreign rule, attention in Polish intellectual circles was diverted away from romantic nationalism to the problem of the development of a modern industrial society. Comte's system had profound impact on the intellectual and literary life of Poland in the 1860s, especially

among younger writers. Thus the phenomenon of 'Warsaw Positivism' developed. The new Realism found expression particularly in fiction literature, and it is significant that some of the earliest translations of novels into Esperanto were from the works of members of this school (Swietochowski, Prus, Orzeszko, Sienkiewicz, and Reymont, among others).[23] There are also passages in Comte's *Système de politique positive* which stress the importance of language and religion as integrative factors in the social group.[24] Thus both *Haskalah* and Positivism were supportive of the application of a rationalistic, scientific outlook to contemporary problems; yet at the same time neither was totally hostile to religion, opposing only traditional religious dogmas.

Zamenhof grew up in this environment, though he did not accept all these currents of opinion uncritically. His family relationships were significant in this respect. Zamenhof's father was a gifted intellectual and follower of *Haskalah*, but somewhat authoritarian in disposition. He was a linguist, and had found remarkable favour on the part of the Russian authorities, despite being a Jew. In 1857, at the age of 20, he had founded his own school in Bialystok. This had failed to prosper, but he had succeeded in obtaining a teaching post at state schools, in geography and modern languages. He continued this work after the family had moved to Warsaw, but took on the additional work of censorship for the Tsarist authorities – for which his command of languages was a qualification.

Although Zamenhof shared a number of his father's interests, notably in languages, there was also evidence of disagreement on some philosophical issues, and, on the matter of Esperanto, the relationship for a time showed considerable strain. On religion and ethnic identity Zamenhof and his father differed. While his father was secularistic in outlook, though still observing Jewish customs, Zamenhof found a need for belief in God, and received support in this from his mother. Zamenhof was more concerned than his father with social problems experienced by the Jews and was against the idea of assimilation. He began to attach importance to the idea of a 'Jewish people' and took the view that peoples do not normally give up their identity. Later in life (in 1909), despite his heavy involvement in the business of the Esperanto movement and language, Zamenhof found time to work on proposals to reform the grammar and orthography of Yiddish.[25] It is not surpris-

ing that Zionist ideals attracted the interest of Zamenhof. This interest developed after 1879, when Zamenhof left school and began training for the medical profession, one of the few professions open to Jews. Until 1881 Zamenhof studied in Moscow; he then returned to study in Warsaw, for financial reasons. It was particularly during the Moscow period that Zamenhof took an interest in Jewish affairs. He collaborated with the journal *Russkiy Yevrey* [The Russian Jew] and became active in the Zionist movement, founding some of the first Zionist groups. Also during 1881–1882 he contributed a series of articles to the periodical *Razsvet* [Dawn] on pogroms in Warsaw and how the Jews should react to them. He advocated the idea of a homeland for the Jews but initially did not insist that this should be in Palestine; he eventually accepted the goal of a homeland in Palestine for the sake of unity. These articles were written under the anagram 'Gamfezon'.[26] Zamenhof gradually became disillusioned with Zionism, finding it unrealisable, and saw the role of Jewish people increasingly as one of uniting humanity. He eventually rejected the idea of Jewish nationalism, writing in 1914 that, although nationalism on the part of the oppressed was more pardonable than nationalism on the part of the oppressor, he was in principle opposed to all nationalism.[27] His ideas developed towards the proposal for a world religion which is examined in Chapter 3.

On the more specific issue of the development of an international language, Zamenhof also came into conflict with his father. His father was not immediately hostile: Zamenhof performed well in school and was particularly good at languages, an interest which his father shared. Zamenhof drew on his linguistic ability to develop the first draft of his project for a universal language, and recruited a number of his classmates to the cause. In 1878 they held a banquet to initiate the new language. The boys made short speeches in the new language and sang a hymn of human brotherhood:

Malamikete de las nacjes,	Enmity of the nations
Kadó, kadó, jam temp' está!	Fall, fall, it is already time!
Lat tot' homoze en familje	The whole of humanity in a family
Konunigare so debá.	Must unite themselves.[28]

Zamenhof's native language was Russian, but he learnt to speak

as part of the ideology of the movement; changes in the structure of the scheme proposed would be ideological changes. Thus the problem of control of fissiparous tendencies became crucial to the Esperantists.

As the first Esperantist, Zamenhof originally had to deal with both organising the members and controlling fissiparous tendencies. Originally Zamenhof merely sought supporters of the idea of Esperanto. The endpapers of the *Unua Libro* contained forms of promise, upon which the reader was to declare 'I, the undersigned, promise to learn the international language proposed by Dr. Esperanto, if it is shown that ten million people have publicly made the same promise.' The reader could also use the forms to collect promises from others. Those wishing to learn Esperanto unconditionally could so indicate, and Zamenhof also invited proposals for change. Zamenhof sent the *Unua Libro* to numerous newspapers, learned organisations, academics, and professional men; the book was also advertised in various foreign newspapers. Zamenhof obtained far greater support from those wishing actually to learn the language, and after the *Unua Libro* he concentrated his attention mostly on attracting those willing to *learn* Esperanto. New Esperantists were invited to translate a short passage into Esperanto and, if successful, were included in Zamenhof's register of Esperantists. Most of the support for Esperanto at this stage came from individuals; however, one learned society, the American Philosophical Society, took a serious interest in the question of international language. It had already set up a committee to consider Volapük but had been highly critical. The committee had considered that there was a natural development in languages away from highly inflected systems, and subscribed to a theory of natural evolution along such lines. Volapük went against this tendency, since it had extensive systems of declension and conjugation. The committee also criticised the unfamiliarity of the vocabulary of Volapük. They argued that it was essential for the international language to be derived from the roots of 'Aryan' languages, since scientific work was written at present in such languages. While Volapük words derived from 'Aryan' roots, they were so deformed as to be unrecognisable. Volapük was thus rejected, but not the whole idea of an international language. Esperanto met with a much more favourable reception as a contribution to the problem. The committee recommended

that the American Philosophical Society should invite the learned societies of the world to consider this question, with a view to calling an international congress on the subject of universal language.[33]

Zamenhof had been encouraged by the response to his *Unua Libro* sufficiently to produce a second (*Dua Libro*) in 1888, consisting of material entirely in Esperanto.[34] In a supplement to this he made reference to the American proposal. He welcomed the initiative, and in view of the forthcoming congress, proposed not to make any changes in the language: this work could be left to the congress itself. Yet Zamenhof clearly mistrusted reliance on bodies of intellectuals. In a supplement to his *Dua Libro* he wrote:

> . . . to link the fate of the international language beforehand with the future congress would be very imprudent . . . the congress could still not take place, and if it does take place it could still happen that it will give no practical results.[35]

Zamenhof thus urged supporters to continue their private work for Esperanto. He proposed that the Esperantists themselves should call an international congress to put forward their own proposals, if the congress proposed by the Americans did not take place within five years. Thus right from the start Zamenhof considered that self-help was necessary; his standpoint on this was confirmed by the fact that the congress did indeed not take place. The learned societies of the world had not shown as much interest as the Americans had expected: while some that did show interest objected to the proposal that the new language should have an 'Aryan' base, and to the American Philosophical Society committee's dismissal of Volapük.[36]

At this time Zamenhof was the sole centre of the movement; he gave supporters individual encouragement, but gave little direct advice about how Esperanto and the movement should be developed. He simply urged supporters to work hard, but in their own way; eventually such tactics would lead to success. This would come by conversion of individuals; 'every sea is created by separate drops',[37] Zamenhof wrote in the *Dua Libro*. As early as 1888 a number of small Esperanto circles and groups were formed, on the initiative of individual supporters. In 1888 Zamenhof published

the first *Adresaro*,[38] listing those who had contacted him and successfully translated the passage already mentioned. This enabled supporters to contact one another. Although Esperanto was an unusual cause in that, by the nature of the idea promoted, mobilisation was to be international rather than national, initial support came mostly from Russia. Particularly well represented were Jewish intellectuals and Tolstoyans. The other main source of support was Germany, where a strong Volapük movement was a source of potential converts. Most noteworthy among these was Leopold Einstein, who had founded in 1885 the *Nürnberger Weltsprach-Verein*. This group had supported Volapük, but in 1888 Einstein received the *Unua* and *Dua Libro* and was sufficiently impressed to transfer his allegiance to Esperanto. He wrote a pamphlet arguing for the superiority of Esperanto, and by the end of 1888 succeeded in influencing the entire club to follow him. Einstein died the following year, but another Nuremberg ex-Volapükist, Chrystian Schmidt, carried on activities and in 1889 began to issue the first-ever periodical in Esperanto, named *La Esperantisto*. Zamenhof collaborated in its production. Initially some articles were in French and German, but it soon became an all-Esperanto periodical. A certain amount of attention was still devoted to criticism of Volapük, but it was mostly concerned with the development of the Esperanto language and movement. The journal was particularly significant as a source of authority for Zamenhof, and in 1890 it was transferred to his personal supervision. Zamenhof found it necessary to subsidise the journal, as there were only 113 paid-up subscribers (mostly Russian).[39] Zamenhof was the *de facto* international leader of Esperanto, and the periodical became a source of influence and authority. Apparently for fear of reprisal from the Tsarist authorities, Zamenhof played down considerably the value-oriented emphasis on Esperanto which he himself supported; but his contributions did emphasise a conversionist,[40] evangelical spirit. He saw as the duty of new recruits themselves to recruit others; the size of the movement would thus increase in geometrical progression, the movement eventually sweeping the world. Zamenhof expected supporters to work hard for Esperanto. He severely reprimanded some supporters who wrote to him asking how Esperanto was progressing. Such persons were asking the wrong question, said Zamenhof; they should ask themselves what

they were doing to promote Esperanto.[41] At the same time, Zamenhof urged support from the masses rather than the powerful, and suspicion of those with secular power soon became common policy. Zamenhof wrote in 1891:

> Some friends wait in vain for the rich, or important persons and societies, or governments to help us, and they in vain think that the prosperity of our cause depends on such help; no, on the contrary, *their help depends on the prosperity of our cause*, we must never forget this, and therefore we must not sit without doing anything and wait for help from the powerful.[42]

Zamenhof also counselled quietism; he wrote in 1892: 'The true friends of our idea work peacefully and calmly. The fate of our cause in no way depends on peripheral noise and external appearance'.[43] The journal became crucial as a source of Zamenhof's authority in the matter of language. Zamenhof had early suggested that the scheme proposed in the *Unua Libro* was merely provisional, and welcomed changes. When changes were proposed, however, he refused to make any. This was largely due to the fact that potential reformers could not agree on which changes should be made, and the reform proposals often contradicted one another. Yet at the same time the existing structure clearly possessed an important affective significance for Zamenhof, and he intended to avoid change if possible. Zamenhof was willing here to appeal to his own higher authority. He had worked on Esperanto privately for many years before publishing it and had tested it in translation and original composition. He could, and did, often use the argument that proposed changes would not work in practice. He replied in the supplement to the *Dua Libro* in such terms to changes proposed by Henry Phillips of the American Philosophical Society: 'The four changes that Mr. H.P. proposes are theoretically very good, but I already thought of them a few years ago and I found that in practice they were very inappropriate.'[44] Supporters of the existing structure of Esperanto have frequently opposed reform by arguing that Zamenhof had already thought of the proposals but had rejected them before publication.

It is appropriate at this stage to consider the kind of changes that various reformers might propose. There was a reasonable amount of agreement about the weak points of Esperanto, though not usually about what could be put in their place. The alphabet

was one source of criticism. Zamenhof had adopted for the orthography of Esperanto the principle of 'one symbol, one sound'; for this purpose he had to introduce a number of extra consonants: ĉ, ĝ, ĥ, ĵ and ŝ. The circumflexed consonants represent the sounds of (respectively) English 'ch' as in 'chip', English 'j' as in 'jam', German 'ch' as in '*Buch*', French 'j' as in '*jardin*', and English 'sh' as in 'shop'. These added to the number of letters available, made the language more phonetic, and eliminated digraphs such as 'sh' and 'ch'. Yet they were unique to Esperanto and would have to be specially stocked by printers. A further objection was commonly made to the existence of an accusative case, formed by the addition of the letter *-n*; thus *hundo* dog makes *hundon* in the accusative. The opponents of this pointed out that the accusative mark was absent in French and English, and that Esperanto should be simpler than natural languages, not more difficult. Supporters of the accusative would argue that it permitted greater freedom of word order and eliminated the need for strict rules for this. Another objection was voiced to the concord of adjective and noun in the plural and accusative. In Esperanto *bela floro* [beautiful flower] makes *belan floron* (singular accusative); *belaj floroj* (plural nominative); and *belajn florojn* (plural accusative). Supporters of this practice again appealed to greater freedom of word order, opponents again to the fact that English, for instance, does not possess adjectival concord, so why should Esperanto? Other objections were to the plural ending in *-j*, because of its strange appearance, and to the table of correlative words (see Appendix II). According to some objectors this was a relic of *a priori* languages; they suggested that a system taken from international roots would be preferable, since it would be more immediately comprehensible. Other objections were raised about certain roots chosen in the original vocabulary; it was argued that some of the roots chosen were not as internationally comprehensible as they might have been.

With Zamenhof now in charge of the journal, the future development of Esperanto was in his hands. It was in fact open for anyone to assume a leadership role, but nobody appears to have wished to do so. The social composition of the original supporters of Esperanto is uncertain, but appears to have included many of Zamenhof's early Zionist contacts and adherents of *Haskalah*.[45] These knew Zamenhof personally and saw him as the natural

Thus Zamenhof threw the whole weight of his *de facto* authority behind the existing scheme. He emphasised the affective significance of Esperanto in its original form and attached importance to the fact that the present scheme worked in practice; he saw this as far more important than theoretical proposals. But he reluctantly began to suggest areas for possible changes. These included changes in the features already mentioned (the compulsory accusative, the plural, etc.). Zamenhof further suggested replacement of many teutonic and slavonic roots by roots of romance or Latin origin; abolition of the article *la* (difficult for slavonic-speakers); changes in many grammatical affixes, removal of diphthongs; and numerous minor changes. The scheme was presented as a package to the subscribers to *La Esperantisto*. A ballot was to take place in 1894, to be followed by a second ballot if less than a third of the members voted. Before the actual vote Zamenhof canvassed privately for support for the existing scheme. He wrote to the St. Petersburg Esperanto Society, which he knew to be conservative on matters of language, shortly before the ballot, and urged members to become individual subscribers to *La Esperantisto* so that they could vote against reforms.[51] Eventually the ballot provided four alternatives. A second ballot was necessary. The result was as follows: (the four choices are indicated)

1. Should we keep the form of our language unchanged?
2. Should we accept the new form, which I have presented to the members of the League, in its entirety?
3. Should we make other reforms in the language?
4. Should we accept in principle our reform project, but only make a few changes in particular details?

Table 16. *Ballot, 1894*[54]

Choice	August	November
	(No. of positive replies)	
1.	144	157
2.	12	11
3.	2	3
4.	95	93

Although the reformist vote was split, the result can still be interpreted as a vote against reforms, since the total number of votes for all reformist positions was less than the total who wished to keep the language unchanged. Although there is an important centrifugal force among the followers of a constructed language in the form of reformist pressure, this can be counteracted. In the case of Esperanto the centripetal force – the affective value of the existing system, combined with the reluctance of existing users to relearn anything – proved more important. An important factor was the influence of Zamenhof himself, as already noted. It is also significant that appeal had been made during this stage of the development of Esperanto for actual *users*, not merely supporters of the idea of a world language. Zamenhof had soon lost interest in collecting promises to learn, and by now the organisation, such as it was, was concerned with *users* of Esperanto. *La Esperantisto* was by now published almost entirely in Esperanto, and it was on the basis of subscribers to this journal that the vote had been taken. The position was different in France in the early twentieth century, as will be seen: here schismatic tendencies occurred in a situation where recruitment had partly been from those merely wishing to support the idea of Esperanto. In this situation fissiparous tendencies were more successful and led to schism.

As a result of the negative vote on reforms, Trompeter withdrew his financial support for the journal, though continuing to subscribe to it and to remain in contact with Zamenhof till 1901, when Trompeter died. Zamenhof suffered financially from the loss of Trompeter's support, which had included a small remuneration for Zamenhof as editor; yet no other supporter came forward, and Zamenhof again took sole charge of the journal. At this point a significant change of emphasis gradually became evident. Esperanto was important to Zamenhof as a value orientation, not just as scientific innovation. Except in occasional poems such as *La Espero*, Zamenhof had decidedly played down the value-oriented aspect during this period: there were merely occasional references, such as in the *Dua Libro*, to the 'brotherhood of the peoples'.[53] Yet clearly Zamenhof would have preferred to give more attention to idealism but felt under pressure to say little about it. The existence of censorhip of published work in Tsarist Russia was undoubtedly a factor; even if the censorship was erratically and

inconsistently applied, the possibility of suppression was too great a risk to take during the early stages of the Esperanto movement. In addition to this, Trompeter was opposed to inclusion in the journal of anything which might have political or religious overtones;[54] thus nothing of this kind appeared. Now that Zamenhof was free from such pressure, he began to pay more attention to matters previously left to one side. He might also have been influenced by the accession of a new Tsar (Nicholas II) in 1894, sharing a widespread (but unfounded) belief that there might be some liberalisation.[55]

In 1888 Zamenhof sent a copy of the *Unua Libro* to Tolstoy, hoping that he might be sympathetic to Esperanto, but received no reply. However, in 1894, Tolstoy was asked by the journal *Posrednik*, of whose editorial board he was a member, to give his opinion on the subject. Tolstoy expressed a favourable opinion. He argued that the learning of foreign languages was a peculiarly appropriate activity for a Christian, and that Esperanto was a desirable cause since it helped to promote understanding between peoples.[56] In *La Esperantisto* for 1895 (No. 92)[57] Zamenhof drew attention to this and made approving reference to the ideological position of *Posrednik*. Zamenhof remarked that this journal frequently used religious language, but that this should not be confused with the external forms of religion: the religiosity of *Posrednik* was a pan-human philosophical religion. He indicated that this standpoint was worthy of approval by Esperantists: 'Everything which accelerates brotherhood between men, we always greet with joy; everything which sows dispute and hate among men should always keep away from us!'[58]

The value-oriented standpoint still remained a minor undercurrent in *La Esperantisto*, but Zamenhof continued to show interest in Tolstoy's ideas, and in the second issue for 1895 published a translation of a letter by him on 'Reason and belief'.[59] Tolstoy had been suspected by the Tsarist authorities since the early 1880s, when he first began to publish his thoughts on the Christian anarcho-pacifist position to which he had been converted.[60] Some of his work had been suppressed as subversive of Church and State. His contribution to *La Esperantisto* attracted the attention of the censor, and as a result *La Esperantisto* was suppressed. Zamenhof made a short-lived attempt to evade the censor by the use of plain

sealed envelopes, but this was discovered and *La Esperantisto* ceased publication in June, 1895. This step threatened the continued development of the Esperanto movement, since over 60% of the subscriptions were Russian. Esperanto publications were not allowed to be issued again in Russia till after the 1905 Revolution. But Zamenhof was still allowed to work on Esperanto individually and to write material which could be published abroad. Also, the St. Petersburg Esperanto Society 'Espero' was allowed to continue its activities, and performed many of the functions of a national Esperanto association until 1908, when the Russian Esperanto League was founded.

These restrictions on Esperanto in Russia were severely damaging to the movement; and had Esperanto been merely Russian-based, the effects would have been even more far-reaching. Yet by its very nature the Esperanto movement recruited on an international basis. Sweden was a country in which Esperanto had found remarkably strong support: indeed, if the criterion of the number of subscriptions to *La Esperantisto* per head of population were to be taken, support for Esperanto would have been stronger in Sweden than in Russia. The *Unua Libro* had been translated into Swedish as early as 1889, and an Esperanto club had existed in Uppsala since 1891. Certain factors in this period of Swedish history contributed to a favourable reception for Esperanto. During the 1880s Sweden was beginning to turn away from her traditional isolationism. This period saw the formation and expansion of new movements that were to influence the direction of industrial Sweden. Socialist, radical, liberal, and rationalist ideas became popular in intellectual circles, and later in the wider society. That the initial basis for support for Esperanto came from the university town of Uppsala suggests some relationship between Esperanto and these currents of opinion.[61] In view of the loss of *La Esperantisto*, the Uppsala Esperanto Club launched in December, 1895, the new journal *Lingvo Internacia*. Sweden had the advantage, in contrast with Tsarist Russia, of a free press, and the new periodical was edited by Paul Nylen, a professional journalist. Trompeter again made a financial contribution, aided by Vladimir Gernet, a research chemist living in Odessa. As with *La Esperantisto*, the new journal served the purpose of linking isolated supporters together: but it was no longer supervised by Zamenhof. Zamenhof's written contri-

butions were infrequent, and Zamenhof thus ceased to be the focal point of the movement. The editorship changed hands a few times. As from 1902 *Lingvo Internacia* began to be edited from Hungary, by Paul de Lengyel, who in 1904 moved to France, where the journal was continued. This journal gradually began to attract attention for literary and cultural contributions, rather than as an important factor in the organisation and cohesion of the Esperantists generally. After 1898, with the foundation of the *Société pour la propagation de l'Espéranto*, and its organ *L'Espérantiste*, Paris rapidly became the focal point of the organised Esperanto movement. The causes and consequences of this will be considered in the next chapter.

The early development of Esperanto in the hostile environment of Tsarist Russia is of considerable significance for the self-conception of the Esperantists. The supporters of Esperanto had intellectual justification for their views but had to come to terms with the dictates of a reactionary and autocratic government. Thus they began to perceive themselves as an enlightened elite. Also, in addition to finding intellectual justification in the Positivist and other currents of ideas, Esperanto evidently had an important affective value for its supporters. This is all the more significant since Zamenhof had decidedly played down the value-oriented interpretation of Esperanto during its development in Russia. Yet an idealistic attitude to Esperanto permeated Russian Esperanto groups through direct contacts. A number of these were formed in Russia in the early period of the development of Esperanto. To a certain extent they were able to attempt a practical application of Zamenhof's proposal to make peace between ethnic groups. Whereas, in many areas of Russia, ethnic groups had little or no harmonious contacts with one another, the Esperanto groups in these areas met on a multi-ethnic basis. After the publication of the *Unua Libro* Zamenhof disseminated his ideas through personal contacts in his own area. He encouraged the development of a shared symbolism in the form of utopian poetry.[62] *La Espero*, written by Zamenhof, is a good example of the content of this work. *La Vojo*[63] is another contribution by Zamenhof to the early poetic literature. Others followed Zamenhof's example, including his brother Felix. An example of this work from outside the Zamenhof family is seen in the following poem by Antoni Grabowski, a

In each part of the world, in each zone of the earth
In the hearts of hundreds of thousands
By now reason vibrates to salute us
So we sons of the earth do sing
Daybreak, daybreak radiates all round
The shadows of the night run away from the world.[64]

Thus Esperanto became the vehicle for a diffuse millenarian ideal, and literature of this kind, which was published and read among Esperanto-speakers, became the vehicle of its expression. Privat, a historian of Esperanto, makes the following comment on the literature of the period:

> National literatures have almost always expressed in the beginning the common hopes or glorious needs of their race. So nothing is more natural than the fact that an international language originally created for itself a literature about humanitarian feelings and aspirations.[65]

Zamenhof was a strong supporter of the development of literary work in Esperanto, both original and translated. In 1894 he began to issue the 'Library of the International Language Esperanto', which could be ordered by subscription. This inclded both original work of the kind just mentioned and translations from various European classics. Of the 'Library' Zamenhof commented: 'If the "Library" flourishes, everything will flourish – if the "Library" falls, everything will fall.'[66] Apart from its role as the vehicle of the distinctive symbolism of Esperanto, Zamenhof attached importance to the 'Library' as an indication to critics that Esperanto worked in practice, and as a bulwark against pressure to reform the structure of the language.

The references in Grabowski's poem to the 'green harbour' (verse 2, line 4) and to the 'standard of the star' (verse 2, line 6) merit explanation. Some early writings of Zamenhof appeared as books in green covers, while some French textbooks appeared with a star on the cover. The green star and green colours generally became the symbol of Esperanto and the value system which Esperanto represents. Many Esperantists still wear a green star as a badge for identification and as an indication of their allegiance.[67]

Thus Esperanto had associated with it an important value-

oriented component which is not immediately obvious from the pages of *La Esperantisto*. Popularised through literature and personal contacts, a decidedly 'spiritual' interpretation of the aims of Esperanto developed. It became known as the *Interna Ideo* [inner idea]. The value-oriented interpretation had an important social basis in the situation of strain which Zamenhof had perceived in relations between ethnic groups in Poland. Yet recruitment to Esperanto was international, and many official publications gave scant attention to Esperanto as anything but a language. Thus some recruits to the cause were suspicious of or hostile to the value-oriented component. This applied especially in France, where Esperanto came to terms with bureaucratic and rationalistic pressures. Thus it will be seen that France became the scene for open conflicts in the interpretation of the aims of Esperanto.

NOTES

1. A.L. Guérard, *A Short History of the International Language Movement*, 1922 (Appendix).
2. For discussion of Esperanto literature see I. Lapenna, U. Lins, and T. Carlevaro, *Esperanto en perspektivo* (hereinafter referred to as *Perspektivo*), Ch. 5–7. See also M. Hagler, 'The Esperanto language as a literary medium', Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Indiana, Bloomington, 1971.
3. Reprinted in R. Descartes, *Oeuvres complètes*, 1897, vol. 1, pp.76–82.
4. G. Dalgarno, *Ars signorum, vulgo character universalis et lingua philosophica*, 1661.
5. J. Wilkins, *Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language*, 1668.
6. G.W. Leibniz, *Dissertatio de Arte Combinatoria* (1666) in *God. Guil. Leibnitii Opera Philosophica*, ed. by J.E. Erdman, 1840, Part I, pp.6–44. For discussion of Leibniz's contribution to the question of international languages see L. Couturat, *La Logique de Leibniz*, 1901, reprinted 1961; L. Couturat, *Opuscules et fragments inédits de Leibniz*, 1903; R.L. Saw, *Leibniz*, 1954.
7. J. Sudre, *Langue musicale et universelle par le moyen de laquelle tous les différents peuples de la terre, les aveugles, les sourds et les muets peuvent se comprendre réciproquement*, 1886. See discussion in L. Couturat and L. Leau, *Histoire de la langue universelle*, 1903, section I, Ch.6; E. Drezen, *Za vseobschim yazykom*, 1928 (more accessible in the Esperanto translation *Historio de la mondolingvo*, third edition 1967). This work will hereinafter be referred to as Drezen, *Historio*.
8. Drezen, *Historio*, pp.98–109; Couturat and Leau, *Histoire de la langue universelle*, *op. cit.*, Section II, Ch.2.
9. J.M. Schleyer, *Volapük, die Weltsprache. Entwurf einer Universalsprache aller Gebildeten der ganzen Erde*, 1880.
10. See A. Ratkai, 'La internacilingva movado kiel kreinto de la Internacia Lingvo', p.169, in *Socipolitikaj aspektoj de la Esperanto-movado*, ed. by D. Blanke, 1978, pp.166–181.

11. See Couturat and Leau, *Histoire de la langue universelle, op. cit.*, Section II, *passim*.
12. See below, p.57.
13. Reprinted in OV, pp.258–275.
14. A sequel to the disputations with the Volapükists is the fact that the Esperanto equivalent of the proverb 'It is Greek to me' appears as 'It is Volapük to me' (*Ĝi estas al mi volapukaĵo*).
15. Zamenhof, letter to Trompeter, n.d. (c. December 1895 or January 1896), OV, pp.422–425.
16. Drezen, *Historio*, Ch. XI; Guérard, *op. cit.*, Ch. VI, VIII.
17. W. Rosenberger, *Wörterbuch der Neutralsprache*, 1902.
18. For material on the life of Zamenhof see E. Privat, *Vivo de Zamenhof*, 1920; M. Boulton, *Zamenhof, Creator of Esperanto*, 1960; E. Drezen, *Zamenhof*, 1929; M. Ziolkowska, *Doktoro Esperanto/Doktor Esperanto*, 1959; I. Lapenna (ed.), *Memorlibro eldonita okaze de la centijara datreveno de la naskiĝo de D-ro L.L. Zamenhof*, 1960; Zamenhof, letter to Borovko, ?1895, OV, pp.417–422, also in L.L. Zamenhof, *Leteroj de L.L. Zamenhof*, ed. by G. Waringhien, 2 vols., 1948: vol. 1, pp.343–351. In the same work see Zamenhof, letter to A. Michaux, 21/2/05, vol. 1, pp.105–115. This collection of letters of Zamenhof is hereinafter referred to as *Leteroj*. There is further material, in some places highly critical of the earlier biographies, in N.Z. Maimon, *La kaŝita vivo de Zamenhof*, 1978.
19. Often given as *Ludwig Lazarus* or *Ludoviko Lazaro* (Esperanto form). The Yiddish form *Leyzer*, in Cyrillic characters, appeared on his birth certificate. For further details about Zamenhof's name see Maimon, *op. cit.*, pp.47–56.
20. See article 'Bialystok' in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 1971, vol. 4, pp.806–811.
21. See article 'Haskalah', *Ibid.*, vol. 7, pp.1,432–1,452; C. Van Kleef, *La Homaranismo de D-ro L.L. Zamenhof*, 1965.
22. Van Kleef, *op. cit*; W.F. Reddaway *et al.*, *The Cambridge History of Poland 1697–1935*, 1951, pp.385ff, 392, 535; R. Dyboski, *Poland*, 1933, p.41 and Ch. IX *passim*.
23. *Perspektivo*, pp.226–229.
24. A. Comte, *Système de politique positive*, 1854, vol. 4, p.75. See also L. Coser, *Masters of Sociological Thought*, 1971, p.11.
25. See *Leteroj*, vol. 2, pp.245–246.
26. 'g' replaces 'h' in accordance with Russian conventions of transliteration. For discussion of the contents of articles in *Razsvet* see A. Holzhaus, *Doktoro kaj lingvo Esperanto, op. cit.*, pp.121–135; also H. Tacuo (ed.), *Hebreo el la geto: de Cionismo al Hilelismo*, 1976, pp.58–95.
27. OV, pp.344–345.
28. Letter to Borovko. The Esperanto here is a primitive version, not to be confused with the final form as published in 1887.
29. Letter to Michaux.
30. See I. Harris, 'Interview with Dr. Zamenhof', *Jewish Chronicle*, 6/9/07, reprinted in Esperanto translation in Maimon, *op. cit.*, pp.161–173.
31. Dr. Esperanto, *Mezhdunarodnyi yazyk: Predislovie i polnyi uchebnik*, 1887. Passages from this work are translated in L.L. Zamenhof, *Fundamenta krestomatio de la lingvo Esperanto*, 1954, first edition 1903, pp.228–239.
32. Letter to Michaux. See also Maimon, *op. cit.*, p.156.
33. See report, 'The scientific value of Volapük', *Nature* 28, 9 August 1888, pp.351–355.
34. L.L. Zamenhof, *Dua libro de l'lingvo internacia*, 1888.

35. L.L. Zamenhof, *Aldono al la 'Dua libro de l'lingvo internacia'*, 1889, reprinted in OV, p.31.
36. For the negative reaction of the London Philological Society see A.J. Ellis, 'On the conditions of a universal language', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1888, pp.59–98. See also Couturat and Leau, *Histoire de la langue universelle*, *op. cit.*, Section III, Ch. X.
37. Reprinted in OV, p.29.
38. L.L. Zamenhof, *Adresaro de la personoj kiuj ellernis la lingvon Esperanto, 1–1000*, *op. cit.*
39. The significance of control of a movement's publications has been noted for other organisations, such as religious and therapeutic groups. R.K. Jones remarks in 'Some sectarian characteristics of therapeutic groups with special reference to Recovery, Inc. and Neurotics Nomine', in *Sectarianism*, ed. by R. Wallis, 1975, pp.190–210 (p.197), 'Such publications not only determine to a large degree the external image of the movement but they become in turn a source of social control in groups lacking formal leadership roles'. For a comparable situation in the Christadelphians see B.R. Wilson, *Sects and Society*, 1961, p.241. For Esperanto the 'external image' aspect has significance only to the extent of indicating that the group is relatively closed to outsiders, since non-Esperantists cannot read the publications. But as a source of authority the significance of the periodical has been crucial.
40. This term is taken from B.R. Wilson, 'An analysis of sect development', in Wilson, *Patterns of Sectarianism*, 1967, pp.22–45 (pp.26–27).
41. See OV, pp.58, 180–181.
42. *La Esperantisto*, No. 50, (1891), reprinted in OV, p.123.
43. *La Esperantisto*, No. 51 (1892), reprinted in OV, p.158.
44. Reprinted in OV, p.31.
45. See G. Waringhien, 'Historia skizo de la Esperanto-movado', in G. Waringhien, *Lingvo kaj vivo*, 1959, pp.397–423; Maimon, *op. cit.*, pp.79–114.
46. *La Esperantisto*, No.3 (1889), pp.17–18. Reprinted in OV, pp.59–60.
47. *La Esperantisto*, No.50 (1891), pp.57–62. Reprinted in OV, pp.126–136.
48. A. Holzhaus, *Wilhelm Heinrich Trompeter*, 1973.
49. *La Esperantisto*, No.76 (1893), reprinted in OV, pp.182–184.
50. *La Esperantisto*, No.77 (1893), reprinted in OV, pp.184–187.
51. OV, p.512.
52. *La Esperantisto*, No.88 (1894), reprinted in OV, pp.197–198.
53. *Dua Libro, op. cit.*, p.3, reprinted in OV, p.21.
54. See Zamenhof, postcard to Dombrovski, 8 March 1893, reprinted in OV, p.490.
55. See G. Fischer, *Russian Liberalism from Gentry to Intelligentsia*, 1958, pp.72–76.
56. For Tolstoy's reaction to Esperanto see E. Privat, *Historio de la lingvo Esperanto* (2 vols.: vol. 1, 1923, vol. 2, 1927) vol. 1, pp.54–55 (hereinafter referred to as Privat, *Historio*); F.I. Kolobanov, *L. Tolstoy i Esperanto*, summarised in I. Lapenna, 'Tolstoj, Zamenhof kaj Esperanto', in *Memorlibro, op. cit.*, ed. by I. Lapenna, pp.37–38; E.J. Simmons, *Leo Tolstoy*, 1960, vol. 2, pp.195–196.
57. Pp.26–27, reprinted in OV, pp.201–202.
58. *Ibid.*, p.27 (202).
59. This is reissued in A. Holzhaus, *Doktoro kaj lingvo Esperanto, op. cit.*, pp.283–285. It does not appear in Tolstoy's collected works, but the existence of the original in the Tolstoy museum in Yasnaya Polyana has been confirmed by Holzhaus.
60. See A. Maude, *The Life of Tolstoy*, revised edition 1930, vol. 1, pp.145–146.

61. See R.F. Tomasson, *Sweden, Prototype of Modern Society*, 1970, pp.8–13.
62. See E. Privat, *Historio, op. cit.*, vol. 1, Ch. XII.
63. See Appendix II.
64. Reprinted *inter alia* in *Esperanta antologio*, ed. by W. Auld, 1963, pp.42–43.
65. Privat, *Historio, op. cit.*, vol. 2, p.182.
66. *La Esperantisto*, No.93 (1895), reprinted in OV, pp.202–207.
67. This is Zamenhof's explanation of the origin of the Green Star, in *The British Esperantist*, No.86 (1911), p.34, reprinted in OV, p.456.

Esperanto would lack official respectability if a value-oriented interpretation were expressed; it might be suspected of association with pacifism and as such would be unpopular with statesmen.

De Beaufront provided the necessary equipment for promoting Esperanto in France. The *Unua Libro* existed in a French version but was not a full textbook; in 1892 de Beaufront provided a comprehensive textbook in French. In 1895 he published a French promotional leaflet. He formed organisations for Esperanto which were international in character but French-dominated. In 1898 he founded the *Société pour la propagation d'Espéranto*, together with a new journal, *L'Espérantiste*. De Beaufront was president of the former and editor of the latter. Secretary of both was René Lemaire, a businessman. Thus de Beaufront formed and directed a central organisation which he was able to shape in accordance with his own ideas. Although founded in France, the new periodical and organisation were used principally to take advantage of the *international* prestige of the French language and culture. *L'Espérantiste* was issued in French or with French and Esperanto parallel texts, rather than entirely in Esperanto in the manner of *La Esperantisto* and *Lingvo Internacia*. In contrast to Zamenhof's recruitment policy, de Beaufront was prepared to accept and encourage those who merely approved of the language, without necessarily being able to speak it. The *Société pour la propagation d'Espéranto* had three categories of members: *approbateurs*, who approved of Esperanto and were prepared to pay a subscription, but who were not willing to learn it; *adeptes*, who had reached an approved standard in the language; and *propagateurs*, who had recruited two *adeptes* or five *approbateurs*.[6] Examinations were set in order to assess standards of competence. De Beaufont was very much concerned to recruit distinguished names to the ranks of the *approbateurs*. He was particularly active in campaigning in French intellectual and scientific circles. Of various efforts in this direction, particularly noteworthy is a lecture (written by Zamenhof) presented by de Beaufront to the Congress of the *Association française pour l'avancement des sciences*, in Paris in 1900.[7] His activities led to the recruitment of a number of intellectuals who shaped the development of Esperanto in France. This was not always in the manner that de Beaufront had wished. A number of different personalities

with different ideas were involved in the history of Esperanto at this stage, and the following *dramatis personae* will be of help:[8]

Emile Boirac (1851–1917), philosopher. Became Rector of the University of Grenoble (1898) and Dijon (1902). Wrote his Latin thesis on Leibniz. Recruited to Esperanto in 1900 and became an active member of the French movement, to which he added his intellectual authority. Wrote a textbook on philosophy, and was also interested in psychical research.

Carlo Bourlet (1866–1913), mathematician. Attended the *Ecole Normale Supérieure*, and eventually became Professor of Mechanics at the *Conservatoire des Arts et des Métiers*. Recruited to Esperanto in 1900 by a colleague and became in 1901 President of the newly founded Paris Esperanto Group. Published a number of mathematics textbooks in French for schools and also for architects and engineers. Had a special interest in applied mechanics, with particular reference to the technology of the bicycle. By virtue of this interest had connections with the bicycle industry and the *Touring-Club de France*, and recruited the support of the latter to Esperanto. Organised cycling competitions for the *Touring-Club*. Attracted the attention of the French publishing house Hachette, and after 1906 issued his own periodical *La Revuo*. Conservative in linguistic matters.[9]

Théophile Cart (1855–1931), linguist. Taught French at Uppsala University 1891–1892, then Professor at Lycée Henri IV and the School of Political Science in Paris. Learnt Esperanto in 1904 and immediately became an active propagandist. Cofounder in 1904 of the *Presa Esperantista Societo* (Esperantist Press Company) and in 1907 took charge of *Lingvo Internacia*. Published a number of textbooks of Esperanto, also (in French) an edition of Goethe. Vice-President of the *Société Linguistique de Paris*. Ultraconservative in Esperanto linguistic matters.[10]

Louis Couturat (1868–1914), philosopher and mathematician. Disciple of Leibniz. Numerous philosophical publications, including edition of some of Leibniz's unpublished works. Taught at Caen and other French universities, eventually becoming an independent scholar. Interested in peace movement and international arbitration. Became interested in Esperanto about the turn of the century, but never became a fluent speaker or an active propagandist. Devoted his attention to theoretical studies of international

language, and was instrumental in the 1908 schism (see next chapter).[11]

Emile Javal (1839–1907), ophthalmologist. Published substantially on topics in ophthalmology, physiology, and pathology of the eye, including astigmatism. Himself became blind in 1900. Jewish; wealthy; liberal social-democratic outlook, served as a Deputy 1885–1889. Attracted to Esperanto after becoming blind, regarding it as useful for dissemination of Braille literature. Closely linked to Zamenhof through profession and religious sympathies, but advocated reforms in Esperanto.

Alfred Michaux (1859–1937), lawyer in Boulogne. Published a French legal vocabulary. Interested in the welfare of juvenile criminals and of refugees. Originally interested in reformed Latin, to which he eventually returned, but recruited to Esperanto by de Beaufront. Organised the first World Esperanto Congress in Boulogne in 1905.

Hippolyte Sébert (1839–1930), general in French army, retired in 1890. Graduate of the *Ecole Polytechnique*. Extensive publications on military science, member of the French Academy of Sciences, and a world authority on ballistics. Recruited to Esperanto in 1898. President of the French Photographic Society. Interested in the rationalisation and means of dissemination of knowledge. To this end he was concerned with promotion of two innovations – decimal classification of books and Esperanto.

There were others who played an important part in the development of Esperanto in France. Among these were René Lemaire already mentioned; Gaston Moch, an artillery officer turned pacifist, who in 1905 began the Esperantist-pacifist journal *Espero Pacifista*; and Léopold Leau, a professor of mathematics who interested Couturat in theoretical research on international language, and collaborated with him in this work. Also influential was the Belgian Commandant Charles Lemaire, a former colonial officer, who later became interested in reforms in Esperanto and eventually lost interest in international language altogether.

Esperanto thus began to gain popularity among French intellectuals. The Positivist faith in intellectual and social evolution remained influential. In such a milieu the adoption of a language like Esperanto could be seen as a contribution to social evolution and the rationalisation of society. The same situation inevitably

gave rise to pressures for scientific scrutiny of the structure of the language as well, but these will be considered in the next chapter. The appeal of Esperanto was not, moreover, confined to intellectual circles. Many Frenchmen might have been anticipating a greater need than before for the learning of foreign languages. Although the international prestige of the French language was still very high, it was not to remain unchallenged as *the* international language. Though France had been first in the field, other national Esperanto societies were formed, and in 1904 the French society changed its name to *Société française pour la propagation d'Espéranto*. By 1907 it had 2,900 members, and there were also 91 local groups, only 11 of which were affiliated to the national association. Some support for Esperanto came from non-Esperanto organisations, and Bourlet was particularly instrumental in forming such links. The *Touring-Club de France* allowed its premises to be used for Esperanto courses, and its periodical contained an Esperanto section. Bourlet also had personal contact with the publishing house Hachette and succeeded in convincing the firm's representative that Esperanto provided a viable publishing proposition. Hachette were unwilling to deal with a Russian directly, and de Beaufront acted as Zamenhof's representative. A controversial publishing contract was for the 'Collection approved by Dr. Zamenhof'. Books in this collection were checked for linguistic accuracy by Zamenhof, who received a small royalty for this task. A number of important works were issued in this collection; they included translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Molière's *L'Avare*; a translation by Boirac of Leibniz's *Monadology*; and the *Fundamenta Krestomatio* [fundamental chrestomathy], a collection of short stories, articles, and poetry, by various authors including Zamenhof. This latter work was recommended by Zamenhof as a model of Esperanto style. In 1903 Zamenhof transferred the publication of his *Adresaro* to Hachette; with Zamenhof's agreement, it became the world Esperantist yearbook, edited by de Menil. As a result of the contract, Esperanto was promoted by Hachette wherever French was spoken. Yet controversy ensued since Hachette took the contract to mean that they had an exclusive right to publish any Esperanto book. Zamenhof ended the 'Approved Collection' in 1905, though he himself continued to publish through Hachette.[12] The firm lost interest in Esperanto soon after Bourlet's death in 1913.

Thus in various ways Esperanto had secured a firm foothold in France. During the first few years of the twentieth century Esperanto had begun to penetrate England also, and in 1903 a small Anglo-French gathering took place at Le Havre. Michaux, the President of the Boulogne Esperanto group, was sufficiently encouraged by the success of this meeting to call a world Esperanto congress in Boulogne for 1905. In this he obtained the support of the Boulogne and Paris Esperanto societies, the *Touring-Club de France*, and the *Société française pour la propagation d'Espéranto*. Michaux put the proposal to Zamenhof, who responded with enthusiasm and promised to attend himself.[13] Zamenhof suggested that the congress should be able to make authoritative decisions and took the opportunity to suggest a new project for a World Esperantist League.[14] This league was to reflect the previous system whereby all subscribers to *La Esperantisto* were members of a league. In Zamenhof's proposal, an organ of the League was to be issued, and all subscribers would be members automatically. Voting, however, would be on the basis of local groups rather than individuals. A Central Committee would be elected as the governing body of the League; this would be elected at world congresses, which would take place annually. Representation on the Central Committee would be on a national basis, though in proportion to the number of members in each national association. The Central Committee would elect its own president, who would also be president of the League. Groups who were members of the League would send their own delegates to the World Congress; such delegates would approve of or reject the decisions of the Central Committee.

Zamenhof's project also included a number of specialist committees. Such were the Action Committee, responsible for day-to-day practical administration and for the execution of all decisions of the League; the Language Committee, concerned with questions of grammar and vocabulary; the Congress Committee, including both permanent members and members of the group in the town where the Congress was to be held; the Censors' Committee, concerned with official approval of manuscripts 'approved by Dr. Zamenhof'; and the Examiners' Committee, concerned with assessing members' ability to translate into Esperanto.

The League could change its rules at a congress. The Language

the world, will become embodied and powerful, and our sons and grandsons will see them, feel them and enjoy them.

In most distant antiquity, long wiped away from the memory of humankind, about which no history has kept even the smallest document for us, the human family became separated and its members ceased to understand one another. Brothers, all created from one model; brothers who all had the same ideas, and the same God in their hearts; brothers who had to help one another and work together for the happiness and glory of their family – those brothers became quite foreign one to another, and became separated apparently for ever in hostile groups; and eternal war began between them. In the course of many thousands of years, throughout the whole time which human history remembers, those brothers just constantly fought between themselves, and all kinds of understanding between them were absolutely impossible. Prophets and poets dreamt of some very distant nebulous time, in which men would again begin to understand one another and would come together in one family; but this was just a dream. It was spoken of as a pleasant fantasy, but nobody took it seriously, nobody believed in it.

And now for the first time the dream of thousands of years begins to be realised. In this small French seaside town have met men from the most varied countries and nations, and they met each other not as deaf-mutes, but they understand one another and speak one to another as brothers, as members of one nation. Often people of different nations meet and understand one another; but what an enormous difference there is between their mutual understanding and ours! At such meetings only a small proportion of the delegates understand one another, those who have had the opportunity to dedicate a great deal of time and a large amount of money to learn foreign languages – all the rest take part in the meeting only with their bodies, not with their heads; but in our meeting all participants understand one another, everybody who wishes to understand us does understand us easily, and neither poverty nor absence of time closes anyone's ears to our speeches. In other congresses, mutual understanding is attainable through an unnatural method, offensive and unjust, because there a member of one nation is humiliated before a member of another nation, speaks his language, putting his own to shame, stammers and blushes and feels embarrassed in front of his interlocutor, while here he would feel strong and proud; in our meeting there are no strong and weak nations, privileged and disprivileged, nobody is humiliated, nobody is embarrassed, we all stand on a neutral basis [*fundamento*], we all have full and equal rights; we all feel as members of one nation, like members of one family, and for the first time in human history we, members of the most varied peoples, stand beside one another not as foreigners, not as competitors, but as brothers who, not inflicting their own language on one another, understand one another, have no suspicion of one another on

account of the darkness which divides them, love one another and shake each other's hand not hypocritically, as one national to another, but sincerely, as man to man. Let us realise fully all the gravity of this day, because today within the hospitable walls of Boulogne-sur-Mer have met not Frenchmen with Englishmen, nor Russians with Poles, but men with men. Blessed is the day: may its consequences be great and glorious!

The speech took a millenarian turn:

. . . . After many thousands of years of being deaf and dumb, and fighting one another, mutual understanding and brotherhood of the members of different peoples of humanity is now, in Boulogne-sur-Mer, really largely beginning; and once begun, it will not stop, but will go forward ever more powerfully, until the last shadows of eternal darkness will disappear for ever. These days, now in Boulogne-sur-Mer, are important indeed, and may they be blessed! . . .

. . . . Soon will begin the work of our congress, dedicated to true brotherhood of man. In this solemn moment my heart is full of something indefinable and mysterious and I feel the desire to lighten my heart with prayer, to turn myself to some force on high and call upon its help and blessing. But just as at the moment I am not a member of any nation, but simply a man, in the same way I feel that at this moment I do not belong to any national or partisan religion, but I am only a man. And at this moment only that high moral force stands before the eyes of my soul, and to this unknown force I turn with my prayer.

Zamenhof concluded his speech with a prayer to God to reunite humanity:

Al Vi, ho potenca senkorpa mistero
Fortego, la mondon reganta,
Al Vi, granda fonto de l'amo kaj vero
Kaj fonto de vivo konstanta,
Al Vi, kiun ĉiuj malsame presentas
Sed ĉiuj egale en koro Vin sentas
Al Vi, kiu kreas, al Vi kiu regas
Hodiaŭ ni preĝas.

Al Vi ni ne venas kun kredo nacia
Kun dogmoj de blinda fervoro
Silentas nun ĉiu disput' religia
Kaj regas nu kredo de koro

Kun ĝi, kiu estas ĉe ĉiuj egala
Kun ĝi, la plej vera, sen trudo batala
Ni staras nun, filoj de l'tuta homaro
Ĉe Via altaro.

Homaron Vi kreis perfekte kaj bele,
Sed ĝi sin dividis batale;
Popolo popolon atakas kruele,
Frat' fraton atakas ŝakale.
Ho, kiu ajn estas Vi, forto mistera
Aŭskultu la voĉon de l'preĝo sincera
Redonu la pacon al la infanaro
De l'granda homaro!

Ni ĵuris labori, ni ĵuris batali,
Por reunuigi l'homaron.
Subtenu nin, Forto, ne lasu nin fali
Sed lasu nin venki la baron;
Donacu Vi benon al nia laboro,
Donacu Vi forton al nia fervoro,
Ke ĉiam ni kontraŭ atakoj sovaĝaj
Nin tenu kuraĝaj.

La verdan standardon tre alte ni tenos;
Ĝi signas la bonon kaj belon.
La Forto mistera de l'mondo nin benos
Kaj nian atingos ni celon.
Ni inter popoloj la murojn detruos,
Kaj ili ekkrakos kaj ili ekbruos
Kaj falos por ĉiam, kaj amo kaj vero
Ekregos sur tero.

Translation:

To thee, O powerful incorporeal mystery
Great force, ruling the world,
To thee, great source of love and truth,
And everlasting source of life,
To thee, whom all men present differently,
Yet sense alike in their hearts

To thee, who createst, to thee, who rulest,
We pray today.

To thee we do not come with a national creed
With dogmas of blind fervour:
All religious dispute is now silent
And only belief of the heart rules.
With this, in which all are equal,
With this, the truest, without compulsion of war
We stand now, sons of the whole of humanity
At thy altar.

Thou didst create humanity in perfect beauty
But it divided itself in battle;
People attack people cruelly,
Brother attacks brother like a jackal.
O whoever thou art, mysterious force,
Hark to the voice of sincere prayer,
Give back peace to the children
Of this vast humanity.

We have sworn to work, we have sworn to fight,
To reunite humanity.
Support us, O Force, do not let us fall,
But let us surmount the barrier;
Give thy blessing to our work,
Give thy strength to our fervour,
So that always, against savage attacks
We shall bear ourselves with courage.

We shall hold the green standard on high;
It stands for the good and beautiful.
The mysterious force of the world will bless us,
And we shall achieve our aim.
We shall destroy the walls between peoples,
They will begin to make a cracking sound
And will be fallen for ever, and love and truth
Will begin to rule on earth.[21]

The speech was greeted with long applause, and cries of 'Long live Zamenhof! – long live Esperanto!' Zamenhof had reason to be

encouraged by the members of the Congress. The speech is widely reproduced in Esperanto literature. Many historians of Esperanto have perpetrated the myth that he had never spoken in public before, but more reliable sources point out that he made speeches at Zionist meetings during his student years. Zamenhof was, however, a retiring person and not at ease when making speeches.[22]

The rank-and-file Esperantists were enthusiastic, but a conflict had already begun between Zamenhof and the French *leaders* over the religious idealism put forward. Zamenhof had sent the text to Michaux before the Congress, and Michaux had shown it to Cart, Javal, Boirac, Bourlet, and Sébert. These appear to have been anti-clerical without exception (de Beaufront, a Roman Catholic, was peripheral to the Boulogne Congress: he was unable to attend, ostensibly through illness). They had objected to expressions such as 'mysterious phantoms' and especially the prayer. In Boulogne the French leaders painstakingly attempted to persuade Zamenhof to omit the prayer, at least ('We will be ruined by ridicule', Sébert had remarked).[23] Zamenhof agreed only to omit the last verse of the prayer, which was to have been:

Kuniĝu la fratoj, plektiĝu la manoj,
Antaŭen kun pacaj armiloj!
Kristanoj, hebreoj aŭ mahometanoj
Ni ĉiuj de Di' estas filoj.
Ni ĉiam memoru pri bon' de l'homaro
Kaj malgraŭ malhelpoj, sen halto kaj staro
Al frata la celo ni iru obstine
Antaŭen, senfine!

Translation:

Together brothers, join hands,
Forward with peaceful armour!
Christians, Jews or Mahometans
We are all children of God.
Let us always be mindful of the good of humanity
And despite obstacles, without standing still
Let us pursue tenaciously the goal of brotherhood
Forward, without end![24]

idea of an international language, conscious that theoretical disputation will lead to nowhere and that the goal can be attained only by practical work, have for a long time all grouped together around the sole language *Esperanto* and work for its dissemination and enrichment of its literature.

3. Because the author of the language Esperanto refused once and for all, right at the beginning, all personal rights and privileges in relation to that language, accordingly Esperanto is "nobody's property" either in material or in moral respects.

The material master of this language is the whole world and anyone who wishes can publish in or about this language all works that he wishes, and can make use of the language for every possible kind of aim. As spiritual masters of this language will always be regarded those persons who are acknowledged by the Esperantist world as the best and most talented authors in this language.

4. Esperanto has no personal legislator and depends on no particular man. All opinions and works of the creator of Esperanto have, like the opinions and works of every other Esperantist, an absolutely *private* character, compulsory for nobody. The only foundation, compulsory for all Esperantists, once and for all, is the booklet *Fundamento de Esperanto*, in which nobody has the right to make change. If anyone strays from the rules and models given in the said work, he can never justify himself by the words "the author of Esperanto so advises or wishes". Any idea which cannot be conveniently expressed by that material which is found in the *Fundamento de Esperanto* any Esperantist has the right to express in such manner as he thinks fit, in the same way as is done in any other language. But for the sake of full unity of the language for all Esperantists it is recommended to imitate that style which is found in the works of the creator of Esperanto, who has worked most for and in Esperanto and knows its spirit best.

5. An Esperantist is every person who knows and uses the language Esperanto, irrespective of what kind of goals he uses it for. Membership of an active Esperantist society is recommended for every Esperantist, but not compulsory.[27]

Much of the Declaration was concerned with linguistic matters, particularly the question of the basic definition of the structure of Esperanto. The decisions taken on this topic were of great significance in the history of Esperanto, but this matter will be deferred to the next chapter. But on matters not directly connected with the structure of the language the Declaration recorded important characteristics of the ideology of the Esperanto movement. It stressed the unique loyalty of Esperantists to Esperanto; it clarified the role of Zamenhof as the most experienced Esperantist; and it

affirmed the purely linguistic mobilisation of the movement. Clause 3 of the Declaration was designed to clear up misunderstanding about the contract with Hachette. Zamenhof also announced at one of the meetings in Boulogne that he proposed to end the 'collection approved by Dr. Zamenhof' and that he would in future have only a personal contract with the firm. A Polish poet, Leo Belmont, expressed a reservation about the Declaration, since it made no mention of the promotion of world peace. It was however decided not to include this as such a mention might be inexpedient for official recognition.[28]

Thus, if the Declaration of Boulogne and Zamenhof's opening speech were taken together, the religious idealism of Zamenhof could be treated as merely his private opinion. Yet this presented certain difficulties, as Zamenhof was the founder and leader of Esperanto, not just an ordinary member. Zamenhof himself was encouraged by the enthusiastic reaction to his speech; his metaphysical ideas seemed acceptable to the participants generally, even if not to the French leaders. Zamenhof took the Congress at Boulogne as a proof of the fact that 'absolute justice, equality and fraternity between the peoples is fully possible.'[29] He saw the Congress as a turning point in history, and wrote

Kion disigis ne unu miljaro
Tion kunigis Bulonjo ĉe l'Maro.

Translation:

What not merely one millennium set apart
Boulogne-sur-Mer brought together.[30]

Thus he was encouraged by the success of the Congress to develop ideas for a world religion. He had already presented some of his religious ideas in 1901, in a Russian pamphlet published pseudonymously.[31] Zamenhof called his religious ideas 'Hillelism'. The Rabbi Hillel[32] (The Elder) a scholar and saint of the first century B.C., and of Babylonian origin, had been influential as a liberal interpreter of the scriptures. He was well known for his exposition of hermeneutic principles. According to tradition, he had summa-

rised Jewish law to a proselyte as follows: 'What is hateful to you do not to your fellow: that is the whole Law; all the rest is explanation: go and learn.'[33]

In his 1901 pamphlet Zamenhof stressed the importance of Hillel's teaching in the solution of the Jewish question. He was particularly concerned with the question of how the Jews should relate to the rest of humanity. He urged that, following Hillel, the teachings of Moses should be interpreted in the spirit rather than in the letter. He also advocated the use of Esperanto among the Jews and the setting up of a colony where the language and Hillelism could be cultivated.

The success of the Boulogne Congress encouraged Zamenhof to broaden the scope of his ideas. Among the French leaders, Zamenhof was able to discuss his religious ideas only with his fellow-Jew Javal; Javal was not unsympathetic but saw little hope for their realisation in the French environment, where the population was mostly Catholic or atheist: neither of these sections of the population would be favourable to the idea of a world religion.[34] Yet Zamenhof saw his ideas as conquering the world slowly, and after a further series of pogroms in Russia felt moved to give his ideas further publicity. In 1906 he published his ideas anonymously in an article, *Dogmoj de Hilelismo*, in the first number of *Ruslanda Esperantisto* for that year.[35] (Esperanto periodicals had been legalised in Russia again following the 1905 revolution.) Building on Hillel's work, Zamenhof set out to provide a positive response to the racial and religious strife in Russia. The article pointed to the Boulogne Congress as a demonstration of the feasibility of its aims, though it stressed that the new religious principles were to be distinguished from Esperanto. The dogmas set out to propose a neutral religion of humanity. They suggested that Hillelism was not intended to take men away from their native land, language, or religion, but rather that it was intended to serve as a 'neutrally human basis' (*fundamento neŭtrale-homa*) for communication between men of all languages and religions. The ultimate aim would be to bind human beings into one 'neutrally human' people, on the basis of a neutral language and neutral religious principles and morals.

A Hillelist was to be a humanist and to regard all peoples as of equal worth. He would regard every country as belonging equally