

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VIII

AUGUST, 1907

NO. 2

Immigration in the United States.

One of the important questions left undecided by the last International Social Congress was the attitude of Socialism towards immigration. The subject was as novel as it is large, and it found the delegates unprepared to deal with it in an intelligent and satisfactory manner. Of the two resolutions offered, the one drafted by the commission practically declared itself for unrestricted labor migration, while the other proposed by several representatives of Holland, Australia and the United States, voiced the opposition of organized labor to the importation into advanced countries of laborers of backward races, such as Chinese and African coolies. On the suggestion of Keir Hardie, both drafts were finally withdrawn in order to afford the socialist parties opportunity to make a more thorough study of the subject.

The discussion on Labor Immigration will be resumed in the coming Stuttgart Congress, and in conjunction with it the experience of the United States in that domain may play an important part in aiding the delegates to arrive at a proper solution of the problem.

The United States is the country of immigration par excellence, and that not only because, historically speaking, we are a nation of immigrants, but also because immigration has at all times been, and to present days remains, a most potent factor in the growth and development of our country, and in the formation of its industrial and social conditions.

The census of the United States in 1820 showed a total population of 9,638,453; in 1900 that number had risen to 76,303,387. If we consider that during the same period over 19,000,000 immigrants were admitted to the United States, and that the birth rate of immigrants is considerably higher than

that of the natives, the conclusion is irresistible that they and their descendants constitute the bulk of the present population of the country.

The majority of "native" citizens to-day can probably not trace their American ancestry to more than two or three generations while the number of foreign born inhabitants in 1905 was between 13,000,000 and 14,000,000.

And the immigration is constantly increasing in volume. During the thirty-year period of 1850—1880, the average number of yearly arrivals vacillated pretty uniformly around a quarter of a million, in the succeeding two decades it rose to almost half a million, per year, and in 1905 the number of immigrants passed the million mark, and in 1906 it was over 1,250,000.

The United States is thus the classic soil of modern immigration, and the study of the sources and causes of that immigration, its effects on the welfare of the country, and particularly the working class of the country, are of more than local interest.

SOURCES, CAUSES AND EFFECTS OF IMMIGRATION.

About the middle of the last century, the American immigration recruited itself chiefly from Ireland and Germany. In the decade of 1840 to 1850, nearly one-half of the total immigration was Irish, while one-quarter was German, and in the succeeding decade both nations were almost equally represented, and together constituted about two-thirds of all American immigration, the balance being chiefly made up of emigrants from England, Scotland, France and Sweden. The German, Irish English and Scandinavian immigration reached the highest point about 1880, but the last twenty-five years show a steady decline in the influx from these countries. Austro-Hungary, Italy and Russia henceforward supply the bulk of American immigrants. In 1870 all immigrants from the three countries mentioned constituted only one per cent, of the total immigration of the United States, in 1880 they rose to ten per cent, while in the five-years period of 1901 to 1905, two-thirds of all immigrants came from these countries. The number of Italian immigrants for that period was 959,768, that of the Austro-Hungarians 944,239, while Russia furnished 658,735.

The causes of this varying stream of immigration are to be found primarily in the industrial conditions of the countries of Europe as well as in those of the United States. It will be noticed that the American immigration commences to assume very large dimensions around the middle of the last century, i. e., at a time when in the more advanced countries of Europe the capitalist mode of production, with its inevitable blossoms of industrial crisis, unemployment and poverty, had reached a high point of

development, while the United States was about entering on its industrial career, and had an abundance of cheap fertile land and other unexploited natural resources. The operation of this economic motive on immigration is clearly shown by the immediate effects of the fluctuating industrial conditions of the country on it. During the Civil War the immigration decreased to less than 90,000 in each of the years 1861 and 1862, in 1865 after the close of the war, it rose again to almost a quarter of a million, and continued increasing until 1873, when it reached the high record of 459,803. But the industrial depression ushered in by that year immediately reflected itself on the immigration which fell from year to year until 1878, when it was reduced to a total of 138,469. The somewhat milder depression of 1894—1898 again witnessed a falling off of almost half of the yearly immigration.

But the economic considerations are not the sole cause of immigration: political motives have also from time to time largely contributed to its growth. The defeat of the revolution in 1848 and the enactment of the Exceptional Laws of 1878, have in each case more than doubled the emigration from Germany; the French risings of 1848 and 1870 had a similar effect, and the political and religious persecutions of the Jews in Russia have resulted in a veritable exodus of the victims to America.

The immigration from these causes represents a natural and spontaneous movement, and must be carefully distinguished from immigration purposely and artificially stimulated.

For a very considerable portion of American immigration is produced by artificial and unscrupulous means, and the worst offenders in this respect are the trans-atlantic steamship companies. The business of steamship travel has increased enormously within the last decades, and more than \$125,000,000 is said to be invested in the principal steamship lines. The chief source of profits of the industry is the carrying of steerage passengers. The steerage passengers are the least troublesome and best paying cargo: they are herded together in such numbers that a large ship frequently carries as many as 2000 of them, their food is of the cheapest, and they receive no attendance worth mentioning. It is, therefore, of the most vital interest to the steamship companies to solicit steerage passengers, and since steerage travel is rarely undertaken for pleasure, the traffic can only be supported by emigration. The part of the steamship companies and their agents in inducing emigration is not generally known or appreciated, for the reason that it is in most cases conducted clandestinely on account of the laws of the United States and some other countries prohibiting such practices. It is, however, an open secret that the principal lines maintain hosts of paid agents in all

parts of Europe, whose business it is to induce the poor and the ignorant to seek wealth and happiness in the New World by glowing descriptions of the conditions in the United States, its high wages, free land and great opportunities. The Red Star Line formerly had no less than 1500 of such agents, the Anchor Line had 2500, and the Inman Line 3400. All of these are smaller concerns, and each of the other companies probably employ still larger numbers. But in addition to such professional solicitors, the steamship companies know how to press tens of thousands of amateur agents into their service. In his report to the Commissioner General of Immigration in 1903, Special Immigrant Inspector, Marcus Braun, stated:

"I learned in the course of my travels, particularly in the countries of Austria-Hungary and Russia, that a large number of reputable persons, such as priests, school teachers, postmasters and country notaries, are directly connected with certain agents representing steamship companies, and that they advise and instruct the emigrants how to procure steamship tickets, passports, and all other things necessary for their travel, for all of which they receive a commission from the agent employing them, *** These sub-agents occupying semi-public positions, in order to earn commissions, play upon the ignorance and susceptibility of the plain peasant, frequently inducing him to sell or mortgage all his belongings for the purpose of raising the necessary travelling expenses."

And the steamship companies are not the only capitalist concerns to stimulate artificial immigration to the United States. In many large industries, the employers find it to their advantage to import foreign labor: unskilled workmen are imported in large numbers by mining concerns and by railroad companies engaged in the construction of new roads, on account of the low wages for which they consent to work; and skilled workmen are generally imported in cases where the American workmen are on strike, or where their organizations are so strong as to enable them to maintain a high standard of wages. Such skilled laborers from foreign countries are usually brought over under contracts of employment, written or oral.

But with all that the question of immigration had not, up to the latter part of the last century, attained to the dignity of a social problem in the United States. The unoccupied territory was so vast, and the nascent industries grew so rapidly that the powerful flow of immigration was easily absorbed by the new country.

Within the last generation, however, practically all the unappropriated and unreserved land of the country suitable for cultivation was disposed of, the inherent forces of the now fully

developed capitalist system of production created the usual "surplus population" of workingmen, and the wisdom of continuing the policy of unrestricted immigration began to be questioned by both employers and employees.

To the employing class, on the whole, the problem was, comparatively speaking, simple. It is in the interest of that class to maintain not only a number of workingmen sufficient for the actual needs of the industries of the nation under existing conditions, but also a certain surplus or reserve army of unemployed in order to keep wages at a low level. Until that point had been reached in our labor population, immigration was encouraged and our good capitalists were exceedingly hospitable to the persecuted and oppressed coming from the different despotic countries of Europe. Our immigration laws were very liberal. But after that critical point had been reached, all further "surplus population" became not only unnecessary, but highly embarrassing. Our ruling classes consequently became more apprehensive of the evil social and moral influence of the foreigners of an inferior grade of civilization, and our laws show a tendency towards increasing strictness in the admission of immigrants.

These considerations apply to the capitalist class on the whole, but, of course, there are still the numerous individual capitalist concerns which have good use for cheap foreign labor, and these continue the wholesale importation of such labor in spite of any and all prohibitive laws.

ATTITUDE OF ORGANIZED LABOR.

As far as the American workingmen are concerned, only the organized portion of it has expressed definite views on the question, and these views are decidedly in favor of greater restriction of immigration.

Within the last thirty years or more the Order of Knights of Labor and the American Federation of Labor, have repeatedly adopted resolutions demanding such restrictions. Among the favorite demands of these organizations were a physical and educational test, prohibition of importation of contract labor and "assisted" immigration and even the wholesale exclusion of certain races.

Mr. Samuel Gompers presented the problem to the annual convention of that body in 1905, in the following language:

"More than a million immigrants landed on our shores during the years which ended June 30, 1905. Far the greater part of them were men who have entered at once into the competition for work. They are already a part of our American industrial system. A few years hence many of them will be loyal and earnest members of the organization of their crafts, as many thousands who came like them a few

years ago are loyal and earnest supporters of the American labor movement to-day.

"But in the meantime their coming places several problems before us. One is the problem of bringing them within the circle of the labor movement. Most of them have known nothing of the principles of unionism in their own country. Hard experience will give them some inkling of the need of united action, but to make them steady and intelligent union men requires our most careful and persistent effort.

"And while the organized labor of this country is struggling with this problem of education and organization, it cannot lose sight of the effect of these immigrants on the old and everpresent problem of maintaining and raising wages and shortening hours. Additional workers, anxious for a chance to labor, is calculated to diminish the share of the product of labor that goes to the laborer, and to increase the share that goes to the employer. Additional men anxious to work in shop or field or on railroad or in forest have precisely this effect; to enable the owners of land and of monopolies to get more of the product of the laborer's work, and to compel the laborer himself to take up with less.

"It is with no ill-will to our brothers from over the sea that we point out the unfortunate results of their coming. We have only good wishes for them. More than that, their interest is ours. * * *

"The greatest hindrance to the rapid rise of our million comrades who came in last year is the other millions who are coming after them. The competition of these other millions will hold them down, and in holding them down will hold down the whole body of American workers. We wish nothing but good to such future immigrants. But we hold that we ought not, for their good, as well as our own, to sacrifice the interests of all the workers on this continent and of the generations that are to follow.

"If we and our children are not to be sacrificed, some check must be put upon the constant overstocking of what some are pleased to term 'labor market'. Some check would have to be put upon it even if the competition between those who are here and those who are coming were on equal terms. But it is not equal. The great mass of our present-day immigration is far inferior to the great body of American workers, and for that very reason its competition is the more hurtful. The more ignorant and poorer a man is, the more completely is he at the mercy of an employer. The weaker he is in body or mind, the better can he be used to break down the independence of his fellows. Just as the cheap labor of women and children displaces the labor of men, so the cheap labor of the unenlightened immigrant displaces the labor of Americans who insist upon American wages and conditions.

"Though most concerned in our own interest and welfare, it is not these considerations entirely that prompt us to restrict, limit and regulate future immigration. * * *

"If the workmen of foreign countries would more largely remain at home, conditions and circumstances would so develop that they would demand and secure material as well as political and social relief, and make for liberty and justice in their own countries. It is the free and unlimited opportunities for the workmen to leave their homes that perpetuates economic, social and political evils at home.

"Our demand for immigration restriction is as humanitarian for

the people of other countries as well as it is wise, just and protective for the people of our own."

This is one of the more enlightened expressions of the pure and simple trade union view on the subject. Many of the strongest trade unions, some of them affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, show far less tolerance towards the immigrant-workingmen of their trades. Their policy is to keep them out of their organizations by exacting unreasonably high initiation fees, and not infrequently requiring a certain length of residence in the country as one of the conditions of their admission. This short-sighted policy is, of course, the exception rather than the rule, and is pursued only in such cases where the trade unions are strong enough to practically control the labor market.

And it must be admitted that the unfriendly attitude of American labor towards immigration is not entirely without foundation, at least as far as the economic aspect of the question is concerned.

The standard life of the American workingmen is above that of the average immigrant laborer.

Thus the average wage of the American agricultural laborer outside of harvest time is estimated at \$1.25 to \$1.50 a day, while that of the English laborer is about 50 cents, that of the Russian and Austria-Hungarian about 30 cents, and that of the Italian still less. Of course, these figures do not take into account the cost of living of the laborers, which is about three times higher in America than in the countries mentioned, but even with proper allowance for that difference, the foreign laborer still underbids the native workingman, so much so that the latter has been driven out from several entire industries. In the mining regions, for instance, the American workingman was first supplanted by the English and Irish immigrant, who in turn made room for the German, and the latter finally yielded the field to the cheaper labor of the Italian and "Slav."

And the life of these new comers is, at least in the beginning, very miserable. Herded together in large numbers, they live in small and dirty shanties, are poorly nourished and clad, and compelled to send their children to work at a very tender age. Compulsory education is a dead letter as far as they are concerned. The degradation of this cheap foreign labor finds perhaps its most revolting expression in the development among them of the "padrone" and "sweating" system, both of which had a somewhat demoralizing effect on the American labor market.

It is true that the competition of cheap immigration labor is felt most keenly in the "unskilled" trades, but it would be a mistake to assume that the "skilled" organized workingmen are entirely unaffected by it. The development of machinery has a strong

tendency to obliterate the distinction between "skilled" and "unskilled" labor, and in many "skilled" trades the workingmen have long periods of idleness during which they are compelled to eke out their existence by common labor.

Thus it happened that on the question of immigration the apparent interests of organized labor have within the last decades largely coincided with those of the employing classes, and the demands of the former for restriction of further immigration have found rather willing ears in the legislatures of the latter. It is a noteworthy fact that of all the demands made from time to time by organized labor in our country, those relating to restriction of immigration have been most readily granted by our ruling classes. The course of immigration legislation in the United States Congress has within the last thirty years been one of successive restrictions.

The first significant act of Congress in that direction was the Chinese Exclusion Law and the different amendments it passed from 1882-1888. Around 1880 there were more than 100,000 Chinamen in the United States, and the majority of them settled in the State of California. They were engaged in mining, in the work of constructing the Pacific railroads, and fruit growing and farming. Their lack of requirements, cheapness of labor, inability to merge with the American workingmen and to organize, and their strange garb and habits, had early engendered a hostile feeling towards them on the part of the local working population, and when, towards the end of the seventies of the last century, the unprecedented industrial depression in California threw most of the native workingmen out of employment, this hostility was fanned into a blaze of hatred. Chinese labor was made responsible for all existing social and economic evils on the Pacific coast, a strong and turbulent agitation sprang up and culminated in the formation of the Working-men's Party of California with the platform: "The Chinese Must Go!" The two old parties were quick in endorsing the motto, and Congress promptly responded to the general demand of the Californians. At present all Chinese immigrants are excluded from the United States except officials, teachers, students, merchants and travellers for curiosity or pleasure.

Other restrictive measures were adopted by Congress one by one, and to-day the immigration laws of the United States bar the following classes of persons from landing: (1) Idiots, insane persons and epileptics; (2) Persons afflicted with contagious or dangerous diseases; (3) Criminals, polygamists and prostitutes; (4) Paupers, beggars and persons likely to become a charge on the public; (5) Contract laborers and assisted immigrants. The barring of the last mentioned class of immigrants and in some

measure also the fourth class, is chiefly due to the agitation of organized labor.

After the assassination of President McKinley by the native American anarchist Czolgosz, Congress passed the notorious law excluding anarchists, defining the term as "persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the United States or of all government or all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials." Our present laws also prohibit all encouragement and solicitation of immigration on the part of the steamship companies, and impose a head tax of four Dollars on every immigrant.

THE SOCIALIST VIEW.

The socialists of the United States have heretofore occupied themselves but little with the question of immigration. The problem has never attained the magnitude of an important political issue which would force the Socialist Party as a political party to define its attitude on it, and the socialist influence on the trade union movement of our country is unfortunately so weak, that the party is not yet called on to act as the theoretical adviser on matters of general interest to organized labor.

As a rule the socialists of the United States do not share the narrower views of pure and simple trade unionism on the question of immigration. From the point of view of the immediate economic welfare of the American workingmen, immigration is certainly not a blessing, but its evil effects are largely exaggerated. The immigrant workingman certainly swells the supply of labor power but to some extent he also helps to increase the demand for it. He is not only a producer, he is also a consumer, and while under the present system he is bound to consume less than he produces, it is still a gross error to overlook his stimulating effect on the industrial growth of the country. The immigrant's low standard of living is also often a temporary rather than a permanent condition. Experience has demonstrated that in most cases the newly arrived workingmen after some time raise their standard of life, assimilate with the American workingmen and join their labor organizations. In fact the organized "American" workingmen to-day are the best proof of that assertion, for in a large, if not in a majority, of cases, they are themselves immigrants or immigrants' children.

And to the extent to which immigration actually is an evil to the working class of the receiving country, it is an evil inseparable from the existing economic system, as inseparable from it as the evils of child labor or woman labor, or the existence of the standing "natural" army of unemployed workingmen in every country with a capitalist development.

The migration of workmen is caused and regulated largely by economic conditions, it is just as much a part of our industrial order as the movement of the masses from the village to the city and from city to city within every country. Capitalism is international, and the working class of the "civilized" world is its marching army, whose battalions are constantly ordered from town to town, from country to country, from hemisphere to hemisphere according to the exigencies of industrial developments and changes. And just as little as any modern country can withdraw from the international market, just so little can it permanently protect itself by artificial barriers from the natural stream of modern labor migration. It is the inexorable rule of supply and demand that in the last instance determines the volume and direction of migration and all legal enactments opposed to that rule are but temporary and inefficient makeshifts. Should the labor market in the United States fall below that of the European markets, the immigration of European labor will fall off no matter how liberal and attractive our immigration laws may be, and should, on the contrary, a condition arise where our employing classes would need more labor than they can advantageously find in their own country, all restrictive immigration laws will be speedily repealed and foreign laborers will be imported in larger numbers than ever. The efforts of organized labor should, therefore, be directed towards the organization and elevation of their immigrated brethren rather than towards their exclusion.

But if the socialists are thus unable to share all the current views of organized labor on immigration, they can just as little afford to ignore all their views.

The considerations indicated above apply only to immigration naturally and normally produced by existing economic conditions, and we may also add to that class immigration produced by political causes. But an entirely different standard must be applied to the other aspects of immigration mentioned in this article. Immigration artificially stimulated for the benefit of the steamship companies, land agents and similar commercial concerns, is just as pernicious to the workmen of the country of emigration as to those of the receiving country, and should be discouraged with all means at the command of the socialists and workmen of all countries. The international importation of workmen from foreign countries for the purpose of breaking strikes or weakening or destroying labor organizations, is just as obnoxious to socialists as it is to the trade unions, and all measures to check these capitalist practices have the full support of the socialists. And finally the majority of the American socialists side with the trade unions in their demand for the exclusion of workmen of such races and nations as have as yet not been drawn into the sphere of

modern production, and who are incapable of assimilation with the workmen of the country of their adoption, and of joining the organizations and struggles of their class. This demand is a direct expression of the natural instinct of self-preservation.

Just what races are to be included in this category is a question that can only be decided from time to time with reference to the particular circumstances and conditions of each case. Years ago the Chinese laborers in California were by common consent declared to be undesirable immigrants, and very recently the same issue was raised in the same state with reference to the Japanese laborers. Whether the claim is justified this time, whether the Japanese workmen have proved themselves incapable of organizing on American soil and taking part in the struggle of their American brethren is the subject of quite animate discussions in American party and labor circles just now. Personally I am not sufficiently familiar with the question to pass judgment on it.

MORRIS HILLQUIT.

Rise of the Russian Proletariat.

CHAPTER III.

THE GENERAL STRIKES.

The first half of 1906 had been marked by an immense protest against the murder of Gapon's followers, but toward the middle of the year the Revolutionary movement died down into a discussion of the coming elections. The Socialists had decided in their various conferences to do what they could to impede the election by strikes and revolt, and they wished to keep the workmen quiet and so save their strength until the election days.

But in the early part of October the printers of Moscow began to talk of a strike. They wanted an increase of wages and more free time. Their Union had been organized by the Socialists and its Executive Committee was largely controlled by the party. According to their plan—to save up the energy of the proletariat for the critical election days, the Socialists did all they could to discourage this strike, but they could not hold the men in. The movement was too strong for them. They had to go with the men or lose them.

Not being able to prevent the strike they decided to turn it into a political demonstration.

When the boss printers of Moscow received the demand of the men, the first thing they read was the demand for a democratic republic based on universal suffrage. Even if the bosses approved of these demands, as many of them undoubtedly did, it was, of course, out of their power to grant them. They were not demands for the improvement of the economic condition of the workmen, but for immediate and thorough-going revolution.

The men were determined and would not listen to any compromise. Many of these boss printers closed their shops. Others transferred their contracts abroad. The strike failed pitifully.

But the political psychology of Russia was very tense. There was a ring in the demands of the Moscow printers—hopeless as they were—which found an echo in the heart of almost every worker in Russia. The next morning their demands appeared in the papers of St. Petersburg, and the Petersburg printers went out in sympathy. Before the day was over, half a dozen of the biggest factories, iron works, textile mills, etc., went out—without demands—to show their solidarity with their Moscow comrades.

It happened that delegates of the railroad men were gathered in conference in St. Petersburg. That night they declared a general railroad strike. Again without demands of their own—to give emphasis to the brave words of the Moscow printers. Before any one realized it, the biggest general strike of history was on foot. Day by day,—hour by hour,—the movement grew. It spread in all directions. The Union of Unions joined in. Engineers, lawyers, doctors, hospital nurses, teachers,—quit work. Almost all the employees of the Imperial State Department went out. The movement was not without its humorous features. The Congress of Apiarians was assembled in Moscow, and they passed a resolution that it was impossible to raise bees unless Russia was granted a constitution. Even the police force struck in some places.

All over Russia hung the fear of the unknown. Such a quiet had never been. The streets of St. Petersburg were empty. The tram cars were deserted by their drivers. There were no cabs. The stores were boarded up as though to resist a siege. At night there was no light. The streets were deserted except by the patrols of Cossacks, but there were no disturbances. The very quiet added to the fearsomeness. The workers had stopped work. Hunger and thirst threatened. People spoke in whispers and waited nervously for what the next hour would bring forth. Never has the idle class been so frightened.

In these days of tension a new entity came into the life of Russia: The Council of Workingmen's Deputies—and the name of Krystalov, the President, grew and grew, until it eclipsed that of Witte, the Premier.

Never had there been such an impressive proletarian action as that of this first general strike. The Council of Workingmen's Deputies functioned admirably. There was none of the bickering and rivalry which wrecked the Paris Commune, and this was not the revolt of one City but of the workingmen of an Empire more than forty times as large as France.

It is hard for one who has not seen it to understand what the words "General Strike" mean. "War," "Insurrection," "Paricide,"—have a place in history and a meaning for everybody,—but a "General Strike" is something new,—something of our generation—and few people realize its power. It came suddenly. There was no warning. The street cars stopped where they stood. Cabs disappeared. The restaurants closed. The ovens of the bakeries got cold. No one bought milk. There were no papers, no mail nor telegrams; no news from the outside world. There were no trains running to bring in the tons of meat and vege-

tables consumed every day. Would the water stop? The Council of the workingmen's Deputies decided, "Not yet."

On the 17th the Tsar broke. The manifesto of October 17th was issued. With fair promises, Nicholas, in his terror, sought to save his throne.

Liberty! Freedom of speech! Freedom of Assembly! A constitution! Amnesty for political prisoners!

With these words the strike was ended. Like magic the streets were alive again. Strangers embraced and kissed as they read the manifesto. Impromptu processions paraded the streets and crowds flocked to the meetings at the University and the Kazan Cathedral. The religious sang *Te Deums* but more sang the *Marseillaise*. The police good naturedly uncovered before the red flag.

The days of freedom had begun.

Not much more could have been expected than the Tsar promised on that 17th of October. To be sure, the promises were vague—they would be developed in detail as soon as possible—the manifesto said—but a movement so spontaneous as the October strike could not be expected to have very definite demands, and all that they had asked had been promised. The telegraphists rushed back to their work to send the news to the remotest corners of the Empire and with almost as much haste, the other workers went back to their toil and life began again.

No one realized the disorganization to traffic and commerce which this strike had caused until long afterward. The chaos of the mails and freight yards was never straightened out. Nearly a year afterward I saw a carload of baby buggies in a siding near *Bostov-on-the-Don*. Some one had quit work without putting a tag on the car and it was being sent back and forth in the hope that some one would claim it.

The workmen of Russia had suddenly decided to stop work, and the result was appalling. The autocracy, which had never before taken revolution seriously, was shaken to its foundation. The capitalists and exploiting classes of Russia received a shock from which they will not soon recover.

And yet Russia is so preponderatingly agricultural that at the very most, not more than 11 per cent of the population was engaged in this strike. The effects of a General Strike in a country where industry is highly developed as in America or England is quite beyond calculation.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DAYS OF FREEDOM.

The first week after the manifesto of October 17th was one

of unbounded joy. Old and experienced men lost their heads and congratulated one another on the freedom of Russia. I was sitting with an old Revolutionist the day after the manifesto when a telegram was received from a comrade in England, a telegram of wild exultation. And the joy with which every one was intoxicated was not of a gift but a conquest. The Tsar had refused to make concessions to Gapon. They had forced them from him. No one spoke of petitions in those days. The word was "We demand." The new liberty of speech and assembly was used to the utmost. Every one with a voice and an idea took to the stump and some who had only a voice. There were meetings everywhere. Workingmens' meetings, students' meetings, meetings for soldiers, meetings for school girls. Nobody knows how many political parties were launched in that first week of the Days of Freedom. Perhaps no phase of life so well reflected the change as the newspapers. Within the week there were a score of more new papers. The Liberals, Radicals, Revolutionists, started printing offices. "The Beginning", "The Dawn", "Toil", "The Laborer", and dozens of others sprang to life, but most startling of all were the satirical papers. A week before a political cartoon had been a crime. Every day now brought out a new set of caricatures.

"When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be.

When the devil got well, the devil a monk was he."

And so, as the tide of proletarian revolt sank back to its old level, the Court regained courage. The reaction set in.

The second week was one of doubt. News came from the South of Jew slaughters. The details of the amnesty were published and many a popular hero was not included. Perhaps the Tsar had, after all, deceived them.

The third week was one of certainty. Even the most hopeful had to admit that the Victory was not yet won. Newspapers were suppressed; so freedom of the press was a myth. Meetings were dispersed; so freedom of speech was only a promise.

Every one prepared again for war. The general strike had proven so effective in October that it was accepted as a weapon for a new struggle. It became only a question of time when it would be called.

The meetings of the Council of workingmen's Deputies were secret and no one can tell exactly what happened there, but it seems to have lost some of the integrity it had during the first strike. Various Socialist factions began to try to control it — not always by praiseworthy methods; but despite these party intrigues it still had a place in the popular mind side by side with — if not superior to — the government.

The Council of Workingmen's Deputies was a makeshift, suddenly called together at the time of the first strike. It had never been fairly representative. It was composed of two elements; delegates hastily chosen from the factories, and educated men appointed by the Socialist parties and similar organizations. These last were supposed to have only a consulting voice but their influence was very great.

Most of the factory deputies were discharged by their employers and so lost touch with their constituents. At best they were simple workmen with absolutely no experience in the work before them. Their intellectual advisors were also inexperienced.

But the gravest defect of the Council was that it was local. It had no regular means of communication with the workmen outside of Petersburg.

I give these facts as extenuating circumstances for the Council needs all the excuses it can get. In the first strike, in October, its work was above praise. It had been hastily convened but it met each problem as it arose and its decisions were marked with surprising sanity. But in the second strike it threw away the advantages already gained. In the third strike it pushed the workmen to their death.

In November the Petersburg workmen began to strike for an eight-hour day. Their demands were purely economic and the strike was not successful. The Council of Workingmen's Deputies tried to cover this local defect by turning the movement into a political general strike of all Russia. A few days previously there had been a mutiny in the Garrison of Kronstadt, and a number of the soldiers had been condemned to death. About this time the martial law had been proclaimed in Poland, and the Polish workmen had taken an active part in the October Strike. The Council of Workingmen's Deputies used these things as a pretext for the second General Strike. They thought that the workingmen, by protesting against the execution of the Kronstadt mutineers, would win the army to their side and they considered that they owed a duty to protest against the martial law under which their Polish comrades were suffering. By calling a strike on these two issues they hoped to cover the defeat of the eight-hour movement.

The slogan of the second strike, "For Bleeding Poland and Kronstadt Martyrs", fell flat. In Petersburg, most of the well-organized men were already on strike but in the other cities and in the provinces the response to this call was very slight. The second General Strike failed dismally, and it was a disastrous failure. Besides the discouraging influence on the workmen, incident to the loss of any strike, it lowered the prestige of the

Council and restored the courage of the Court. It was a pitiful display of weakness, and the officials got definitely over their October scare. Everything which had been promised was retracted and the oppression set in earnest.

The prime cause of the failure of the November Strike was that it originated — not as in the first strike, in the spontaneous wish of all workers — but in the order of a body which was not representative. Ignorant of the conditions and temper of the men outside of St. Petersburg, the men could only judge from what was taking place in that city, and the St. Petersburg men responded loyally. The blame of the failure cannot be placed on the workmen outside of St. Petersburg. They had shown their revolutionary spirit in October and were to amply testify to it again in December, but the call of "Bleeding Poland" and the "Kronstadt Martyrs" stirred no echo in their hearts. To protest against the oppression of Poland was perhaps an ethical duty. To strike on behalf of the mutinous soldiers would have been a good strategical move; but neither ethics nor strategy is motive sufficient to stir the great masses.

On the other hand, no one can doubt the absolute sincerity and devotion of the men who composed the Council. It was only an error in judgment but it was a frightfully costly error.

There was another element of weakness in the second strike for which the blame can be more definitely placed. The Socialists, the intellectual leaders of the workingmen, had used the first of the days of freedom to villify the middle class. The editorials of their papers bristled with venomous attacks on every one — but themselves — who did not earn their living by manual labor. Every one who did not call himself a proletarian was Bourgeois, and not only an enemy of the working class, but also a traitor to the cause of political freedom. No one will deny that the Bourgeoisie of France and other western states have often used and abused the workingmen in their Revolution. No one who is familiar with America or other democratic states will deny that — at election times — the Bourgeoisie offer the workingmen all sorts of promises which they have no intention of fulfilling. But in Russia things are different. The Russian Socialists who knew history were right in believing that the ideals of the workingmen were not identical with those of the Russian Capitalist, and if the class of factory workers in Russia had been big enough and sufficiently developed to overthrow Tsarism and to keep the political power in their own hands, the leaders would have been wise to say: "We will do this thing ourselves and keep the benefits ourselves". But the factory workers form only nine or ten percent of Russia's population. Single-handed

they are powerless against the forces of autocracy. A very large element of strength of the first General Strike was given by these whom the Socialists called the Bourgeoisie.

The Socialists had succeeded by their vituperation in alienating the professional classes and all the Radical and Liberal elements of Society. This split of course weakened the opposition immensely and gave proportionate strength to the Government. The Radicals and Liberals gave no help to the November Strike, either by actual participation or by money.

The last Days of Freedom were pitiful days. The Government's success in suppressing the second Strike encouraged foreign bankers to give the Government another loan wherewith to hire more Cossacs and to buy more ammunition for the machine guns. Almost every newspaper was suppressed and arrests often totalled over a hundred a day in St. Petersburg. The Council of Workingmen's Deputies, 127 of them, were arrested at one of their meetings.

All pretenses on the part of the Government, of keeping the promises of October, had been dropped, one after another. The Revolutionists had to look forward to another struggle. Evidently, General Strikes could not be called successfully very often and even such an imposing movement as that of the October Strike had had only a temporary effect. There must be found some new and deadly weapon. It was decided that the next General Strike should be followed by an armed insurrection.

When should it be? There was great difference of opinion. Some thought that the election days would be the psychological moment. Others thought that that was too soon, for there were very few firearms in the hands of the workingmen. There was no definite plan, but it was the subject of discussion in all Revolutionary circles. All the efforts of the parties of the Extreme Left were spent in the smuggling in of arms, and as fast as possible, the Socialist organized the workingmen into a Revolutionary Militia. The possession of fire-arms, without a police permit—is a serious crime and to be found with a large number means a long term in exile. So the work of arming went on with pitiful slowness.

Meanwhile, the activity of the Government, refreshed by the new loan — was redoubled. A new Council of Workingmen's Deputies had been organized, but it, in its turn, had been arrested. All the organizations of workmen formed in the first week of the Days of Freedom, were being dispersed. Hundreds of leaders were being thrown into prison.

And on the ninth of December a new Council of workingmen's Deputies called for a third General Strike and an armed

uprising. They knew that the workmen were neither organized for the strike nor armed for an Insurrection. But the persecution of the Government was so fierce that they said: "We are growing weaker instead of stronger. If we sit idle, what little organization we have will be wrecked. It is now or never.

It was a forlorn hope.

CHAPTER V.

THE DECEMBER DAYS.

Close to the site of the very oldest settlement of Moscow is a large high school. Mr. Fielder, the superintendent of this school, was a Liberal, and during the Days of Freedom, he opened the class rooms in the evenings for political meetings.

On the evening of the 9th of December, 1905, in one of the class rooms there was a meeting of Workingmen's Deputies, delegates of the Socialist party and leaders of the Revolutionary militia. They were there to discuss the call of the Petersburg Council of Workingmen's Deputies to the general Strike and armed uprising. Their discussion was interrupted by the news that the schoolhouse was surrounded by troops and that the police were demanding their surrender.

Most of them were armed and surrender meant a long term of imprisonment. They hurriedly determined on resistance. They barricaded the doors, and with pistol fire and two or three bombs which they had with them succeeded in temporarily beating back their assailants.

The windows of this school were soon riddled by rifle balls but the walls were of solid stone. The Revolutionists were well armed and perhaps they thought, if we hold out till the news of our plight spreads through the city, the workmen will rise and come to our rescue.

Although some of their number had been killed, no one thought of surrender until Moscow woke up to the sound of cannon fire,—the first since the days of Napoleon, nearly a hundred years before. Peaceful Moscowites started from their sleep at the thunder of the guns and called from the windows to know the trouble. The more war-like hurried into their clothes and went to the rendezvous, but long before there could be any plan of rescue the defenders of the school had surrendered.

Solid shot and shrapnel tore through the stone walls of the buildings. The cannon were beyond the range of their pistols, beyond the reach of their bombs. With the masonry crashing around them, they decided on surrender. Some few managed to escape. The rest were taken by the police and thrown into prison where they still remain.

Such was the beginning of the December Insurrection. The Revolutionists were not ready; did not want it. The Council in Petersburg who had issued the call were not able to do anything. They did not succeed in getting the Petersburg workmen out. They did not fire a single gun in their own Revolt. Outside of Petersburg the strike fared better. In Moscow almost all the workmen came out and on the 10th, the morning after the attack on Fielder's school, the workmen paraded the streets with red flags. Again the Government forced matters. They tried "The whiff of the grape shot" which Napoleon had said would quiet any Insurrection. The artillery poured grape and shrapnel into crowds of workingmen and it is probable that more lives were lost on this day than in all the rest of the Insurrection. No one knows the number who fell that day. The blood of many harmless onlookers, women and children, reddened the snow of Moscow. And almost immediately the barricades sprang up. Flags as red as the blood stains on the snow waved on these barricades. And the news of the barricades in Moscow raised the red flag in many another city.

On the morning of the 11th, all the outer city was a maize of barricades. Only the center of the city belonged to the Tsar.

It is almost inevitable to compare these Russian barricades with those of the Paris Commune. But it is an unfair comparison. The Frenchman was bred to war. They had the Revolutions of 1792 and 1840 to learn from. They had trained officers at their disposal and best of all, they were armed. The workmen of Moscow had not a single officer to direct them. No one of them had ever seen a barricade, and among all the population there were scarcely 2,000 armed; most of them with only pistols. They had neither machine guns nor cannons.

The arrest of their leaders in the Fielder school, the brutal firing on the peaceful processions had forced them to revolt. They had read in books of barricades, and barricades they made. From the point of view of scientific fortifications, they were laughable. Loose piles of telegraph poles, iron railings, overturned street-cars, anything that came handy. In some places, mere banks of snow such as children build.

But from the point of view of history—the history of the upward forging of the disinherited,—they were not laughable. They represented the first crude efforts of the Russian people to break their chains by force. Father Gapon's demonstration and the October Strike had been protests. This—was an assault.

And from the point of view of the Governor of Moscow, they were not laughable. This mushroom growth of baricades was more frightful than a peaceful Strike. Of the troops at his disposal, so

much of the Infantry were disaffected that they could not be trusted. The Cavalry was almost useless against the network of tangled wires with which the Revolutionists had surrounded their barricades and Artillery was not very effective against piles of the empty boxes which the insurgents had enough sense not to defend. It was guerrilla warfare. The Revolutionists kept behind cover. They shot on the troops from windows and dropped bombs from house tops. They could move about with triple the speed of their regular troops and they amply demonstrated that Karl Marx was wrong when he said that the invention of machine guns had made city Insurrections impossible.

For almost a week the Insurgents held their ground, and even advanced their fortification. They could build more barricades in a night than the troops could destroy in a day. In the fighting the Revolutionists lost very few men. They certainly killed many times more soldiers than they lost themselves, and they could have killed more if they had tried, but as they were hoping that the troops would come over to them, they did what they could to win their friendship, confining their attacks as much as possible, against the officers.

Although they were very poorly armed they had one great advantage over the troops,—their number. When one man was worn out he handed his gun to a comrade and went to sleep. So the few arms which the Revolutionists had, were working all the time. The troops, not having a chance to rest, were very much worn out by fatigue.

For the first three days of the Insurrection, the Insurgents' cause was on the increase. Every gun they captured, by changing it from fatigued hands to fresh ones, added three men to their firing force. And on the 14th and 15th, it became a question what was happening outside of the City. The Insurgents were gaining in strength. The garrison was weakening through fatigue, rapidly. A few days more, and the soldiers, not over-loyal at first, might have thrown down their arms.

What was happening outside?

Petersburg was as quiet as death. The Strike had failed, and there was no shadow of an Insurrection beyond the words in the appeal of the Council of Workingmen's Deputies. The inhabitants of the Baltic provinces had revolted, burned the chateaux of the nobles, and in almost every part of their territory had established Revolutionary government. The Cities of the South were also up. Kharkov, Jekaterinoslag, Odessa, Rostov, and Batoun were battlefields closely comparable to Moscow, Novorossisk on the shores of the Black Sea had won the fight and established a Republic. Almost every town in Siberia was in revolt, and in many

places, aided by the discontented soldiers of the federal Manchurian army, the workmen had planted the red flag on the town halls.

Just at this critical moment, when some of the cities had overthrown their garrisons and when fully half of the cities were waging a hopeful fight, the railroad Strike broke.

Then, as the government could move its loyal troops from one place to another, it became only a question of time when the Insurrection would be crushed out.

The crushing process began in Moscow, as it was of the most importance strategically. It is the ancient capital of Russia and still holds in the heart of the people a more important place than Petersburg. The foreign papers had little news of the Insurrection in other cities, but were full of exciting stories from Moscow. To re-establish its credit abroad, as well as at home, the government had to concentrate all its energies here. On the 13th a train load of fresh soldiers arrived from Tver, and the next day, and the next, troops were rushed from Petersburg where there was no sign of trouble.

The arrival of these troops turned the tide. The Revolutionists, disheartened by the failure of the Petersburg workmen to support them, discouraged by the failure of the Strike, lost heart and for the remaining days fought despairingly. The Revolutionary militia from the cotton mills and furniture factories of the Presnia Suburb held out the longest. They were the best organized and best led of all the scattered troops of fighters.

But on the 17th, the barricades being down in the rest of the City, they found themselves surrounded by an overpowering force. The cannon fire was terrific. Further defence was hopeless. They held their positions for some hours and then slipped through the surrounding forces and escaped.

The next few days were spent by the troops in destroying the buildings whose owners were suspected of complicity in the Revolt, and in hunting out and killing as many of the Insurgents as possible. In this process they were not over particular and many an innocent person was executed.

The days of pacification were the days of terror. The City was crowded with patrols. It was impossible to go on the street without being searched by the soldiers and there was short shift if you were found with a weapon. It was a crime to have given medical aid to the wounded, and more than one doctor met the fate of Dr. Liebmann, who was shot by the soldiers in his own house before his family on the bare suspicion of having aided in one of Red Cross Stations established by the Revolutionists.

When Moscow was sufficiently pacified the troops were

moved to other cities, and after they were recaptured the same bloody policy of pacifications was applied. It took months to reconquer Siberia. Ali Kanov, a Russian General of Turkish descent, was still pacifying the Caucasus in March, and although the Republican Government in the Baltic Provinces was overthrown in January the Government still finds it necessary, a year later, to maintain their field court martial and the summary executions have only slightly abated.

The collapse of the December Insurrection marked the end of the Days of Freedom. Freedom, won by the working men was quickly withdrawn after their defeat on the barricades.

The factory workers of Russia—less than a tenth of the population — have fought their fight. For a few days in October they ruled the Empire. But their power gradually waned. They were crushed in December. Worn out by three General Strikes, their leaders rotting in prison, their bravest spirits buried beside the barricades, it is doubtful if this generation of workmen will recover sufficient strength to be a decisive force in the near future.

The factory workers of Russia of this generation have striven for freedom more valiantly, more determinedly, more solidly, than any other country, but the hope of Russia does not lie with them. It is an agricultural country, the only one known to this or the last century. There is no real proletariat; no numerous and well-organized class of factory workers. The center of political gravity lies outside of the City.

ALBERT EDWARD.

To the Workers of the World.

MANIFESTO OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU.

At the very moment in which Nicholas was about to call the first peace conference his policy in the far east was rendering the war with Japan inevitable.

At the moment in which he was receiving the congratulations of the second Hague congress he ordered the dissolution of the second duma.

This double coincidence is an admirable illustration of the farce which has been and is being played now at The Hague and at St. Petersburg. The farce will be complete when the third peace congress shall meet in a palace erected by a man who in his own country, the United States, was one of the first to hurl an armed police against the working class and to illustrate to the world his idea of social peace, by ordering them to fire upon the workers in his shops—the creators of his immense fortune.

For a long time the proletariat has thoroughly understood the traditional policy of the Russian government—that pivot of the reaction. External peace, as it conceives it is not the abolition of war, but the weakening of its opponents and the domination of czarism. Its dream of domestic peace is a people crushed and autocracy perpetuated.

After the first congress at The Hague Nicholas went forth to devastate Manchuria and turn loose the horrors of Blagovechtchensk. He violated his oath to the Finnish people and drowned all Russia in blood. He re-established the tortures of the middle ages at Riga; he permitted the massacre and pillage of the poor peasants of Gorja by his soldiers to go unpunished; he has permitted the guards of the prisons to kill with the bayonets political prisoners, both men and women. During the insurrection of Moscow he permitted his soldiers to fire upon ambulances and his imperial guards have, under form of law, killed railway employes engaged in their regular work.

The czar has treated his own subjects as he would be ashamed to treat the soldiers of an enemy. And it is this chief of a band of capitalists and colonial pirates, who is seeking to impose himself upon the world as the symbol and personification of their right of primitive force, who seeks to show us how peaceable agreements can be substituted for bloody battles and permanent treaties of peace replace fratricidal war.

Admitting sincerity, it is impossible to realize these peaceful intentions, because militarism is nothing more than the organized armament of the state for the purpose of holding the working class beneath the economic and political yoke of the bourgeoisie—because under capitalism wars between nations are generally only the result of their struggles for the markets of the world, because each power asserts itself, not alone to maintain the markets which it already possesses, but to conquer new ones, and this, too often, by the subjugation of foreign peoples and the confiscation of their territory.

Let the diplomats who are seated at The Hague look about them! They will see the masters of West Africa by the side of the rulers of India, the conquerors of Madagascar by the side of the exploiters of the Congo, and the victors in Manchuria by the side of their unfortunate adversaries.

Wars, which are systematically undertaken by the dominant classes for the purpose of arousing the mutual antagonism of different peoples, appear to the proletariat as the very essence of capitalism, which will disappear only with the disappearance of capitalist exploitation itself.

The working class, on the contrary is the natural enemy of war, because it is the principal victim—victim through the sacrifice of its children, victim through the loss of its product, and because war is in opposition to the object of Socialism, which is the creation of a new order of things, based upon the solidarity of the producers, upon the fraternity of nations, upon the liberty of the people.

When in 1870 Germany annexed Alsace-Lorraine the representatives of the Socialist proletariat, Bebel and Liebknecht, protested against war and annexation.

When in 1904 the official heads of Russia and Japan were sacrificing thousands of young lives, the representatives of the proletariats of Russia and Japan, were clasping fraternal hands at the Socialist congress at Amsterdam.

In 1870 while the cannon were thundering on the frontiers the German workers wrote to the French workers:

“We must never forget that the workers of all countries are friends, and that the despots of all countries are our enemies.”

And the French workers replied to the German workers:

“French workers! German workers! Spanish workers! Let us unite our voices in a cry of denunciation of war.”

Such was the language of the first international of the workers. Such is the language of the new international of the laborers. Its representatives have, in spite of calumny and persecution, consistently supported their ideas of peace between nations by their acts, in systematically refusing to vote for all military

credit, and it is certain that the day on which the workers control armies wars will cease.

This is why they demand the military disarmament of the bourgeoisie, and the armament of the working class through the general armament of the whole people.

Each time that a threatening cloud appears upon the political horizon, the working class intervenes in parliaments, in the streets, by its deputies and by manifestations, and it may well decide in the hour of danger to go further than it has hitherto done to anticipate and prevent war.

Its politics will not be contradictory. Just as in the Boer war the English proletariat was opposed to its government, so no two divisions of the international army of labor will permit themselves to be in opposing camps.

The international labor movement has always maintained as a principle that no government can threaten the independence of any nation without arousing against it its own working class and the international working class. This is why the idea of peace can only take form and triumph through the progress and realization of the ideal of Socialism.

War, on the contrary, finds its best ground for culture in the growth of absolutism. Viewed from this point the dissolution of the *duma* constitutes a danger for all Europe. It has surprised no one. We are accustomed to seeing czarism violate its pledges, and the moment that it has the power it will treat other nations as it treats the Russian people.

Nicholas II, during a moment of danger, promised liberty. But when the peril seemed less threatening he sent back the first *duma*, since it did not appear sufficiently docile. He desired a parliament of servants.

The government of Russia accepted the words, government by parliament, but not the thing. In response to the desires of the bureaucracy and his sovereign, Stolypin promulgated restrictive legislation, tampered with the electoral lists, imprisoned his opponents. This great minister showed his chivalry by turning loose the Black Bands and the police to massacre women and children.

Events baffled the ministerial calculations. In spite of the interference and violence of the officials the second *duma* appeared more radical than the first. It included more than 100 deputies, professing some of the different shades of Socialism.

On the morrow of the elections it became evident that the days of the second *duma* were numbered. But Stolypin wished to play the part of the good prince, and so he permitted a parliament to exist on condition that it always consented to just what the government wished. The cadets were weak enough frequent-

ly to agree to his suggestions. They repulsed the project of amnesty; they refused to censure the official assassins, and they did not even dare to reject a budget over which they had no control. They guarded Stolypin against all words of censure and smiled while he persecuted and murdered.

The chief of the cabinet has made easy game of them. He searched the homes of the deputies. He forged telegrams in the name of the people commanding the dissolution of the duma. He demanded that the proceedings of the sessions in which the question of the army was discussed should be secret. He presented resolutions of sympathy with the police. He gave them an opportunity to discover plots against the government and the peace of the nation. He demanded immediate and unquestioning solid support at all times. The bourgeois representatives did not have the courage to give this impudence the reply which it merited and dissolution was announced without the cadets having been permitted the honor of once taking a manly attitude.

The organized proletariat of Russia is charged and has charged itself with the task of meeting this situation. There must be no truce in the battle against autocracy, and it is the duty of the workers of the world to come once more to the assistance of their comrades in the struggle.

The Socialist deputies in the Austrian reichsrath have already announced their intention of questioning their government upon the consequences of dissolution, some of the already apparent complications of which menace the interests of foreign governments.

The Socialists of France have not been slow to call the attention of their government to the solemn obligations which it has taken in regard to Russian bonds.

The Socialists of Great Britain, the traditional parliamentary country, have already held meetings of protest on the 14th of July, the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille, against the succession of coup d'états, which their authors have sought to justify by hypocrisy and lying.

The proletariats of other countries may be depended upon to support this movement and to recall to their members that *Socialism alone means Peace*, and that the watchword must always be "*Down with Autocracy; long live the Russian Revolution.*"

* * *

This statement is signed by the representatives of twenty-five nations, Russia being omitted, because of the fact that signing such a document by a Russian would at once make him a marked man.

The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.

Of all the writings of Karl Marx there is none better adapted than this to give the reader an insight into the practical applications of the doctrine of historical materialism. It is especially helpful to American Socialists just at this time, for, just as Louis Bonaparte was a sort of second edition of the great Napoleon, so Theodore Roosevelt is a sort of second edition of Louis Bonaparte. Farmer support enabled both Louis Napoleon and Theodore Roosevelt to dictate to a divided and incompetent bourgeoisie; but the French bourgeoisie of 1849—52 was incompetent because it had not yet arrived at maturity, while the American bourgeoisie of 1906—07 is incompetent because it is rotten ripe and only waiting to be mowed down by the scythe of the Class Conscious proletariat.

The way in which the psychology of the individual is moulded by material class conditions is clearly shown in the following passage. Marx has been showing that the House of Bourbon was the political representative of large landed property, while the House of Orleans was the political representative of Capital; he continues :

“That simultaneously old recollections; personal animosities, fears and hopes; prejudices and illusions; sympathies and antipathies; convictions, faith and principles bound these factions to one House or the other, who denies it? Upon the several forms of property, upon the social conditions of existence, a whole superstructure is reared of various and peculiarly shaped feelings, illusions, habits of thought and conceptions of life. The whole class produces and shapes these out of its material foundation and out of the corresponding social conditions. The individual unit to whom they flow through tradition and education, may fancy that they constitute the true reasons for and premises of his conduct.”

The following description of the coalition of the small traders and workingmen in the Social Democratic party of 1849 may be applied almost word for word to the followers of Roosevelt, Hearst or Bryan; and it comes far nearer than I could wish to being a description of the Socialist Party. It should be noted that Marx credited the small traders and their spokesmen with a sincere conviction that they were trying to save Society by avoid-

*1 The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. By Karl Marx, translated by Daniel De Leon. Chicago : Charles H. Kerr & Co. Paper, 25 Cents.

ing the Class Struggle. American Socialists are too apt to be less fair in describing the motives of contemporary reformers.

"The peculiar character of the Social Democracy (in France in 1849) is summed up in this: that democratic-republican institutions are demanded as the means, not to remove the two extremes—Capital and Wage-slavery—, but in order to weaken their antagonism and transform them into a harmonious whole. However different the methods may be that are proposed for the accomplishment of this object, however much the object itself may be festooned with more or less revolutionary fancies, the substance remains the same. This substance is the transformation of society upon democratic lines, but a transformation within the boundaries of the small traders' class. No one must run away with the narrow notion that the small traders' class means on principle to enforce a selfish class interest. It believes rather that the special conditions for its own emancipation are the general conditions under which alone modern society can be saved and the class struggle avoided. Likewise must we avoid running away with the notion that the Democratic Representatives are all 'shop-keepers', or enthuse for these. They may—by education and individual standing—be as distant from them as heaven is from earth. That which makes them representatives of the small traders' class is that they do not intellectually leap the bounds which that class itself does not leap in practical life; that, consequently, they are theoretically driven to the same problem and solutions, to which material interests and social standing practically drive the latter. Such, in fact, is at all times the relation of the 'political' and 'literary' representatives of a class to the class they represent."

In another passage Marx calls the tendency to rely upon political methods alone the disease of "Parliamentary Idiocy"—a disease "that fetters those whom it infects to an imaginary world, and robs them of all sense, all remembrance, all understanding of the rude outside world." This malady is not yet extinct.

Marx wrote this in 1852 so soon after the coup d'etat of December 2nd 1851, that it was impossible for him to get an absolutely true perspective; there can be no doubt that the Empire of Louis Bonaparte lasted much longer than Marx expected it to. Marx did not and could not realize how very far from maturity as a class the French bourgeoisie then was.

It will be found extremely interesting and illuminating to read in connection with Marx's "Eighteenth Brumaire" Browning's apology for the career of Louis Bonaparte in the little-read poem "Prince Hohenstiel-Schwangau".

ROBERT R. LAMONTE.

May 19, 1907.

The Intellectuals and Working Class Socialism.

2. THE EVOLUTION OF FRENCH SOCIALISM AND THE INTELLECTUALS.

The formation in France of a working class socialism free from alloy enables us to gauge better by contrast the value of the socialism of the intellectuals. While the former proceeds from economic reality, from the development of the great industry and its proletarian institutions, the latter comes from the democratic Utopia, ideological systems, and the State superstition. The former sees in the working class the free and voluntary agent in the transformation of the world, the latter regards it as merely the passive instrument utilized by the new aristocracy of thought to impose its plans. Whether they invent theories, construct societies, or occupy themselves prosaically with conquering the public powers and exploiting the State, the intellectuals of socialism, like intellectuals everywhere, have but one aim, to assure the dictatorship of the Idea, and of the Idealists.

This is clearly apparent from the analysis of the two aspects which the socialism of the intellectuals has assumed; utopian socialism and parliamentary socialism. In both cases, although from very different reasons, the literary caste claims to think and act for the proletariat, but in fact it thinks and acts for itself alone; it obeys that illusion common in history which impels social groups to veil with idealistic appearances the egoistic aims which they pursue.

I—UTOPIAN SOCIALISM.

1—Some years ago the most distinguished opponents of the Marxian socialism of the class struggle, the university men, the jurists, and other "scientists of four phrases" were seized with a frenzied infatuation for the Utopians. They talked of nothing so much as of *civilizing socialism*, which had fallen into its working-class barbarism, by bringing it back to the old "French Sources."

In fact, this *return* to the *Utopians* was natural. They were partisans of this principle, that truth is accessible only to literary people, and they had arrived at this other truth, that the direction of the world belongs rightly to "men of science." Why not begin again the Utopian adventure and rescue the laboring masses from the savagery of instinct by giving them for guides the priests of Intelligence?

The promoters of this movement were not destitute of practical sense; they knew that the worship of superior talents, even though a little out of repair, still has chances of permanence. There will always be people with parchments, who will derive from their diplomas the right of governing the universe; the literary pedants, whose profession is to keep a shop of ideas, will not renounce their trade sooner than necessary, and for a long time yet credulous crowds will purchase the intellectual trash and applaud the charlatans who sell it.

I hasten to say that the first Utopians could not be held responsible for this speculation. The inventors of systems at the beginning of the nineteenth century did not look to the exploitation of human credulity. They were excellent people, who believed in good faith that they were bringing men the recipe for happiness.

The old workingman, Corbon, whose admirable book, "The Secret of the People of Paris," is worth reading for an understanding of the psychology of the masses toward the middle of the last century, reminds us that the proletarian class was in no way deceived in the matter. It had felt what a mystical devotion to the cause of labor animated through their extravagances the followers of Saint-Simon and Fourier. "They may have erred," wrote Corbon, "but they were moved by the profound conviction of the efficacy of their systems, and still more by the ardent desire to improve as promptly as possible the condition of the lower classes. The people, sure of their intentions, could not fail to be grateful even though they showed themselves skeptical with regard to the panaceas, and ridiculed some of the doctrines." We could not say so much of our parliamentary socialists.

It should moreover be added in their defence that at the time when they lived they could not find in their capitalist environment the elements for a just estimate of the social movement. Marx and Engels have judged these pioneers of the first socialist epoch as they deserve. "The founders of these systems," says the Communist Manifesto, "see, indeed, the class antagonisms, as well as the action of the decomposing elements in the prevailing form of society. But the proletariat, as yet in its infancy, offers to them the spectacle of a class without any historical initiative or any independent political movement.

Since the development of class antagonism keeps even pace with the development of industry, the economic situation, as they find it, does not as yet offer to them the material conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat. They therefore search after a new social science, after new social laws, that are to create these conditions.

Historical action is to yield to their personal inventive action, historically created conditions of emancipation to phantastic ones, and the gradual, spontaneous class-organisation of the proletariat to an organisation of society specially contrived by these inventors. Future history resolves itself, in their eyes, into the propaganda and the practical carrying out of their social plans."

The same explanation would not answer for our new utopians. The continuous growth of the working class into a conscious class is the great historic fact of the nineteenth century, as the theorists of "reformism" know very well. But they can not conceive of leaving the proletariat to itself, to its own impulses and reactions, without overwhelming the world with the most terrible catastrophes. A socialism inspired by "working-class coarseness", rude as the factory, brutal as the strike, seems to them a backward step toward barbarism, while it would be "so simple" to listen to *reason* voicing itself through them, and to employ the *positive methods* of democracy. What good could possibly come from the blind clash of unchained forces. Would it not be better to follow the enlightened opinions of competent people?

II. In this very way the (early) utopians stated the problem which they proposed to solve, and it is this intellectualist way of going about it, which assumes that *ideas lead the world*, that our reformists have admired in them most. Reason, guided by science, was to give the "solution of the social question". The formula once found, it need only be applied and society would be transformed in a flash. These inventors of societies were "true children of that amiable, idealistic eighteenth century which has not without reason been described as the century of Wisdom and Light".

It is the common illusion of intellectual speculators to think themselves above phenomena and happenings, in the immaterial world of spirits. The utopians all came from cultured circles: "they were recruited", as Corbon says, "from among the fine flower of the educated youth. The Saint-Simonian group and the Fourierist phalanx counted scarcely any but lettered people among its apostles or adherents; most were indeed intellectuals of the first order."* These seekers after the absolute pictured the social movement to themselves as an outward process, capable of being modified according to a previous plan or of being adapted to a preconceived end. They were the firmest of believers in the disinterested role of Thought, to which they assigned for its mission the quest of Eternal Truth.

But the mind does not work on a void. It borrows from the

* Corbon, work cited, page 103.

environment around it the materials which it combines. It is not enough to say with Marx and Engels that the utopians substituted, their own inventions for the historic reality that failed them. We must show that their systems were but a fantastic reconstruction of the society that they had under their eyes. They deformed, magnified, idealized, minified the elements which they found around them, and out of these made an original composite which seemed to have no connection with reality.

Nevertheless it is the contemporary environment which explains these plans of society, and they, in turn, help to understand that time. How are we to interpret Saint-Simonism, if it be separated from the brilliant renaissance of Christianity and the accelerated development of the new social order, with its procession of inventors, technicians, captains of industry, ready to inaugurate triumphant capitalism? How can we read Fourier understandingly, without thinking of the eighteenth-century theories on the state of nature, the passions and the sentiments, of the dissolute manners of the Directory, its taste for gallant feasts and easy pleasures? And may not both of these, — the Saint-Simonian system and the Fourierist system, — be summed up as the social aspect of the *romanticism* with which this epoch is so highly colored? And again, are they not a form, perhaps the most astonishing form, of that "Napoleonic malady,"* born of the formidable suggestion produced by the revolutionary wars and swollen by the imperial epopee, and which in spite of economic obstacles, inspired those attacked by it with the mystical belief in the creative virtue of Force in the service of the Idea?

We ask in all sincerity what practical borrowings the literary representatives of reformism propose to make from the utopians, and for what use they intend them. What can we derive for our present conduct from a system which is but a distorted aspect of one moment of history? The Saint-Simonians and Fourierists themselves quickly forgot, in contact with economic reality, their dreams of renovation, and they adapted themselves admirably to the new conditions of capitalism. Corbon observes again: "The two doctrines gradually divested themselves of everything repugnant to common sense, and it may thus be seen that both of them, in their primary data, and considered apart from all plans of realization, answered to the highest needs."

But our "cultured" reformists do not stoop to such prosaic interpretations. They do not examine so closely; of Utopianism

* "They (the Saint-Simonians) played in sincerity that role of apostles, believing that they were imitating the life of the twelve fishermen of Galilee, hoping, like them, to conquer the world and to rule it. The desire of being leaders of nations possessed them. In them, as in many others, the Napoleonic malady thus showed itself."—S. Charlety, *Histoire du Saint-Simonisme*, p. 476.

they keep only the formal processes of abstract thought; knowledge of economics is the last thing with which the professionals of Intelligence concern themselves. They conceive of the Idea only as detached from the world and shut up in the splendor of isolation. To observe reality and submit to its empire would be a discipline too humiliating for the noble function of Thinker. Is it not for the mind to restore order in the chaos of facts? And without the bright light of formulas, how should we find our way through the darkness of things?

There is some truth in the contention. The operations of the mind have for their aim to guide us in the labyrinth of facts. But we also need, if we are not to be astray, a prudent reserve. Every creation of thought is an artificial act, which makes a choice within what is real, and keeps only the elements suited for its combinations. Even in the most prudent researches, the observer knows that truth is never entirely perceived, and that there always remains an arbitrary element in our estimates. Moreover, however exact they may be, formulas translate merely a momentary and historic aspect of things, and can not fix in their schedule the whole course of life; they are for us nothing but a relative assistance for the intimate comprehension of phenomena. We grasp the real movements far more by intuition than by formal representation.

But the mind has a high opinion of itself and it delights in its creations. It forgets that reality, just now grasped, has already fled, and that it remains behind: it can not believe that its painfully constructed work can be but a passing thing, and it has not strength to follow the forward march of events. So it lingers in contemplation of the abstractions it has created, and is made prisoner by its own chimeras. It clings to them the more as they become remote from their origin, as they survive their cause. These abstractions have long ago come to be nothing but dry husks, formal expressions without real content, which like an ever higher barrier conceal life from sight. Dogmatism, intellectualism, sectarianism, these terrible maladies of the mind, thus pervert the thought of the professional intellectual, and instead of a living brain, lured by the concrete side of things, we find only an idealist swollen with pride, an adorer of his abstract "science", a ferocious defender of dead ideas.

Be it understood that contempt for practice, its everlasting motion and change, is the first virtue of the intellectual. But this disdain is still more comprehensible when we come to the practice of the working class. Our reformists are aghast at a proletarian movement which respects nothing, — neither their dogmas, nor their programmes, nor their formulas, which accepts no orders but from itself and no lessons but from its own experience. Their

eyes are offended at the sight of laborers primitive enough to rush furiously to the conquest of their rights, obeying only the spontaneous impulses of their consciousness, an obscure consciousness quite steeped in instinct.

It might be urged in objection that the practice of the capitalist is equally unreasoning; that industry is all the while overwhelmed by processes as sudden as they are hazardous; that every technique is provisional, constantly renewed, modified, improved; that the economic world, in the course of a perpetual revolution, is swept on as by a torrent which leaves nothing stable nor immovable*; and that the vigor of enterprise is measured by the adventurous audacity of those in charge. But to what purpose? The capitalists who do things are no more acceptable to the adepts of formal science than the laborers who do things.

It is thus quite logically that our new utopians have tried to rehabilitate the methods of their illustrious predecessors. If the individual genius of a Saint-Simon or a Fourier could bring forth wonders, what may we not expect from the collective genius of that compact mass of cultured men who put their talents at the service of socialism?

III.—Of all the utopian systems, Saint-Simonism realizes the most perfect type of the socialism of the intellectuals. It has conceived of a society wholly subjected to the hierarchy of the scientific corps, and even to-day its conceptions inspire the apologists of our "literary aristocracy".

It is in his *Lettres d'un Habitant de Genève* that Saint-Simon explained his first conception of the government of the world by the literary people. "Open a subscription", he exclaimed, "before Newton's tomb; all without distinction subscribe whatever sum you please. Let every subscriber name three mathematicians, three physicists, three chemists, three physiologists, three authors, three painters, three musicians. Renew the subscription as well as the nomination every year, but allow each one unlimited liberty to renominate the same persons. Divide the proceeds of the subscription among the three mathematicians, the three physicists, etc., who shall have obtained the most votes. Request the president of the Royal Society of London to receive the subscription for this year; in following years place this honorable function on the person who has made the largest subscription.

* Modern industry never looks upon and treats the existing form of a process as final. The technical basis of that industry is therefore revolutionary, while all earlier modes of production were essentially conservative. By means of machinery, chemical processes and other methods, it is continually causing changes not only in the technical basis of production, but also in the functions of the laborer, and in the social combinations of the labor-process.—Marx's *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 532 (Kerr edition).

Require of those whom you name that they receive neither positions nor honors, nor money from any fraction of your body, but leave them individually free to employ their energies as they will. The men of genius will then enjoy a reward worthy of them and of you; this reward will place them in the one position which can furnish them the means of rendering you all the services of which they are capable; it will become the goal of ambition for the most energetic souls, and this will divert them from aims hurtful to your tranquility. By this measure, finally, you will give leaders to those who labor for your progress in enlightenment, you will invest these leaders with an immense consideration, and you will put a great pecuniary force at their disposal."*

With certain variations, this idea of a new sacerdotal caste ruling the world constitutes the basis of Saint-Simon's whole system. It recurs, transformed or developed, in his principal works, the *Catechisme politique des industriels*, *le Systeme industriel*, etc. With what then is he dealing? The problem is simple. The dissolution of society, an accomplished fact from 1789, has left standing not one of the ancient powers, temporal nor spiritual. The nobility, grown useless, has disappeared, and the clergy, powerless through its inability to lead men, has fallen into decay. The French Revolution, which has destroyed everything, has rebuilt nothing. Only disorder and anarchy remain, the task is to re-establish social authority.

To this end, a "new philosophical system" must be elaborated. Saint-Simon is the very prototype of those ideologists who think that without a "conception of the world" there is no coherent activity. "Every social regime," he says, "is an application of a philosophical system, and consequently it is impossible to establish a new regime without having first established the new philosophical system to which it must correspond."** The lawyers and metaphysicians of the French Revolution could not solve the problem because they employed a false method. They thought it enough to affirm a few abstract principles of moral order, then let things follow their course. But individualism and liberalism gave rise to the worst miseries. Experience thus proved, to Saint-Simon, into what a chaos an ill-ordered society rushed: there is no lasting social state without organization.

Now Saint-Simon has found the system, which only has to be applied: it is *positive science*, which admits nothing but the rational and the demonstrable. On the ruins of a decrepit religion and an abstract ideology, *positive philosophy* affords a foundation for a social rationalism, to which the philosophic rationalism of Descartes has after a fashion paved the way.

* Saint-Simon. Edit. Rodrigues, 1832, p. 3.
 • Page 44 of work quoted above.

Only *scientists*, accustomed to positive methods, can govern society according to principles as rigorous as a scientific demonstration, and acceptable to every reflecting mind. They are fully competent to direct politics: *science is foresight*.¹ Equalitarian theories, which lead to the doctrine of popular sovereignty and to the practice of universal suffrage, are anti-social. They start from the absurd assumption that the ignorant man in the street knows as much as the scientific specialist. Saint-Simon paraphrases this conception, that the government rightly belongs to *scientific capacities*, by saying that "authority should be distributed in proportion to enlightenment".²

But is that song so out of date? Do the professionals of Intelligence thing otherwise in our days? The chartered sociologists of our universities also believe that their profound "science" is all that can lift society out of the rut into which it has sunk. We may not talk so much now of "positive methods", but there is a deal of loud talk about "sociological methods". And the people who decorate with this name a gibberish having no connection with reality are not far from regarding themselves as the natural guides of a society whom Reason ought to rescue from Chance.

How will the new system operate? This is clearly shown by the books of Saint-Simon quoted above. While the *military organization* was established with a view to war, the *industrial organization*, which Saint-Simon announces, will have no aim but production.³ The vestiges of the past, war, feudalism, theft, parasitism, oppression, will have disappeared, and only useful functions will remain. In his famous "Parable", Saint-Simon explains his meaning.⁴ Scientists, manufacturers, artists,—these alone are necessary to society: the governors, ministers, priests, functionaries, landed proprietors are but useless and vain parasites. The Saint-Simonian regime will consequently recognize only the three productive classes, scientists, artists, manufacturers. The first two will have the spiritual power, formerly held by the clergy. The scientists will devote themselves to the laws of the exploitation of the globe and to scientific researches; the artists will awaken "in the souls of the manufacturers ideas of glory and generous sentiments". As for the manufacturers, they will wield

¹ "A scientist," says Saint-Simon, "is a being who foresees; it is because science affords means for prediction that it is useful, and that scientists are superior to other men."—The same, p. 33.

² The same, p. 40.

³ "All society," says Saint-Simon, "rests on industry. Industry is the sole guarantee of its existence, the one source of all wealth and all prosperity. The state of things most favorable to industry is therefore, by that very fact, the most favorable to society. Here we have at once both our point of departure and the end of all our efforts."—Works, Vol. II, p. 13.

⁴ "Parabole politique," 1819.

the temporal power, and within the industrial class the bankers will dominate the merchants, manufacturers and farmers. In such a social world the government, being in the hands of the wise, can not but be *rational* and *scientific*.

These are the very principles of State Socialism. And, in fact, Saint-Simon assigns as the end of the social organization "the quickest possible amelioration of the lot of the poorest class". The new social order will be "organized directly in the interest of the majority". Without attacking the rights of the proprietors, the State is to take up the cause of the toilers. Its most urgent task will be to devote its first outlay toward "preparing work for all able-bodied men, in order to assure their physical existence," to "diffusing as promptly as possible among the proletarian class the positive knowledge that has been acquired," and finally to "guaranteeing to the individuals composing that class pleasures and enjoyments suited to develop their intelligence".* Saint-Simon, according to an idea in which the State Socialists often follow him, indicates that the State will attain this end by undertaking great public works,—clearing of land, roads, bridges, canals. Here the scientists will play a decisive part, in planning a whole series of projects to develop the industrial, commercial and agricultural life in that direction.**

But Saint-Simon's dream goes further, and we find ourselves in the most theocratical *university socialism*. There is to be an official dogma, taught by the scientists. Positive ethics, the product of reason and science, the basis of the new religion, will be obligatory and universal. The scientists exercising that high priesthood will prove that the interest of all and that of each are intermingled, and that one profits from the perfecting of the other. Chairs of ethics will be established, and public instruction will have for its basis principles rationally formulated. Here again we seem to be listening to words of yesterday. The apostles of our *professorial socialism* talked in no other fashion when they demanded so insolently, at the conclusion of the Dreyfus Affair, the dictatorship of the literary corps and a system of official instruction.

Quite like our democratic Jacobins, Saint-Simon thinks that since his ethics is positive, scientific and demonstrable, there is no great harm in *imposing* it: the yoke of reason is not heavy except for unreasonable people. So the Institute shall edit a *national catechism*. This catechism "shall define" the principles which shall serve as a basis for the social organization, together with a summary of the principal laws which rule the world of matter." A royal shall regulate strictly the instruction in these principles:

* Works, Vol. VI., p. 171.

** Works, Vol. VI., p. 162.

Article 1. The Institute shall have the oversight of public instruction; nothing shall be taught in the schools contrary to the principles established in the national catechism. *Article 2.* The ministers of the different forms of worship shall be subject to the supervision of the Institute, both as to their preaching and as to their instruction of children. *Article 3.* No Frenchman can exercise the rights of citizenship without first passing an examination on the national catechism: the Institute shall regulate the method and the conditions of the examination*". Here we have the genuine monopoly of instruction.

In plain language, official dogma will tolerate no heresy. Like our democrats, Saint-Simon has no conception of *liberty of error*. Let science become the foundation of ethics and religion, and no contest is possible: people do not rebel against a positive demonstration. Science suppresses liberty of conscience. Saint-Simon assures us to the contrary: the new clergy will not fall into the errors of the old, since one was ignorant and the other is wise. Never did rationalist fury conceive a more absolute sway of an intellectual aristocracy over the mass. It is easy to understand the attraction exercised by Saint-Simon over our professional thinkers.

HUBERT LAGARDELLE.

(Translated by Charles H. Kerr.)

(To be Continued.)

* Works. Vol. VI., p. 237-239.

International Socialist Congress of Stuttgart.

The International Socialist bureau, at its session of the 9th ult., has taken the following actions:

1. The bureau will meet on Friday, Aug. 16, at 3 p. m., at the Liederhalle, to take the last measures in view of the organization of the international congress. The delegates to the bureau will receive a special invitation.

2. The interparliamentary commission will meet on Saturday, Aug. 17, at 11 a. m., at the Liederhalle. The Socialist legislative representatives will receive a special convocation.

3. The first plenary opening sitting of the international congress will be held at the Liederhalle on Saturday, Aug. 18, at 11 a. m., to hear the speeches of welcome and to definitely draw up the order of the day.

4. On the same day Sunday, Aug. 18, at 4:30 p. m., great public meetings in the open air will be held on the Volksfestplatz (popular festival place), near the König Karls-Brücke (King Charles bridge), on the Neckar.

5. The delegates will be invited to the concert, which will be given on Saturday evening, at 8:30, in the great hall of the Liederhalle.

6. The divers national sections will meet in the halls of the Liederhalle, on Monday, Aug. 19, at 9 a. m., to verify of the mandates of their delegates, and their secretaries will transmit the validated lists to the secretary of the International Socialist bureau.

7. The section of the congress, intrusted with the examination of one or several points put down in the order of the day, will meet on the same day, Monday Aug. 19, at 11 a. m.

8. The reporters and editors of Socialist papers will meet on Monday, Aug. 19, at 9 p. m. in one of the halls of the Liederhalle, in order to discuss a method to improve the communication of Socialist correspondence between the divers organs of the affiliated parties and eventually to the creation of an international news service.

9. The plenary sessions will be held on the following days from 9 to 12 a. m., and from 2 to 6 p. m.

At the same session of June 9 the bureau has decided to submit to the congress the following procedure and order of the day:

(a) The congress, assembled to approve the divers resolutions taken by the bureau, would adopt these resolutions as a

whole, on one hand to gain time, and, on the other, because these resolutions are work of the authorized delegates of all the affiliated parties.

(b) For the same reason, the congress would adopt as a whole the regulations of the congresses, of the bureau and of the interparliamentary commission.

(c) The bureau recommends the rejection of an amendment of the Independent Labor Party abolishing the requirement for trade unions, invited to the international congresses, that they be formally based on the principle of the class struggle.

(d) The bureau recommends the rejection of the proposition of the Italian Socialist Party in Switzerland for a uniform membership card for all the organizations affiliated with the bureau.

(e) The bureau proposes to transmit to the interparliamentary commission the proposition of the Social Democratic Federation of Great Britain, asking that the Socialist mandatories of all parliaments should agree to present at the same time, in every parliament, the projects of labor legislation relating to the same object.

(f) The bureau proposes to reject as being yet insufficiently mature, the proposition of the Transwaal and of France relatively to the utility and choice of an international language.

(g) The bureau proposes not to discuss the proposition of the Social Democratic women of Germany, relative to the democratization of suffrage, but to accept the proposition of the Social-Democratic women of Austria asking for the insertion in the agenda of the right of suffrage for women.

(h) The bureau lastly proposes to draw up as follows the order of the day :

1. Militarism and international conflicts.
2. The relations between the Socialist political parties and the trade unions.
3. The colonial question..
4. The emigration and immigration of working people.
5. Woman suffrage.

The bureau proposes the following assignment of the votes, to which the national sections have a right, in virtue of article IIIb of the project of regulation of congresses :

Germany, Austria-Bohemia, France, Great Britain, Russia, 20 votes; Italy, 15; United States, 14; Belgium, 12; Denmark, Poland, Switzerland, 10; Unified Australia, Finland, Holland, Sweden, 8; Spain, Hungary, Norway, 6; South Africa, Argentine, Nonunified Australia, Bulgaria, Japan, Roumania Servia, 4; Luxemburg, 2.

In conformity with the scheme of regulations, each national

section will have the right to admit the groups depending on the section. For instance, a group not affiliated with the Socialist Party, French section of the Labor International, will have to apply to the latter in order to be admitted to the congress of Stuttgart. But the rejected organizations have the right to appeal to the bureau. It is also the national section which apportions the votes allotted to it. But in case the organizations forming the sections have not been able to agree about the allotment of the votes, such allotment will be effected by the bureau.

The congress will be held in the Liederhalle. Besides a large hall for plenary sessions, the comrades will find there halls for the sections, a restaurant, a reading room, where they will be able to consult the Socialist papers of most of the affiliated parties, and, lastly, an exhibition of pamphlets and books allowing congressists to get an idea of the richness of the Socialist literature of every country.

From this day on, the groups can obtain from the local committee of Stuttgart, provisional cards for their delegates. But these groups must get them through the intermediary of their national secretary, who will receive the cards and forward them to the groups. The delegates of Russia and Poland can also apply for these provisional cards to the representatives of these sections at the International Socialist bureau.

The local committee of Stuttgart will find lodgings for the delegates to the congress, but cannot do the same for the assistants to the congress. The delegates to the congress in applying to the local committee, must add to their application an attestation of their quality of delegates, signed by the secretary of their party or of their national section, or, for Russia and Poland, by their delegate to the International Socialist bureau. They can also send their application through the intermediary of their secretaries or delegates to the bureau. These applications for lodging must be, at the latest, on July 15, in possession of the local committee of Stuttgart, who will immediately forward to the applicant a confirmative card, and then, through the intermediary of the above mentioned persons, a provisional delegate's card, bearing the address of the applicant for lodging. From the 16th to the 18th of August an inquiry and lodgin^g office will be set up in the central hall of the station of Stuttgart.

The Workingman to the Socialists.

And now my mission great, wide, breaking on
My soul, I come to you, ye scorned, depised,
Ye prisoned, martyred men. Ye've stood with me
In lock-out, strike, in starving home. Ye've giv'n
Your lives for me. Aye, yes, I come enthralled
By your great light, virile with strength hard won
On desp'rate battle field. And hence with you,
O Comrades dear, hands clasped around the globe,
I wage class struggle bold, invincible,
Till strong, impregnable, we build our State,
The Comrade State,—slow, consummation great
Of Labor's awful toil, and grief, and want,—
His battle, valliant, long, for life's rich joys,—
Our State,—the State of 'each for all and all
For each,'—incarnate soul of proletaire.

John Hallam Vonmor.

The Full Dinner Pail.

What base affront to come to me to send
Ye back to power again! Think ye to still
My holy needs with plea of Dinner Pail
Heaped high, aspill? Bourgeois Republican
And Democrat, ye know not me. I scorn
Ye both and all your grov'ling ways: your lust
For power, inhuman greed, ideals base.

Out of my awful toil, my barren days,
My strike, my starving home, has come a life—
Ye wot not of, whose glory flames my soul.
It cries, Arise! arise! incarnate me
In State! Strike mightily henceforth Bourgeois'

Fell power and doom his State! Then build thereon
Thy Comrade Commonwealth, august, divine.

John Hallam Vonmor.

The Scab.

Come Treason from thy hellish throne
And brand him, brand him deep thine own.
Thou coward base to sneak to camp
Of foe enleagued with famine grim,
And gold 'gainst brother struggling brave
For pittance bare of joy of life,
For Cause that fires the heart around
The world! Ah better far to starve —
Yea die in garret bare, or rot
Unknown on ocean wave, than gain
Thy need by traitor's damned deed!
Thou Judas of the Proletaire!
We curse thee deep! We spew thee out!

John Hallam Vonmor.

EDITORIAL

A Victory Gained.

It is no exaggeration, no figure of speech to speak of the acquittal of William D. Haywood as an epochal event in the history of the working class in the United States. The struggle which preceded it has been the greatest manifestation of the class conflict ever seen on this continent.

There has been no force of capitalism that has not been brought into action. The entire governmental power was utilized. Two states lent their machinery of government to the Mine Owners' Association to carry out their murderous purposes. Corporate and individual capital combined with official machinery to wreck the resistance to exploitation.

When this power was found inadequate, — when the kidnapping of Moyer and Haywood, instead of intimidating the workers proved to be only a bugle call to greater action, then new forces were brought up by both sides. The national government took a hand, at first indirectly by sending Taft, the presidential errand boy, to Idaho to assist in the election of Governor Gooding on the platform of "These men will never leave Idaho alive." Just now Taft is wondering how much this pulling of Teddy's chestnuts from the fire is going to affect a certain budding presidential boom.

When the laborers refused to be intimidated by Taft, Roosevelt himself was called upon to show whose collar he wore. He responded at first by innuendo in his Chicago speech, where he referred to the accused as murderers. This was at a time when the case was under consideration by the Supreme court and doubtless had its share in producing the shameful verdict of that body, a verdict that will go down to historical infamy side by side with the Dred Scott decision with which it has so frequently been compared.

The only effect of this was to rouse the workers to still greater exertions. Unawed by the majesty of the Supreme Court they set

about calling new battallions of the labor army into action. Moyer-Haywood conferences were formed in all the great cities. These conferences are one of the most significant phases of the entire struggle. The initiative in their formation was generally taken by the Socialist Party or by the Socialists within the trade unions, and when they were completed they constituted the first organ for the activity of the organized workers and the Socialist Party combined that has ever existed in the United States.

Discovering that covert sneers and veiled indirect attacks were hopeless to intimidate the militant workers of the country, Roosevelt came into the open with his now infamous "undesirable citizen" letter. It is significant of the bulk which the Haywood trial has taken that while he coupled Harriman with Debs, Haywood and Moyer in this phrase, yet the only portion which has stuck in the public mind was that which applied to the men on trial for their lives.

The cowardly dastardliness of this attack upon men on trial for their lives was a shot which proved to be very much of a boomerang. Instead of turning the tide of public indignation against the men attacked, it brought down such a storm of denunciation upon its author as to force him completely into the open, and the workers of the United States were treated to the very remarkable spectacle of the President on the defensive against the attacks of an outraged working-class. Perhaps it is not too much to say that this marked the turning point of the battle. There was something so despicable in this action, so much akin to that other much boasted feat of Roosevelt, — shooting a Spaniard in the back, that it roused thousands hitherto indifferent.

From thousands of trade union treasuries a flood of money began to flow into the defense fund. Protest meetings redoubled in frequency and in virility. The Moyer-Haywood conferences organized great parades, that filled the streets with marching thousands of workmen demanding that they know "the reason why" their foremost champions must die.

The funds that came were needed. They made it possible to procure the best legal talent before the American bar and insured that, so far at least as the forms of the law were concerned, that the accused men should not suffer.

But not all the resources of capitalism were exhausted when the battallions mentioned above had been wheeled into action. During the whole fight there had been a utilization of other and no less powerful forces. Foremost among these was the capitalist press.

When the story of this battle is told in some future day, one of the blackest of its many sullied pages will be the one that tells of the part played by the press controlled by the exploiting class.

From the very beginning of the struggle in the Rocky Moun-

tain States the capitalist press of America has shown a subservient slavery to the blood thirsty mob of profit takers that has no equal in history. The great news agencies exhausted every resource at their command, during the early stages, to suppress all mention of the occurrences, and to preserve the darkness that is essential to the deeds that were being done. Trained "special writers" like Walter Wellman were sent into the region to telegraph back the carefully fabricated libels of the Mine Owners' Association. A telegraph and telephone and mail censorship were established in the first crude stages of the fight. But when the battle had grown too broad for secrecy to be longer maintained; other tactics were necessary.

Then began that campaign of lying and vilification and slander that has continued up until the present moment; that has misstated almost every event of the trial; that has cunningly manipulated evidence, distorted facts and twisted everything with that shrewdness that is the most striking characteristic of modern journalism. It has not been alone the great dailies that have been guilty of such tactics. Semi-religious magazines like the "Outlook," and "radical" publications like "Colliers," have vied with openly reactionary magazines like "McClure's" and "Harpers", in attempting to deceive the laborers.

It is once more significant that these publications have been brought into action. They have been long in building up a reputation for "impartiality." They have always claimed to stand on both sides of the class line, and when leaning over to the side of labor cost nothing they have been willing to bend in that direction in order to maintain that reputation. But now they have thrown that reputation to the winds. More nearly correct they have used that reputation for the purpose for which it was acquired. They have used it to bolster up capitalism when it was in desperate straits.

Whatever our individual opinions may be upon religion, there is no denying but what it has been used as one of the means of class rule. Never however has it been more misused than in this present case. When Orchard declared that he was moved to attempt to hang Haywood by his religious conversion it was one of the hardest blows that religion ever received. When a host of preachers took him at his word and sought to preach the gospel of St. Orchard and McParland his father confessor the gorge of even the average believer began to rise. So it was that this method of controlling and directing the public mind was soon relinquished.

In every great expression of the class struggle, the institutions of class education are always called upon to bolster up the ruler's aim. It looked as if this feature would be lacking in the Boise battle, but in order that no feature necessary to symmetrical completeness might be missing a Harvard Professor of psychology, Hugo Mun-

sterberg, seized the opportunity to write himself down not only as an intellectual prostitute but as a shameful charlatan, by pretending to read Orchard's consciousness and to pass an expert opinion that he was speaking the truth.

In short the whole paraphernalia of capitalism had been brought into action to accomplish the judicial murder of the men who stood between them and profits.

Against these forces stood nothing but the working-class. Nothing but the working-class. Nothing but a little over three-fourths of the population, the portion that produce the wealth and performs all the necessary social functions.

In spite of the fact that every local of the Western Federation of Miners was infested with Pinkerton detectives seeking and manufacturing evidence, in spite of the terrible provocation to which the miners had been subject for nearly a dozen years, in spite of all the machinery which capitalism could bring to bear to accomplish the judicial murder of the officials of the union, a jury selected by the Mine Owners, without a single union man in it has refused to convict the object of the conspiracy, and he goes forth as free man.

Out of this fight the working-class advances to new victories strengthened and prepared for greater battles. It has gained a new solidarity, a greater militancy, a deeper selfconfidence, and a more thorough insight into the weaknesses and wickednesses of its enemy than have been vouchsafed hitherto.

Once again it has been proven that blows upon the working-class, like blows upon the white hot iron, only drive its particles closer together and forge it into a better weapon.

In the fight the brunt of conflict has fallen upon the Socialist press and well may that press be proud of the part it has played. From start to finish it has poured a flood of light upon the scenes of conflict. It sounded the first battle cry, it rallied the hosts of labor when things looked dark, it formulated the intellectual weapons and distributed them among the fighters, and finally when the struggle was drawing to a close it carried the words of encouragement and news of the more immediate actors to the whole great army of labor.

It is therefore fitting that when victory is won that the Socialist press should rejoice. And well it may rejoice, for in the heat of conflict it has forged new weapons and improved old ones until today it is manifold more effective for the class struggle than when the fight began.

It may well be that from this trial will date the growth and development of a proletarian activity and militancy that will bring about the speedy overthrow of the whole capitalist system.

International Socialist Congress.

During the week beginning August 17th there will meet in Stuttgart, Germany, what will be without doubt, the most important gathering for the working-class ever held.

The program of the Congress is published elsewhere in this issue and will give a general idea of the importance of the discussions that will be held.

The editor of the International Socialist Review is one of the delegates to that Congress and the next issue of this periodical will be largely devoted to the proceedings of the Congress. For this reason it will probably appear about a week later than usual, since the Congress does not end until the 24th of August, and it will take some time to get the material in shape and arrange for publication.

The past three years, since the last Congress was held, have been stirring ones in the Socialist world. The Russian revolution, the Austrian and German and Finish elections, the rise of new problems in relation to the trade unions, all these require a new adjustment of many things that have been considered fixed.

This Congress will give an opportunity to bring these matters to a focus and reflect the opinions and knowledge of those in closest touch with the questions before the workers of the United States.

There should be a large number of extra copies of the September issue circulated by the Socialists of the United States. To do this it will be necessary that orders be sent in before publication as no more will be printed than have been ordered.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

Very few persons who watched the Haywood trial at Boise, Idaho, and read with more or less indignation about the infamous schemes practiced by the Pinkertons, realize what organized labor of this country is compelled to contend with nowadays. In fact, union people themselves, unless constantly active in organization matters, have little conception of the growth and expansion of modern capitalism's espionage system during the past few years. While most union men have been busy with their daily work and ordinary problems of life—while they voted their old party tickets regularly and thus strengthened the grip of capitalism, and while they shouted justly to "keep politics out of the union" and placed all their confidence and hope in the pure and simple strike and boycott—a complete new industry has grown up and flourished right under their noses.

The Pinkertons were undoubtedly the first to engage in the shameful work of worming their way into labor organizations and breaking them up. But while the Pinkertons and Thiels, the pioneers to "operate" in unions, were careful to prevent their disreputable practices from becoming known, during the past few years these spying and scab-procuring agencies have rapidly multiplied, and as they increased in number they became bolder in advertising their degraded business. Like brazen prostitutes, these latest schools of criminals and degenerates boldly flaunt their viciousness and immorality in the public's face. They tell you straight that they are procurers and have thugs and Judases to sell at so much per job lot. I append a "confidential" circular letter that was recently issued to "the trade" by the Joy Detective Service, of Cleveland, O., one of the latest houses of ill fame that has entered the competitive field to bid for business. Those students of social questions who insist that the world is getting better and that the present civilization will be perpetual may find some food for thought in this offer to sell or lease traitors by wholesale. And, please remember, that scores of these agencies flourish throughout the country.

The circular, which was turned over to me by a friend, reads as follows:

This Service makes a specialty of handling labor troubles, either existing or contemplated.

We break strikes in all parts of the United States or Canada, and are prepared to submit a list of references from manufacturers and others who have employed us during the past five years.

We have in our employ experienced guards for the protection of life and property during strikes and lockouts. These men are all over six feet in height, and selected for their ability to handle this class of work. All have seen strike service, many hold state and city police commissions, and should not be confounded with guards furnished by our imitators and recruited from slums of the cities.

We furnish secret operatives of all trades, Union or Non-Union, for work in mill, mine, factory, store, etc., for the purpose of securing inside information.

Is your shop being unionized?

Is your output being restricted?

Is the union running your shop?

Is material being wasted or stolen?

Have you a "shop committee," and who are they?

Do your foremen show favoritism?

Are you losing castings in your foundry?

Do you care to know what is being done at union meetings?

Let us place a mechanic operative with you, and find out.

In handling strikes we take entire charge of the same, furnish necessary guards to protect men while at work or escort them to and from work if boarding outside.

We employ, transport and deliver non-union men to fill up affected plants.

We charge no premium on such mechanics, but employ them at any price per day you wish to pay them, charging only for actual time agent may be engaged in securing them.

Men employed by us will be taken to affected plant by our guards and safely delivered and strikers not permitted to molest them.

We have found from experience that strikes are broken quickest where new men are boarded inside or adjacent to affected plant, and we are prepared to fit up and maintain temporary boarding quarters, furnishing colored cooks, waiters, etc. Our captains are thoroughly competent to handle such boarding quarters, making same practically self-sustaining. Sanitary arrangements are carefully looked after, and nothing is allowed to go to waste.

Secret men attend all meetings of strikers and report proceedings. This service possesses the necessary equipment, such as Winchester rifles, police clubs, cots, blankets, etc., to handle any sized trouble. We are represented in all of the larger cities of the United States and Canada, and a representative will call on you free of charge upon request.

The Joy Detective Service, Inc.,

Or J. D. Scott,

Cleveland, O.

1110 New England Bldg.

At least one jurisdiction struggle in marine circles has been settled. For several years the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association and the Licensed Tugmen's Protective Association were bitter rivals, and upon more than one occasion charges of scabbing were hurled back and forth to the great delight of the capitalists and their hangers-on. Under the agreement made in Buffalo during the past month the tugmen will have control of all harbor crafts, except those carrying passengers, and the M. E. B. A. will henceforth have jurisdiction over all outside crafts.

It is within the range of possibilities that the jurisdiction war between the longshoremen and seamen, which has raged for a number of years, may also be settled this fall. In the recent arbitration conference between representatives of both organizations all the grievances and contentions were thoroughly considered. President Gompers, of the A. F. of L., acted as arbiter and he finally ruled that the longshoremen had no right to the title of "Marine and Transport Workers," which was a victory for the seamen. He also advised, however, that the two organizations amalgamate, and with that end in view representatives of both unions will hold a further conference in Norfolk, Va., next November, and endeavor to establish harmonious relations.

During the past month the longshoremen held their annual convention in Detroit, and, judging from the officers' reports, that organization is facing some severe problems. There has been considerable loss in membership for three reasons, viz.: the oilers and watertenders seceded and went under the wing of the seamen; secondly, the ore handlers have been greatly decimated by the introduction of loading and unloading machinery, a few men now doing the work that formerly required hundreds; thirdly, many lumber shovers have been thrown out of employment because the trust has greatly restricted the output in order to arbitrarily force up prices, which, in some instances, amounted to over one hundred per cent, which price advance is also diminishing consumption and reacting on the building trades.

Gompers' recommendation to the two organizations to amalgamate will be followed if good sense and wisdom prevails. In combination lies the safety of the marine and longshore unions, for it cannot be denied that a large percentage of the vessel and dock owners are antagonistic, either openly or secretly to trade unions, and at the very first favorable opportunity they are going to enforce the open ships and the open docks to the cheapest scab labor to be found and close the doors to union people. Some of the capitalists wanted to fight last year and again this year, but on account of the business activity they were overruled by some of the more important interests. If an industrial depression comes the plutes will declare war: that is, they will take advantage of the situation to cut wages, and if a strike is precipitated they will welcome it gladly in order to destroy the labor organizations if possible. If the unions remain split up into crafts and quarreling among themselves so much the worse for them.

It is notable, in this respect, that this is the second or third time that President Gompers has repudiated his autonomistic notions and displayed almost human intelligence during the past year. The mighty Sam'l advised the merging of the woodworkers and carpenters, and is credited with advising the Chicago metal trades to arrange their agreements with employers so that they would all expire on the same date, and all the unions could work or fight together, instead of scabbing against each other, as is frequently the case. If Gompers keeps on progressing he is likely to say or do things worth remembering.

The lithographers' strike for eight hours is off—lost in the association shops. The struggle began almost a year ago and has been bitterly fought. The bosses' association hoisted the open shop skull

and crossbones and cried death to the union. They were able to hire a few scabs and just enough members turned traitor to enable the masters to turn out a portion of their work, and those capitalists who had contracts for lithographing that was delayed, declined to cancel the same or sue for damages and cheerfully agreed to wait until their orders were filed. It might be said, in passing, that the same policy was noticeable during the printers' eight-hour strike, and it goes to prove that there is a whole lot more class-consciousness among capitalists than among laborers, as a rule. The lithographers are a highly skilled lot of men and were inclined to have aristocratic notions of exclusiveness, the same as are nurtured by the railroad engineers. They are not identified with the A. F. of L. and seldom make common cause with other working people anywhere. At the same time it cannot be disputed that they sacrificed heroically and fought to the last ditch. At one time those members who were employed paid as high as 25 per cent of their earnings into the strike fund, but it was the old story of pitting empty stomachs against money bags. Anyway, the lithographers lost. And no class of barbarians ever treated their prisoners more brutally than the capitalists treated the strikers, who fought honorably throughout the contest. Scores of the active members have been blacklisted and driven out of the trade while all those who were re-employed were forced to sign away their rights and liberties as American citizens—they were forced to pledge themselves to join no union and participate in no strike in the future.

To crown the whole infamous business, that sweet-scented "workingman's friend," Secretary Straus, of the Department of Commerce and Labor, has come to the support of the masters to make the blacklist effective. It was naturally believed by the lithographers that, in view of the immense amount of work that accumulated owing to the delays of the strike, the blacklisting threats would vanish into thin air. Here is where the journeymen made a wrong guess. They did not take into consideration their opponents' political power. When the strike petered out the capitalists sent their agents to Europe to employ foreign scabs. They ignored the men who were blacklisted, raised a loud howl about "scarcity of labor," and brought in their contract laborers. A test case was made and the state courts held that the importations were illegal. But along comes Secretary Straus, overrules the courts, spits on the immigration laws, and admits the foreigners in order to enforce the blacklist. In fact, the contract labor law is a dead one, and has been for months—ever since Straus handed down an "opinion" that Southern States could import all the laborers they desired.

The importance of gaining control of the powers of government is demonstrated once more in the lithographers' case. It is hard enough to fight organized bosses, backed by unlimited capital, without being attacked by government politicians as well. But nothing else can be expected under present circumstances.

After weeks of guerilla warfare, with the members on strike in San Francisco and threatening to walk out any day in New York, Chicago and other places, the contest between the commercial telegraphers and the Western Union and Postal Companies came to an end. The unionists claim to have gained partial recognition, that all employes are to be reinstated within thirty days, and that the

wage question will be arbitrated. The company managers deny that the union is recognized, and declare that the strikers must apply for reinstatement as individuals, and that those who are "not objectionable" will be re-employed upon their promise to give good and faithful service and discontinue all agitation," etc. The bosses are silent regarding future wages, but it is probable that some increase will be made in order to avoid renewed friction and to cause members to become lukewarm toward the organization—it is an old trick.

Two very important lessons were taught by this struggle. The first is the action of the Postal Co. in displaying its loyalty to its class interests. The Postal is the powerful rival of the Western Union and there has been intense competition between the two corporations for business during the past decade. The Western Union was the devil and the Postal the good angel, from the organized labor viewpoint. The former corporation victimized a union operator whenever he or she was known and the employes were forced to organize in secret. The Postal, on the other hand, posed as "the workingman's friend." The A. F. of L. placed a boycott on the W. U. some half dozen years ago, and thousands of dollars have been diverted to the Postal, with the result that the letter concern has become rich and powerful. Now organized labor is receiving its pay. Throughout the recent controversy the Postal has displayed a more vindictive spirit toward the telegraphers, if such a thing was possible, than the Western Union. It is one of the ironies of capitalism that we frequently create Frankensteins that would turn about and devour us.

The second lesson is the "butting in" of the national administration. Ever since Roosevelt's action in enforcing the open shop in the government printing office and causing the loss of several hundred members, that gentleman has spoken gently to organizations in trouble and carried a big club. His anthracite coal commission placed a premium on union deserters, and today, according to the miners' officials, the Pennsylvania unions are in a demoralized condition because of the open shop policy that prevails. His open shop ideas were reflected in other instances that cannot be mentioned here. When indications pointed to a national strike of telegraphers, which would have resulted in big business being forced to sit up and take notice of labor's solidarity and power, and which would doubtless have quickened the agitation of government ownership of telegraphs, Roosevelt dispatched his trusty retainer, Labor Commissioner Neill, to repair to the disaffected districts and apply the chloroform. Mr. Neill rushed to New York, thence to Chicago and finally to San Francisco. Little has been given out of what actually transpired in the various conferences held. Nor was it necessary to make much hullaballo about it. Mr. Neill was reported to have left San Francisco "satisfied," after General Managers Clowry and Adams, of the telegraph companies, promised to reinstate the strikers if they are "good and faithful and discontinue all agitation." Unquestionably Mr. Roosevelt has cut another notch in his big stick, and his eminent and distinguished service in putting the quietus to the telegraphers' strike will probably afford a text for another brain storm on the relations of capital and labor in some future state paper.

Let no person underestimate the extraordinary ability and shrewd manipulations of the Messrs. Roosevelt, Taft, Straus, Neill, etc., etc., as arbitrators and adjustors in labor controversies. Gentlemen who

are capable in palming off gold bricks on union people repeatedly and winning applause for so doing must be adepts in their peculiar line. If you are successful in securing somebody to participate in a shell game and making them believe they will get something for their trouble, you possess all the wonderful attributes that go to make up a great statesman. And if you can get your victims to actually pass resolutions of thanks and holler themselves hoarse for you, then you are in a fair way to be canonized as a saint and placed on a pedestal, to be gazed upon in awe and admiration by generations of yaps to come. Really, there isn't so very much difference between a king or a czar who throws his subjects a bone occasionally and statesman in a republic whose skill in phrasemongering is second only to his dexterity in adjusting labor disputes—with labor always and everlastingly holding the bag.

There have been three significant events showing the steady, regular progress of socialism in Europe. Two of these have taken place in England and offer proof that the parliamentary elections of a year ago were not part of a sporadic revolt but were the beginning of a great socialist movement. There have been two by-elections for Parliament, in both of which socialists have been victorious. The first of these landed Pete Curren, the well known socialist and trade-union agitator, in the House of Commons. The second was in the Colne Valley district for West Riding, where, after a bitter fight against all other parties, Victor Grayson, the socialist, was elected by a plurality of 153. This victory is hailed with especial joy by the socialists and fear by the capitalist parties, because the issue was so clear cut and the victory so decisive. It is positive proof that at last England, the "classic land of capitalism," is well on the way toward becoming the classic land of socialism.

The other event of importance was the unexpected (by the capitalists, at least) victory of the socialists in Rome. Here again the opposition was bitter and firm. The Catholic Church took an especially active part in fighting the socialists, yet in spite of that fact 24 out of the 29 members to be elected at this election were socialists. This makes the socialists the strongest single party in the Municipal Council of Rome. There have been no other important elections held in Europe during the past month, and the socialist organizations have been largely occupied with preparations for the International Socialist Congress to be held at Stuttgart next month.

BOOK REVIEWS

Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History, by Karl Kautsky. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Cloth, Standard Socialist Series, 206 pp., 50 cents.

About two years ago there was a sharp controversy in Germany over the management of the Vorwaerts. The editorial management had fallen into the hands of those who were inclined to lay less emphasis upon the class struggle materialistic side of Socialist philosophy, and more upon the sentimental phase of the subject. Against this management of the leading German Socialist organ Kautsky led a vigorous attack. This book is the result of that attack being based upon a series of articles written in criticism of the Vorwaerts management.

Kautsky is without doubt entitled to the title of the greatest living exponent of Marxian doctrines. As such he always commands a hearing, and repays reading, whether we may agree with him or not.

The present work is one of the most valuable of his many studies. In the method of work as well as in the subject matter it is an excellent exemplification of the application of Marxism. The comparative historic method is used throughout, which, as is sometimes the case with this method, gives a somewhat cumbersome look to the general plan.

Yet within the compass of these few pages he has condensed a remarkably large amount of fundamental philosophy. It is at once a history of ethical theories with their relation to industrial facts, and a discussion of the position of present day socialist thought to ethical problems.

We watch the various ethical concepts taking form from the "Ancient and Christian Ethics", and the "Ethical systems of the Period of Enlightenment", through the "Ethics of Kant" and "Darwinism" to the "Ethics of Marxism".

Each of these has made some contribution to that great body of ethical rules which has played so great and so valuable a part in social solidarity. Those who foolishly think to affect an extremely revolutionary radicalism by announcing that all morality is conventionality and that all convention is bad, and that therefore those who are least conventional are "best" will find no consolation in this work. Kautsky takes the position that "not only are the social instincts something absolutely not conventional, but something deeply grounded in human nature, the nature of man as a social animal. The connection between the tenets of morals and the social needs has

been already proved by so many practical examples, that we can accept it as a general rule." To be sure he immediately adds, "If, however, this connection exists then an alteration of society must necessitate an alteration in many moral precepts."

The work covers a field on which there has hitherto been almost nothing in English and where much was needed. It bids fair to become one of those books which are essential to even a small socialist library.

The Industrial Republic, by Upton Sinclair, Doubleday Page & Co., Cloth, 284 pp., \$1.20.

If the author of this book had said that he was writing as a dreamer and a genius, he might have been forgiven and even praised for some portion of it. But when he claims to write as a "scientist and a prophet," he cannot but expect that his credentials will be examined. Even a superficial reading of the book is enough to show that he knows very little about Socialism. There are many of the Socialist phrases but little of the substance. The philosophy which lies behind the book, in so far as it has a philosophy, is a combination of utopianism and Wilshire's catastrophic theory of crises and overproduction.

It is possible that the author has done all the reading that he claims upon the Civil War period, but he seems to have but illy digested what he read, for to him the Republican Party aims at Abolition and the whole interpretation which he puts upon events is the idealistic bourgeois one.

When he comes to treat of "Industrial Evolution" he is somewhat better, although what such a sentence as this means it is hard to tell, "Following close upon the heels of political society you have the evolution of industrial society." Industrial society has existed since there was a social unit. Political society has been formulated by industry, and the Socialists were the first to make known this truth. There is no conception of the class as a dynamic of social evolution, and he draws historical parallels between present capitalism and Roman society before the decline such as have been drawn by every alarmist since Rome fell. Neither is Rooseveltian race suicide "simply a popular term for that 'elimination of the middle class' which Karl Marx predicted half a century ago," and it is almost ridiculous to confuse them. Marx was speaking of a great industrial evolution which wiped out a certain industrial class, by destroying their industrial foundation, without necessarily affecting their numbers as individual units in the census. Race suicide may possibly be to some small extent a result of that industrial elimination, in that a decaying industrial class finds the struggle harder for its members and these seek to reduce the birth rate, but that is as far as the connection goes.

The whole point of view is idealistic, utopian, and the book reaches its fitting climax in a very silly tabular comparison between the Civil War and the present period, in which various individuals of the two periods are given fanciful names which are supposed to apply to identical types in the two periods. This table was first published something over a year ago and the intervening time has served to make it appear even more foolish than at the time of first publication. It is safe to predict that before a few more years shall have passed away the author will wish he had never penned this table.

Following this comes a wild nightmare description of a terrible panic that is to come in 1913 to be followed by the election of Hearst and the inauguration of Socialism, by Hearst in spite of himself. Having produced the revolution the author proceeds to give the details of "The Industrial Republic," and makes it a very bourgeois paradise indeed in which "a man will be able to order anything he wishes, from a flying machine to a seven-legged spider made of diamonds."

There is much that is good in the book. Its descriptions of the evils of capitalism are strong, as might well be expected from the author of "The Jungle." The whole is far better written than the average Socialist work, but it is wholly misleading so far as Socialism is concerned, and belongs to the literature of the days of Populism and Nationalism, rather than to the age of scientific Marxism.

Socialism, Positive and Negative, by Robert Rives La Monte. Charles H. Kerr and Company, Cloth, (Standard Socialist Series), 150 pp., 50 cents.

La Monte writes with a brilliancy that sometimes enables him to cover up errors, and makes one feel a little suspicious of him. On the whole there is not much to complain of in this volume of essays, which are largely an exposition of what might be called ultra-Marxism, at least much of it is not Marx, though it may be none the less true for all that. He is perhaps at his best from a scholarly point of view in "Science and Socialism," and this notwithstanding the fact that Comrade Boudin has most severely criticised this same essay. In this controversy both Boudin and LaMonte are right, in our opinion. Boudin is right that it is not Marxism, for Marx never set about applying the laws of biological evolution to society, notwithstanding his admiration of Darwin's work, and La Monte is right in that he is working out laws that are true and the foundation for which were probably laid by Marx.

The essay on "Marxism and Ethics" is one of those where La Monte is better from a literary than a scholarly point of view. To say that "morality is a class institution" is either meaningless, or false, or else words have been given a new meaning, or else, and we fancy this is the true explanation, in his endeavor to be ultra-radical the author has "met himself going back."

The majority of the rules of even present morality are far older than capitalism, many much older than a class society, some have their roots far back in the animal world. To assume that "in the free fellowship of the future there will be no morality" is playing with phrases, or else it is a complete rejection of the dialectic philosophy and an adoption of utopianism, tinged with "eternal truth" philosophy,—all of which things are comrade LaMonte's particular **betes noir**. The same criticism applies with even more crushing force to the essay, of which it is not hard to see the author is particularly proud, "The Nihilism of Socialism."

This is the chapter about which he chuckles while he warns the reader against its "unwise frankness," and that he is doubtless hoping will prove terribly shocking to all who read. In this he destroys religion, the state and the family. Unfortunately this has been done some thousands of times before in history, although not often in the name of dialectics, and these institutions are still with us. Changes

there will certainly be in all these institutions, in the transition to a proletarian ruled society; but one can hardly accept the criticisms of a Shaw or an Ibsen as authoritative pronouncements on Marxism, or as inspired prophets concerning future institutions, no matter how much we may grant them as the greatest literary critics of bourgeois institutions.

The next essay "The Biogenetic Law" is written to explain just how the author evolved to his present highest possible stage of revolution. There is a condescending pity for those who have not evolved to his high station, but unfortunately once more for one who has reached the highest tips of evolutionary dialectics, he assumes that there is just such a finished point at which evolution must stop. Who knows but that on beyond LaMonte there may be yet other un-numbered higher stages of revolutionists in comparison with which he is the most moss-backed of conservatives.

After all the book really deserves a more favorable review than this, for it is strikingly suggestive, and thought compelling, but it is written in such a cock-sure superior way as to challenge criticism, no matter how much you may like it. At any rate every Socialist ought to read it. It will help to wake him up.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

CAMPAIGN BOOKS.

The acquittal of Haywood, so largely due to the persistent agitation of the Socialists, and the general sentiment in favor of his nomination as our presidential candidate next year, make it clear that the Socialist Party is on the eve of a period of rapid growth. The real problem is no longer as before how to get the attention and interest of possible converts. The development of the class war has solved that question for us and has brought us up against a new problem,—how to transform our new recruits into men with some real understanding of how things are evolving and a very definite idea of WHAT THEY WANT.

Very likely we shall have a million new voters when the next count is made; if we can educate one out of ten in this way, the chances are that the whole party will hold together and grow; if on the other hand it is all shouting and no study, our converts will be fair game for the next politician who promises "something right now."

The time to do the work of education is before the campaign shouting begins. Now while there are no special appeals to be made for campaign funds, and while capitalist prosperity is as yet undisturbed by the approaching election, is the time when inquirers and sympathizers can be successfully urged to buy and read books.

We have for several months been giving most of the space in this department to the description of bound books suitable for libraries; this time we shall give most of it to propaganda pamphlets.

Crime and Criminals. This speech by Clarence S. Darrow, whose splendid defense of Haywood has endeared him to every socialist, was delivered and first published several years ago, and is now in its third edition and selling faster than ever before. It was an address to the prisoners in the County Jail in Chicago. A good idea of the forcefulness of the speech may be obtained from the impression it made on the capitalistic editor of the Columbus Dispatch. He says:

"A persual will convince any intelligent person of Darrow's standing as a fomenter of crime, a traitor to "labor," and an arch-enemy of law and common-sense.....No more damning indictment was ever framed against a public leader that Darrow thus brings against himself.....The man who tells murderers and burglars that they are 'just as good as any one,' and who declares that he 'could take 500 of the worst criminals and 500 of the most depraved abandoned women, and from them build up a community as good and as moral as any in the land' ought to be thoroughly known and plainly branded."

Strangely enough, an opposite impression was made on the editor of the Press-Post, published in the same city. This paper gives a highly favorable review of the book, occupying two columns, with a portrait of the author. Newspapers all over the country are now discussing the book, and it will undoubtedly have a rapid sale where ever offered at socialist street meetings.

Socialism, Revolution and Internationalism. This book is by Gabriel Deville, one of the foremost socialist writers of France. It has been translated into English by Robert Rives LaMonte, but has never been extensively advertised until lately. We have now printed a new and attractive edition, and can thoroughly recommend the book as one of the very best popular presentations of the principles of international socialism that can be had at any price. Moreover it is one of the strongest arguments that can be found in defense of the need of political action on the part of socialists.

Manifesto of the Communist Party. By Marx and Engels. This great document, fifty-nine years old and still circulated by the socialists of every country in the world, is the best possible answer to the charge that socialism has no definite meaning. The book is one that every inquirer should read and every one who expects to talk about socialism should read over and over.

Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By Frederick Engels. This is another of the indispensable books. This ten cent edition is the same, page for page, with our library edition sold at fifty cents. The difference is simply that this is on thinner paper with narrower margins and bound in paper covers instead of cloth.

Socialist Songs with Music. Compiled by Charles H. Kerr. The only book of socialist songs published in America which voices the spirit of Marxian socialism. It contains five songs by William Morris and thirty-one by other writers. Care has been taken to exclude such songs as tend to stimulate sentimentality rather than clear

thinking. The price has lately been reduced from 20c to 10c to put the book within the reach of the less prosperous Locals.

Socialism, What it Is and What it Seeks to Accomplish. By Wilhelm Liebknecht. This is at once a history of the beginnings of socialism by one of the men who were doing things and a statement of the principles of the international party by one of its most trusted representatives. Liebknecht was a close friend of Marx and Engels, but put his own strength into the development of the political movement rather than the theory of socialism.

Class Struggles in America. By A. M. Simons. This is a condensed history of the United States in the light of the socialist philosophy, and will be found to contain many facts that are startling to those who have thus far received their information from school-books and capitalist newspapers. It is good propaganda for those who have not yet become students, since it deals in a concrete way with events often discussed.

Life of Frederick Engels. By Karl Kautsky. This book, written just after Engels' death, is not only a biography, but a condensed history of the beginnings of the international socialist movement, with which Engels was so closely identified.

The Socialist Movement. By Charles H. Vail. One of the best possible pamphlets to put into the hands of a beginner. It explains why the socialist movement is and must be proletarian, and gives a brief and clear summary of the theories of surplus value and economic determinism.

Not Guilty. By John Spargo. A play founded on the Haywood case. Though it was written and printed before the conclusion of the trial, the author guessed correctly at the outcome. The play brings out the conspiracy of the mine owners in a graphic fashion. It makes good reading, and is well suited for production on the stage by amateurs.

All of these books retail at ten cents each, and any of them will be sent postpaid on receipt of price. Our stockholders buy them at six cents each by mail or five cents if sent at purchaser's expense. For one dollar we will mail the ten books and a credit certificate good for 40c. at any time within a year toward the purchase of a share of stock. See pages 61 and 62 of last month's Review. We have here described less than half of our 10c propaganda books. For descriptions of the others see our Socialist Book Bulletin, mailed free on request.

FINANCES FOR JULY.

The book sales for the month were \$1,619.68, stock sales \$267.68, Review subscriptions and sales \$133.90. We also received a contribution from Eugene Dietzgen of \$250, and from Dr. Heinrich Stinnes of \$3.70, making the total receipts for the month \$2,274.96. This is highly gratifying from one point of view, since in midsummer, when book sales are usually at a low ebb, the receipts were more than enough to pay the ordinary expences. But we have lately been making so many additions to our book list, including the publication of the second volume of Marx's Capital, that the unpaid bills still amount to about \$2,000. Moreover the publishing house owes to Charles H. Kerr about \$3,000, representing stock belonging to him which has been sold, the money being left in the business. He will be obliged to withdraw about \$900 of this money at the end of August to pay a personal debt, and he has issued a circular letter to stockholders offering to donate the remaining \$2,100 to the publishing house, provided that others will among them contribute an equal amount in sums of \$20 or more. He does not ask for smaller contributions for the reason that they would be likely to come from those not able to buy all the socialist books they would be glad to have, and he suggests that those who wish to help in the present emergency who can not spare so much as \$20 send as large orders for books as possible.

WHY CONTRIBUTIONS ARE NEEDED.

There are no deficits to make up. The whole trouble is lack of capital. This is a handicap that the manager has been struggling with from the start, and he would rather give the \$2,100 to the publishing house than carry the burden longer. The business has been financed on his personal credit, and he has found it necessary to work for thirteen years without a vacation in order to keep the creditors satisfied.

The work of this publishing house is too important to the socialist movement of the United States to leave its future dependent on the life on any one man. A large majority of the stock is already in the hands of socialists holding one share each, but as long as there is any debt to non-socialists, there is always the possible danger of an unfriendly receivership in the event of the death or disability of the manager.

Out of our 1787 stockholders, there should be a hundred who could each afford \$20 or more toward putting the publishing house on a solid and permanent basis. And there are a few who could easily give much larger sums. All contributions will be acknowledged

in the Review unless the donors have special reasons for keeping their names in the background.

THE AMERICAN ESPERANTO BOOK.

Arthur Baker, editor of *America Esperantisto*, has prepared a text-book for the study of Esperanto which contains exercises, grammar, and copious vocabularies, all in one volume, so that the purchaser will not find himself obliged to buy other books before he can learn the language. Comrade Baker's book contains 316 pages, bound in the same style as our editions of *Capital* and *Ancient Society*. The price including postage to any address is one dollar, with the usual discount to stockholders.

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION.

This book by Karl Marx is one of the most interesting and readable of his works. Unlike most of them, it is not a translation, being written by Marx himself in the English language. The subtitle, *Germany in 1848*, indicates the scope of the book. It is made up of letters which Marx wrote, in the early days of his exile in London, to the *New York Tribune*, giving a graphic history of the brief success and ultimate failure of the Revolution of 1848 in Germany. These letters were edited after Marx's death by his daughter, Eleanor Marx Aveling, and published in the *Social Science Series*. We have sold many copies in that edition at \$1.00, and the steadily increasing demand has led us to bring the book out in the *Standard Socialist Series* at 50c. The book is full of lessons for the revolutionists of today, and at the reduced price should have a rapid sale.