March 8, 1913 Five Cents

The New Review

A-WEEKLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

150 Nassau Street New York

matter of his speeches, and his frequent intercessions with various departments of the Administration on behalf of the workers and the oppressed. The extended eulogy reads like the last verse in the first chapter of Genesis, in which it is stated that "God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good." No doubt, much that Berger did was very good. The best thing he did was to get into Congress on the Socialist ticket; it was high time that somebody got in there on that ticket. The next best thing was that during his entire term he appears never to have made himself and our cause ridiculous—which he might easily have done, considering that he was the only Socialist in the House. Nevertheless there are some flaws in Berger's brief congressional career, and these it is now our duty to point out.

To begin with, the official eulogist in Washington tells us that "much of Berger's success in Washington has been due to his genial personality, which has universally made friends for him and his party." The same impression of Berger's "geniality" is also obtained from a recent Washington correspondence in the New York *Evening Post,* in which Berger is stated to have become very popular in the House and to have boasted of the liking for him of Joe Cannon and "all the little Joe Cannons." Frankly, it seems to us that a Socialist Representative who has not earned the sincere and undying hatred of all the Joe Cannons, big and little, has not entirely succeeded in his mission. Is it possible for the spokesmen of the millions who suffer every day of the year from monstrous oppression and injustice to give voice to their wrongs without arousing violent and bitter resentment in the breasts of those who are determined to continue these wrongs with all the means of repression at their disposal? The great thinkers and leaders of Socialism, Marx, Engels, Lassalle, Liebknecht, Bebel, Guesde, Lafargue, have been cordially hated by the political and economic representatives of capital. Flaming hatred of injustice has never yet failed to call forth the flaming hatred of the unjust.

However, this "geniality" may indicate nothing more than a defect of temperament, or it may be an effect of excessive caution and moderation, although these qualities have not been characteristic traits of Victor Berger in his numerous controversies with fellow-Socialists. Let us not quarrel over something that, after all, is largely a matter of taste. Perhaps the right course for the lone Socialist in Congress was to be humorous and amiable at all times. Let us, therefore, consider his acts rather than his demeanor.

The chief boast of his official eulogist is that he introduced a very large number of bills and resolutions, nearly all of which were, of course, never considered. Was this the right course to pursue? Should this sort of activity occupy the greater portion of the time of a Socialist Representative? We raise this question now, partly because to our knowledge it was never raised before, but chiefly because Socialists are sure to be elected again, and in ever increasing numbers, to the House of Representatives. Should they devote their time and energy chiefly to the elaboration of bills that are sure to be contemptuously ignored by the majority parties, or should they, on the contrary, primarily exercise the function of critics, of prosecuting attorneys for the working class, and introduce bills and resolutions only on extraordinary occasions, when they would arrest the attention of the whole country?

For a considerable time to come Socialists are sure to remain in a minority, both in the country and in Congress. A minority party cannot hope, in ordinary times, to shape the legislation of the country. It is true that it may obtain concessions, large or small, depending upon its strength, but these may be obtained in one of two ways. They may be obtained, first, by the method of conciliation and moderation. The Socialist minority may say to the capitalist majority: "It is true we are a weak minority and we cannot force you to grant us anything. But we might give you a deal of trouble if we chose. We might hamper you in your work by filibustering methods. We might shout from the housetops, giving the country information of all your crooked deals and servility to the rich and powerful. We might compel you to treat us harshly and contrary to established parliamentary usage. And you know you wouldn't like to do it yourselves, for it would attract the attention of the country toward us. But we are willing to be on our good behavior, to criticise you very mildly (for you know we must criticise you, our Socialist constituents demand it of us), not to resort to obstruction, and not to force you to the employment of the gag. In short, we are willing to be good fellows, provided you regard us as 'his Majesty's loyal opposition' and, therefore, a part of the government, give us leave to introduce bills and resolutions, give us the floor to make short speeches, permit us to insert in the *Congressional Record* speeches we have never made, and occasionally grant us a real little favor for the working class that we represent." This is one way to obtain concessions. It is not a novel way. It has been tried in France, England and other countries, and always with

disastrous results. It has brought the elements of disintegration into the Socialist parties, has caused loss of confidence in political action on the part of the masses, and has given encouragement to syndicalism, anarchism, and indifferentism.

There is also another way to obtain concessions. It is not so agreeable or respectable a way. It involves fighting, ceaseless fighting, fighting at all points, tooth and nail. It involves the use of obstructive methods, even violent methods, which often result in being gagged completely. It involves being hated by the majority. It involves exclusion from all the little governmental favors. It involves the loss of credit for the little reforms the majority is compelled to enact into law in order to still the clamor of the masses without. But although ostracised politically, although hated by all the Joe Cannons, big and little, although hated by all the capitalists of the country, nevertheless a Socialist party that consistently follows such a course is bound to grow in numbers, in self-consciousness, in devotion to and understanding of its ultimate grand aim. Such is the Social Democracy of Germany, always in a fighting posture and clad in full armor, and therefore totally excluded from all governmental favors. It has pursued an uninterrupted course of opposition, criticism, obstruction, defiance. It voted even against Bismarck's social reform bills, which it regarded, in the words of Franz Mehring, not as *social* reform but as *beggarly* reforms, mere improvements in the administration of that public charity which no society divided into rich and poor can dispense with. And behold, the German social legislation, beggarly as it is, has become the model for all other capitalist countries, while the German Social Democracy is the most numerous, best organized and best informed of all Socialist parties in the world. And while there are in the German Social Democracy wide diversities of view as to theory and tactics, and although there are in the radical wing of the party conflicts of opinion as to the present and prospective value of mass action, nevertheless there is no anti-political syndicalism or anarchism to speak of in the ranks of the workers.

But, it is said, Berger's numerous bills were intended to show the country what the Socialists would do if they were in power, and the official eulogist adds that "one of Berger's chief accomplishments has been to break down a great deal of prejudice against the Socialist party, held by millions of the bourgeois of the country." Berger may have contributed to the breaking down of blind prejudice against Socialism, by his election even

more than by anything he did in Congress, but that he showed the country what the Socialists would do if they were in power is a highly disputable proposition.

Take two bills that Berger very likely considers among the most important ones of those he brought forward, the Old Age Pension bill and the so-called Collective Ownership bill. The former raised a storm of protests in the party because of its exclusion from the benefits of the bill (1) of all those who have not been citizens of the United States for sixteen consecutive years, (2) of all who have been convicted of a felony, and (3) of all who have not been dutiful husbands or wives. In the end the National Executive Committee was compelled to "request" Berger to amend his bill in all of these respects. But can any old age pension bill, even the very best, show the country what the Socialists would do if they were in power? Under capitalism the best of all old age pension laws can be nothing more than a liberal and humane poor law, and while it is by no means a matter of indifference to us whether a poor law is liberal or niggardly, humane or harsh, no poor law can serve as an illustration of what we would do if we had the power. The so-called Collective Ownership bill, which really should have been called a bill for the Establishment of State Capitalism, caused no such storm of protests because nobody took it seriously and very few cared what was in it. It did not even contain a provision guaranteeing the right of combination to the employes in the State Capitalist industries, and of course no provision for participation by the employes in the management of these industries. A fine illustration of industrial democracy, forsooth!

But it might be argued that while these bills were defective, better bills would have accomplished the desired purpose of showing what the Socialists would do if they were in power. To which we reply: The fault lies not so much with the particular form of Berger's bills as with the whole underlying conception. The Socialists cannot possibly show the country what they would do if they had the power before they have the power to do what they would. There is a vast difference between a general demand and a bill embodying the demand in a particular form. The demand for an old age pension bill as a most urgent measure of relief under capitalism, or the demand for the collective ownership of the means of production as the basis of a new social order, may be made by the Socialist party even while it is small in numbers and devoid of all influence, leaving it to the capitalist government to introduce the former under pressure of public

opinion, and in as liberal a form as may be extorted from it by all the combination of influences that usually goes to the enacting of such a law, and biding the time when its own power will enable it to introduce the latter. But a bill, a proposal of law, cannot be made in general terms. A law must be concrete, definite, specific, and a bill that is intended to be taken seriously and not brushed aside with contempt must take account of a mass of detail. In a society composed of conflicting classes and interests, every law of importance is, moreover, a compromise, a resultant of the social parallelogram of forces existing at the moment of its enactment, and the practical legislator must take account of this parallelogram. Suppose there were twenty-five Socialists in Congress and that they proposed in all seriousness and with the necessary detail the taking over of the great industries by the nation and their administration on a democratic basis. The capitalist majority in Congress would be quite right if it just shrugged its shoulders and proceeded with the order of the day. And the twenty-five Socialists would make themselves no less ridiculous if they proposed the abolition of the army, the dismantling of the navy, or the levying of a twenty-five per cent. income tax on all incomes over $5,000.

The fact is that the proposal of laws, save on extraordinary occasions, is the exclusive function of the majority party, the party in control of the government, and not of the minority. The majority party has at its disposal all the legal, statistical and other information in possession of the government. The majority party knows the demands of the ruling powers and the extent of the concessions they are willing to make. The majority party can propose laws because it can make them and enforce them and stands ready to take the responsibility for them, while the minority can neither make them nor enforce them, and hence should not propose them.

This has been the practice of parliaments. This has been the practice of successful Socialist parties abroad. And it is to be hoped that when the next Socialist delegation enters Congress, it will pay heed to the teachings of experience and not indulge in vain delusions, even though they are euphemistically styled "constructive."

H. S.

Big Business and Workmen's Compensation

By Paul Kennaday.

Big Business and the American people are coming to close quarters in a new field. The fight is on in many states and soon will come in many more. The casualty insurance companies are trying with all the ingenuity of long experience to turn to their own profit the immense new business in sight with the passage of the workmen's compensation or insurance laws in state after state. We have been slow, heartlessly slow, as a people, to write into our statutes the protection against the results of industrial injuries with which Europe has been familiar these many years. But now, as though making up for the lost time and past neglect, we are all at it with a vengeance, turning heaven and earth to get the principle of workmen's compensation enacted into law, impatient of delay, regardless of mere constitutions, "God-sakers" many of us, as Wells puts it, shouting "for God's sake let us do *something*."

This something is "elective" compensation insurance. Seized upon with alacrity by reformers, fought at first at every step by the casualty insurance companies and employers, "elective" acts are now cherished like a prodigal son returned seeking forgiveness for rebellion, no more to carry disgrace and ruin in his wake.

"Elective" acts are drawn with the acknowledged purpose of subverting state constitutions. The New York Court of Appeals in the Ives case said that to compel an employer to give compensation without fault was taking property without due process of law. The thing to do, plainly, is to get around the constitution. The method is ingenious but effective. Write into a compensation or insurance act that employer and employed may "elect" whether they will come under it or not. If they refuse to elect, take away from employers their old stand-bys, those barbarous anachronisms of our present laws, the defenses of "contributory negligence," "fellow servant" and "assumption of risk" which have done such noble service in leaving penniless injured workmen or their widows. Of course, employes by the law of the land enter into only free contracts, and so they, too, may elect to stay out, even though their employer "elects" to come in. And in that case the employer has these three defenses,

which can still be used against the employe in case he ever sues for damages for injuries—and in case he retains his position one minute after he has exercised his "election."

The peculiar advantage of this "club" feature, as it has been aptly termed, in these elective laws, is that if the scale of compensation is high enough to be at all adequate to the workers, the cost of coming under the act will be so great, owing to the rates charged by the casualty companies, that most employers will stay out. But staying out, they will still take liability insurance with these companies at lower rates, yet at rates very much in excess of present liability rates. If, on the other hand, the scale of compensation is made so low that employers will elect to come under it with the rates charged to them by the companies, these casualty companies reap a rich harvest, for no employer can run the risk of damage suits with his old judge-made defenses taken from him.

So we see the casualty companies aiding and abetting in the passage of "elective" laws. With equal determination they stop, where they can, laws which give the employer no election, but compel him to insure. For there are states like Ohio and New York, where the amendment made or pending to the state constitution, gives the legislature power to pass such acts. And *compelled* to give compensation, the employer, if the legislature chooses, may be forced to give adequate compensation to his injured workers. And this again may, and probably will, lead the average employer to take state, mutual, or self-insurance in preference to the higher rates which private companies must charge to continue their profits and enormous salaries.

And while this has been going on from Massachusetts to California, Big Business has been looking on, taking advantage of every false step, putting legislators and commissioners into false positions, proposing very quietly but very effectively, none the less, to let the American people once more deliver themselves over to private interests, ever anxious to perform public duties.

It has been estimated, rightly or wrongly, that $100,000,000 in annual profits are at stake for the casualty insurance companies in this fight. Whatever the exact sum, it is certainly too large to let slip. And whatever we may think of state insurance, of its propriety or of its advisability at once, whether it is good or bad, the casualty companies can have but one opinion on the subject, that it's about as serious an injury to them as the loss of a man's head is to him.

And so the casualty insurance companies are to be found

advising, wherever workmen's compensation is under discussion. At meetings of bar associations their attorneys have resolutions passed deprecating state insurance. At meetings of state commissioners they are free with their praise of that "New Jersey model" which has proved such a bonanza to the insuring interests. At legislative hearings they openly denounce as "socialistic," and therefore to be cast out without more ado, state insurance. And like the trail of the serpent, or the ways of a maid with a man, their ways are often past finding out.

But the drift is setting against Big Business, here as elsewhere. The State of Washington led the way with a compulsory state insurance act, by driving out the casualty companies and leaving to them, in the place of big profits, the small comfort of predicting the early collapse of a signal success in "state socialism." The Ohio senate and assembly last week amended their former elective state insurance act, by giving employers two other options, self-insurance and mutual insurance, but compelling them to insure in one of the three ways. This closes the rich Ohio field to liability insurance companies. The Oregon house of representatives has just passed a state insurance act, and according to press despatches "casualty companies are resorting to every conceivable method to defeat the bill in the senate, but it is confidently expected that the senate will concur in the action of the house."

Compulsory acts are in force in Arizona and, as far as state employes are concerned, in Wisconsin, while Massachusetts is building up against the strenuous rivalry of private companies a strong state mutual insurance company.

In New York the fight is on in deadliest earnest, for in New York not only is there open espousal of state insurance by the determined State Federation of Labor, but the situation is still more perilous for the casualty companies, because looming up large is the spectre of compulsory insurance, "state or otherwise." Last year the New York legislature passed a constitutional amendment to overcome the constitutional objections to a compulsory law. This year a Democratic party which swept into power a governor and an overwhelming majority in senate and assembly pledged itself "to pass again this proposed amendment in the next session of the legislature," and the people are beyond any doubt in favor of such relief as this amendment will bring from the present cruelties and anachronisms of damage suits at law. No doubt Big Business would be glad to see the Democratic party go back on solemn pledges to the people and to see

the people led astray at the polls next November. Neither of these contingencies in the present humor of legislators and their constituents is hardly within the range of practical politics.

Yet agreeable as it would be to some to have the impossible thus happen, no small measure of consolation is to be had in the bill recommended by the senate committee on insurance. That committee is no more to be blamed than is the able commissioner of insurance, whose integrity and genuine desire to do justice to the over-burdened workers of the state none can doubt. They have simply floundered and have made mistakes in trying too hastily to solve as difficult a problem as can be put up to legislators. Nevertheless, this composite bill has defects writ large upon every page. Not only does it provide for an industrial compensation board drawing aggregate salaries of $36,000 to do little more than oversee and approve agreements as to amounts to be paid in settlement of claims, but it leaves in the state insurance department, where the State Federation of Labor and many more do not want it, the fixing of rates and the whole administration of the state fund to which employers may contribute if they do not elect self-insurance, mutual insurance or casualty company insurance.

That a bill, put together as this one has been, has many most serious defects in draughtmanship, was to be expected, but that it should be deliberately put forward with glowing encomiums as containing "the best features of compensation laws of other states" and of the five bills introduced in New York, is a serious reflection upon the wisdom and deliberative methods of law makers. Constitutions are perhaps nothing among friends, but three constitutional objections to one bill is good measure, too much running over. Thus we see here an infant impliedly waiving a constitutional guarantee, we see that the employe, unless he does an overt act, is held to have waived his constitutional guarantee to trial by jury, and finally we find a discrimination between those to whom the act does or does not apply, a discrimination neither warranted by fact nor defendable at law.

And while the legislature has done this, to escape one other constitutional defect in their former bill, they have, in effect, turned the whole rich New York field over to the casualty companies. For now it is provided that the employer must "elect" his methods of insuring by filing his papers with the insurance department. And that plainly means that the average employer will do nothing at all until an agent of a casualty company comes to him and offers to attend to everything—in the meantime telling him what dismal failures have been, whenever tried, all state, mutual and self-insurance "socialistic" schemes.

Curiously enough, while men are deliberately and openly planning the utter rout of the casualty companies, no spokesman for those companies appears in sight in New York. There are some so utterly unregenerate as to ask, "Why need they?"

A Call To Action

By Moses Oppenheimer.

For the time being the Burnett-Dillingham Immigration Bill is shelved with all its dangerous features. But the margin of defeat was exceedingly narrow. The Senate had voted four to one to override the President's veto. In the House only five votes were lacking to put this infamous measure on the statute book. Predictions are already made that the next session of Congress would pass this measure beyond any doubt.

The New Review in a previous issue has pointed out conclusively some of the provisions of this bill that would destroy our traditional institution of Political Asylum, not openly, but surreptitiously, by giving the immigration authorities new and efficient powers of exclusion against persons alleged to have "committed" a crime. These provisions would open wide the door for the mischief of the secret international political police, while at the same time making an effective defense practically impossible.

The trick was done with dark lantern methods in the Conference Committee of both Houses. What part Russian influence played in the sneak transaction, nobody is able to state. What we do know is that some of the most astute and most reactionary leaders of the Senate, notably Root and Lodge, were suspiciously eager to jam the bill through before the American people could be informed as to its full significance.

It now behooves the Socialist party to wake up and act. It is our function and our duty to defeat the right of Political Asylum against open or sneaky encroachment. It is up to our officials and to our press. They cannot and they must not shirk the responsibility.

Syndicalist Organization in France

By Paul Louis (Paris).

In a former article I have examined briefly the organization of the Socialist party in France: I would now like to show the operation of the Syndicalist associations and their numerical strength, and speak not only of the syndicats, which are the primary form of such associations, but also of the Labor Bourses, the unions of syndicats, the federations of trade and industry and the General Confederation of Labor.

The French Syndicalist movement has developed especially during the last fifteen years. If we ask why it has taken so long to establish itself on a solid basis, we find numerous reasons:

(1). Legislation has always been placing obstacles both of political and of economic character in the way of labor associations. Every organization of the proletariat, whatever may have been its object, was regarded as suspicious and subversive. Immediately after the Great Revolution, or rather during the Revolution, the so-called Chapelier Law prohibited both labor unions and strikes. The Penal Code of the Empire was made stricter still, and the Monarchy of July, in the presence of the outbreaks at Paris and Lyons, which indicated the awakening of the industrial proletariat, added still more to this severity. It was by all sorts of expedients that the wage-earners succeeded, in spite of everything, in taking concerted action for the protection of their interests. They formed at first more or less professional "Mutualities," and then "Resistances," which, without threatening the framework of the social system itself, and faithful to the same spirit that moved old English trade-unionism, struggled against the reduction of wages or for increase in wages. But these "Resistances" were jealously watched by the police, and continually were attacked and dispersed. The Republic of 1848 showed some fleeting signs of liberalism, and suddenly there appeared an enormous efflorescence of labor associations; most of them succumbed, however, in the repressions of June, one of the wildest episodes in the history of class struggles in France. The Second Empire carried police interference still farther, until finally it discovered that in spite of all its measures to the contrary the labor movement was

growing. The government was forced in 1864 to proclaim the principle of free coalition; shortly afterward, it was obliged to leave in practice a rudimentary freedom to the syndical chambers, which had replaced the "Resistances."

The syndical chambers had concentrated especially in Paris, where they tried, on the eve of the War of 1870 and the fall of Napoleon III, to form a collective organization. But they were then in the period of arbitrary despotism: at the least movement of any significance, they were dissolved, and their directors arrested and imprisoned. They were obliged rather to conceal the fact of their organization and limit themselves to the same tasks as before, although the spirit of the International had already penetrated into their midst.

After the downfall of the Commune (March-May, 1871), in which many of the syndicals of that time participated in Paris, a new era of repression began. The syndical chambers were dissolved at one stroke. The associative movement was nevertheless so strong, and the French proletariat so energetic, that within six years after the Commune, corporative associations were springing up everywhere. It has been estimated that in 1882, 60,000 workmen were members of the syndicats or syndical chambers, the first name prevailing after the Law of 1884 recognized the existence of professional associations. This law, which was veritably forced through by the will of the proletariat, although it was not entirely favorable to the workers, assured a very relative freedom. Henceforth the syndicats could be formed without authorization, but they were obliged to communicate to the government their statutes and the names of their directors or administrators. Practically, the law left to the government strong weapons against the working class; and whenever the government has been able, it has sided against the syndicats. It has further made use of the provisions of the Penal Code whenever a social crisis, a general strike, has broken out, and it has never hesitated to arrest those whom it considered the leaders. Nothing, however, has prevented syndicalist enthusiasm from manifesting itself with increasing prestige.

(2). If the French syndicats present smaller contingents than those of the English Trade Unions or the German Gewerkschaften, it is not only because the French protelariat is slightly inferior to that of Germany and much inferior to that of the

United Kingdom. The reason is that great industry has not made on the territory of the Republic the same astonishing prog ress that it has made elsewhere. It is not difficult to understand this. France has no coal deposits comparable to those of the United States, of England or of Germany. She has only 200,000 miners as compared with 1,100,000 in the United Kingdom. Her metal works, her weaving and spinning factories, although their products are advantageously quoted on the market, do not deliver to the trade quantities equal to those furnished by her two neighboring rivals. France has remained a country of artistic and "de luxe" industry, and the production of such commodities scarcely demands a powerful concentration of personnel: in addition to the great laboring groups of Lille, Roubaix, Tourcoing, Lyons, Saint-Etienne, Rouen and Reims, we must consider the artisan class as well. Finally the rural element forms a considerable bulk, and it is a matter of common knowledge that this class is less susceptible than any other to syndicalist propaganda.

(3). The French workingman, as I have already pointed out, is essentially individualistic, and hostile to close agreements imposing strict obligations. He does not like to bind himself. He understands solidarity and is quite capable of sacrificing himself on those great occasions when deep convulsions stir the proletarian class to the very depths; he shrinks on the contrary from the petty annoyances, the humdrum sacrifices, the tasks without glory, which unions demand from day to day. It is only recently that the French laborer has become aware of the virtue of permanent associations, which do indeed exact of each man a partial gift of himself, but which return this gift a hundred fold, by winning him inestimable collective advantages. As one reviews the history of the "Mutualities," the "Resistances," the "Syndical Chambers," the "Syndicats," in the nineteenth century, one notices at every moment, ruptures, dissolutions, reorganizations, all entailing endless expenditures. The federations of trades which are finally developing to-day, have passed during the last twenty years very critical moments. The groups composing them have waged the bitterest struggles against each other. Accusations were hurled against the most devoted militants, who finally in sheer exhaustion gave way. Their departure brought about confusion and all incorporation lapsed into the

silence of death, till some element more active and courageous tried again to rouse it into life. It has seemed as though the French proletariat has been quite as eager to form syndicats as it has been careless about making them permanent.

Here then are some of the reasons why labor unions in France, have been and still are inferior in efficient contingents to those of other great countries. It might perhaps be desirable to touch on the history of the internal revolutions of France, revolutions which have followed each other in rapid succession, and at times without apparent or appreciable preparation. These uprisings have accustomed the masses to love insurrection for itself and to believe in the omnipotence of violence. It was not until the concept of the general strike, so revolutionary in certain of its aspects, came to replace the romanticism of the barricade, that syndicalism felt its power increasing.

The spread of syndicalism has been apparent from several considerations: (1). The membership of the syndicats has increased. (2). The syndicats of particular trades have tended to fuse with one another. It is noticeable that in direct ratio to this tendency, the total number of syndicats has progressed less rapidly than that of syndicat members. (3). The syndicats of particular trades have assembled in national federations so as to generalize their claims and to prevent the workers of one region from blocking the efforts of those of another. (4). The syndicats of all the trades of a given locality have formed unions and Labor Bourses (Bourses de Travail). So the labor unit must express itself in each city through the community of action which reigns among all the organized wage earners, whatever be their trade. A single enthusiasm thus impels the whole proletariat, conscious of unity, toward a single goal by sustaining the same claims. A given syndicat, very feeble in its isolated action, conducts a very efficient campaign if it can count on the support of all the other syndicats, from whatever trade they may come. Departmental federation, which has recently appeared, has extended largely and effectively the field of operation of the local union. (5). The unions and federations have concentrated, or more exactly federated, into the C. G. T. (Confederation Generale de Travail), the origins of which go back to 1895, and which equipped itself in 1904 with its present constitution.

These are the elements of syndicalism we are about to dis-

cuss in their order, overlooking for the moment the divers tendencies which manifest themselves among the French syndicats, as well as the doctrines which confront one another in the congresses.

It is extremely difficult to obtain authoritative statistics on the syndicats and on their members in France. The elementary groups do not themselves publish any census which might serve as a stable basis for calculation. The federations or the unions of syndicats are not acquainted with the numbers of their component elements, the latter often concealing the truth in order to obtain assessments as low as possible. The C. G. T., at its last congress at Havre, was obliged itself to recognize that its adherents numbered some 200,000 more than its taxed members. Certainly, regrettable abuses exist in this regard. It would be desirable that all the members of the local syndicats should become contributors to the departmental and national federations. At any rate, we must content ourselves with the few facts we possess. These are derived from the Bureau of Labor, from the Ministry of Labor and from the Social Bureau: they must be accepted with circumspection, first of all, because the sources of information of these official bodies are rather uncertain; then because the local corporations, when questioned, may consider it to their interest to conceal the truth; and finally, because the totals presented confuse the syndicats of the Reds—who stand more or less for class war—and the syndicats of the Yellows, which are properly associations of strike-beakers, started under the protection and for the protection of large capital. I may add that the Yellows represent but slight contingents.

In 1884 there were 68 known syndicats of workmen; in 1887, 501; in 1890, 1,006; in 1893, 1,926; in 1896, 2,243; in 1900, 2,682; in 1905, 4,625; in 1910, 5,260; in 1912, 5,217. Between 1908 and 1912 there has been a falling off of 307 syndicats, but this diminution, as we shall see, in no way corresponds to a numerical weakening of the syndicalist army. It results rather from a systematically prosecuted fusion of locals in a given trade, which formerly were running counter to each other to the greater prejudice of the proletariat.

In 1890, the syndicalists numbered 139,692; in 1893, 402,630; in 1896, 422,777; in 1900, 491,647; in 1903, 643,757; in 1906, 836,134; in 1910, 977,350; in 1912, 1,064,410. In short, the progress has been without interruption, save in 1909, a year, which in France as elsewhere, but less than elsewhere, was as might be expected from the economic crisis, marked by a reduction.

In 1890, the average membership of a syndicat was 139; in 1895, about 200; slightly declining then in 1900, to settle in 1912 around 204.

These syndicats have created around themselves institutions of varying nature. If in general they adhere to the doctrine of class war, and look forward to a complete overturning of the social system, they nevertheless do not repudiate partial reforms, such as the reduction of hours of labor, increase in the guarantees of hygiene and safety, improvement of the condition of the workers, the better thereby to strengthen their capacity for struggle. They also adapt themselves to the present social structure in order to organize a concrete solidarity for the mutual advantage of their brothers; 1,137 of them have bureaus of employment for the workers in their trades; 1,502 have started libraries; 808 have funds for mutual aid; 624 have funds for those out of work; 473 distribute mileage to those of their members who have to move in search of work; 357 have founded trade schools; 79 pension endowments; others have instituted co-operatives of distribution or even of production. Thus more than 6,000 locals serve as the centre, the home, of proletarian activity.

Above the syndicats, we have, as has been said, the unions and federations, the functions of which we have defined.

The local unions of syndicats, which are also called Labor Exchanges, but inexactly (for the union is the assemblage of local syndicats, while the Bourse is the edifice, usually municipal* which shelters this assemblage) are tending at present to give way or at least to subject themselves to the Departmental unions of syndicats. That is, the new unions are intended to have a vaster territory and their propaganda should cover a far wider zone. The last congress of the C. G. T. at Havre (September, 1912) decided that this transformation should be completed by Jan. 1, 1913, and it expected the greatest results therefrom, as far as regards the diffusion of syndicalistic ideas; for under the present organization it happens that two and even three local unions

*For some years past the local unions have shown a tendency to leave the Bourses, where they were subject to annoyance from the municipal authorities.

are operating in one department side by side, and accordingly a considerable portion of that department is lost for syndicalism; it also happens that unfortunate rivalries are occasioned between these neighboring unions.

According to the Annual Government Report, there are in France 141 Labor Bourses; according to the reports of the Confederation, there are 153 local unions of syndicats.

The trade Federations, which extend their influences over the whole territory, are numerically estimated only so far as they adhere to the C. G. T. This central, though not centralized, organization counted 53 federations, most of which are federations of particular trades: match workers, furniture makers, launderers, blacksmiths, tinsmiths, shoemakers, etc.; while others are federations of industries, foodstuffs, pottery, fabrics, skins and hides, etc. These 53 federations unite 2,837 syndicats. The tendency which has been in evidence for some years and is still at work, is in the direction of concentrating trade federations into industrial federation. Thus the federation of mechanics was expelled from the C. G. T. because it refused to fuse with the federation of metals. The latter federation of industry had already absorbed the firemen, conductors and engineers, while that of skins and hides was taking in the trade federation of furriers.

The largest federations are the builders (80,000 members), the railroads (11,000), skins and hides (10,600), metals (28,600), mines (20,000), ports and docks (16,000), textiles (13,500). Certainly these figures are underestimated, for the federations generally conceal a part of their membership, in joining the C. G. T., to avoid high assessments.

The C. G. T. has two branches, the one the Bourse section, the other the section of Federations. It has a permanent bureau formed by appointment: two secretaries, one treasurer and one assistant treasurer. It is administered by a federal committee composed of delegates of Bourses and Federations. A congress is held every two years. The budgets are likewise formed every two years, to cover the interval between congresses. From 1910 to 1912, the receipts for 24 months were 139,000 francs, derived especially from stamps sold by the federations and unions of syndicats, and of federal papers delivered to the members.

At the present moment, the Confederation has 400,000 dues payers and 600,000 members. The difference is explained from

the facts that only general groups, that is federations or local unions, can be admitted as voting elements, and these groups enroll themselves always for a part only of their membership. In a word the C. G. T. embraces more than half but less than two thirds of the French syndicalists, admitting as exact, which it probably is not, the total of 1,064,000 given by the Annual Government Report.

Social-Economic Classes In the United States

By Isaac Halevy.

I.

Until the last national convention of the Socialist party it was an accepted proposition of the orthodox Socialist doctrine that "the working class" forms a majority of the population of the United States (exclusive of dependents). "The working class" was understood to be synonymous with the wage-earning class, or the "proletariat," and quite distinct from the "propertied class." The farmer who cultivates his farm with the aid of his own family, without hired labor, was regarded as a property owner, as an entrepreneur, whose interests are quite distinct from, if not antagonistic to, the interests of the wage-earning class. The People's Party, which was the political union of the farmers' organizations and the labor unions, was opposed in its day by the orthodox Socialists as a "middle class" party. It was an unquestioned truth that "the working class" (meaning the wage-earning class), being in the majority, lacked only "class-consciousness" to wrest the political power from "the capitalist class."

The Socialist Labor party organization of Chicago, which, under the leadership of the late Thomas I. Morgan, in 1894 became affiliated with the People's Party, maintained, on the contrary, that the wage-earning class alone formed but a minority of the people, and could accordingly attain political power only in co-operation with the working farmers, i. e., with a portion of "the middle class." This view has at the last convention of the Socialist party become a part of its platform. To be sure, the Socialist party has remained, as before, the political party of "the working class," but the term has been given a broad construction, embracing both the wage-earners and the working farmers employing no

hired help. In this manner the assumption that "the working class" forms the majority of the population of the United States, has been squared with the facts. That the new interpretation repudiates in effect the Marxian theory of the class-struggle in capitalistic society, has passed unnoticed in the American Socialist press, although the Socialist party professes adherence to the principles of Scientific Socialism.

A scientific platform for a working class party in the United States can be built only upon an analysis of the class-composition of the American people. The material for such an analysis is contained in a statistical study which appeared some time ago in "The Journal of Political Economy."[1]

The fundamental idea of Marx's theory of the evolution of capitalism is that capitalistic society tends to divide into two classes: capitalists and wage-earners. All other social groups are merely survivals of the pre-capitalistic age, which are gradually eliminated by the evolution of capitalism, some of them merging in the capitalist, others in the wage-working class. "The transformation of capitalistic private property . . . . . into socialized property" is, according to Marx, the historical mission of the wage-working class. This theory is not based upon sentimental sympathy for the man of toil—there are deserving poor among those whom the development of capitalism has doomed to "annihilation," according to Marx: the small farmer who cultivates his own land and the artisan.[1]

The historical part of the wage-working class in the transformation of capitalism into socialism is the effect of purely economic causes. The consciousness of a social class is the outgrowth of its economic functions. A clear understanding of this theory is an essential prerequisite for a classification of the self-supporting population that would be of value to the Socialist student.

The occupation statistics of the United States census only incidentally segregate the wage-worker from the capitalist. It is self-evident, of course, that the banker, the wholesale merchant, or the manufacturer is a capitalist, and that railroad employees, textile mill operatives, or oil works operatives are wage-workers. But there are numerous occupation groups which comprise both employers and employees, such as lumbermen, barbers, teamsters, fishermen, etc. Indiscriminate use of census statistics may therefore lead to false conclusions, as e. g., that the "working class" forms 69.6 per cent of all persons engaged in gainful occupations.

[1]"The Social-Economic Classes of the Population of the United States," by Isaac A. Hourwich.—*The Journal of Political Economy*, 1911, Nos. 3 and 4.

[1]Karl Marx, Capital, Book I., Ch. XXXII.: Historical Tendency of Capitalistic Accumulation.

The development of the corporate form of capitalistic enterprise tends to differentiate the ownership from the management of industrial capital. A director of a corporation under the New York Corporation Law, need not even be a stockholder. He is merely a hired man, like any common laborer employed by the corporation. Mr. George F. Baer may accordingly be classified as a "wage-worker," along with the section hands of the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad. It is evident from this illustration that a generalization which has its proper place in an outline of social evolution may prove a fallacy when applied to society as it still exists today. To answer its purpose, a classification of present day society must not ignore the transitional groups between the main social classes.

On the other hand, the character of the published statistical data limits their use for the purposes of classification: you cannot always find what you want, because the official statistician was not guided by your scheme of classification, and the published figures are not available in the form that would suit your scheme best.

The following classification of the population of the United States in 1900 is the result of a comparative analysis of the census statistics of occupations, manufactures and mining:

1. Farmers;
2. Members of farmers' families working on the home farm;
3. Hired farm laborers;
4. Entrepreneurs (exclusive of farmers), comprising employers of labor and small independent business men who employ no hired help;
5. Professional men and women of all grades;
6. Agents and commercial travelers;
7. Salaried employes, exclusive of the selling force;
8. Selling force, comprising salesmen and saleswomen, cash girls and bundle boys;
9. Industrial wage-earners, comprising all wage-earners except farm laborers;
10. Domestic servants.

The entrepreneur class does not quite coincide with the capitalist class. A capitalist is primarily an employer of labor; the proprietor of a small stationery store who attends to his business with the assistance of his wife and children is an entrepreneur, i. e., a businessman, but not a capitalist, for he is neither directly nor indirectly an exploiter of wage-labor, and his business yields him no surplus-value. The census statistics, however, permit of no differentiation between these two subdivisions of the entrepreneur class. On the other hand, the farmers are also entrepreneurs; nevertheless, the many mooted questions relating to the rôle of the farmers in capitalistic society call for their segregation into

a separate social group. Still, the reader is at liberty to combine them with any other group.

Farmers' sons and daughters working on the home farm were, prior to the census of 1900, merged together with hired farm help into the class of farm laborers. Such a classification is absurd, although the farmer's son has no title to his home farm, yet his interests are identical with those of his father and antagonistic to those of the hired man working side by side with him.

The professional man is essentially an entrepreneur, with the ideas of a small business man. He is very often an employer of labor: a lawyer usually employs a clerk, sometimes a staff of clerks; an architect employs a force of draftsmen, etc. On the other hand, concentration of business enterprise has reduced many formerly independent professional men to the condition of hired men. Yet the differentiation of employer and employe within this social group has not reached as yet the consciousness of the bulk of professional men. The head of a law firm and the lawyer employed as a clerk in his office are both members of "the legal profession," possibly both members of the local bar association; the younger lawyer looks forward to the time when he will become a member of the law firm of his employer or will start out in practice for himself. Though a hired man, he has not the class-consciousness of a wage-worker; his psychology is akin to that of a journeyman carpenter under the guild system.

Agents and traveling salesmen are usually hired on a commission basis; their interests are therefore identical with those of their employers. To be sure, before the bargain between the principal and the agent is struck, there is a great deal of dickering between them. So there is between the proprietor of a planing mill and the manufacturer of furniture over the price of lumber, yet they are both capitalists bound together by class-solidarity. Even when the traveling salesman is hired on a salary and commissions, his economic function remains that of the advance agent of capitalism. Not infrequently the agent is an independent business man; if he is not, his aim in life is to become one. The psychology of the agent or traveling salesman is not that of a wage-worker, but that of a business man, an entrepreneur.

"Salaried employes" comprise superintendents, foremen, mining engineers, chemists and other experts employed in industrial establishments, accountants, bookkeepers, clerks, stenographers, and the like. They represent the administrative personnel in industry. In corporate undertakings where the personal capitalist has been supplanted by impersonal "capital," the salaried employes are the agents through whom the legal person, Capital, exercises its control over industry. The exploitation of Labor by Capital is carried out through the superintendent, the foreman, the time-keeper, the chief engineer, etc. Formally, they are themselves hired men; you may call them "clerical workers" and include them in "the working class," if you please. But their duties place them in a position antagonistic to that of the employes working "under them." The recent employers' liability acts have recognized this relation in the new legal distinction between the "fellow-servant" and the "vice-principal." To be sure, a young man holding a "pencil job" with an industrial concern may directly have no authority over the mill hands, and as a rule is paid less than any of them; yet he considers himself socially above them. His ambition is to climb up the scale of employment into a position of authority over them. Through daily association in the office with those in authority he imbibes the capitalistic view of the relation between capital and labor. In strikes these men are sworn in as deputy sheriffs, or pressed into service as strikebreakers; the militia is largely recruited among them.

The part assigned to the working class in the Marxian theory of the development of capitalistic society does not rest upon the mere form of employment for hire. It is because concentration of industry organizes the individual hired men into large working groups with common interests opposed to the interest of a single employer that they develop into a class with its own class-consciousness. It is for this reason that the workers on the railroads, in the mines and mills—in short, the industrial wage-workers, form the backbone of the working class. Hired farm hands are, of course, wage-workers alike with city laborers, or factory operatives. Nevertheless there is a very material difference between these two subdivisions of the wage-working class. There are very few farmers employing large numbers of laborers; most of the farmers employ one or two men at a time. The isolation of the farm laborers, on the one hand, and their close association with the employer and his family, on the other, prevent the development of class-consciousness and class-solidarity among them.

The same applies to salesmen and saleswomen in stores. Their occupation preceded by centuries the capitalistic era. The department store has made great inroads into the retail trade; withal, the small retail merchant is still very much in evidence. The isolation of the salesmen and saleswomen employed in small stores furnishes no social basis for class feeling: they see no class, but merely scattered individual salesmen and saleswomen. Most of them have, or think they have, a reasonable expectation eventually to rise to the status of "independent" business-men on a small scale.[1] Though ranking among the lowest-paid grades of labor, they re-

[1]The total number of male retail merchants in 1900 was 758,000, and the total number of salesmen 463,000, which shows that the probability of the average salesman to become a retail merchant was fully 100%.

gard themselves as socially superior to a plain working-man or factory girl. This caste feeling may at times yield to the efforts of the trade union organizer or the socialist propagandist. There are retail clerks' unions in this country. In Russia the salesmen in stores were among the most active workers of the Social-Democratic party during the recent revolution. But Socialist propaganda has gained numerous individual converts among the professional and propertied classes as well. The ideals of the salesmen as a social group, however, are those of the "Hallroom Boys."

The lowest rung on the social ladder is occupied by domestic servants. Formally, they are also wage-workers. Yet their social status is that of domestic slaves of modern society—as Marx has put it. No mill owner would think of interfering with the freedom of his female mill hands to receive the attentions of male friends, yet this right is asserted by every "respectable" mistress toward her servant girl. As in the case of the farm hands and employes in small retail stores, the isolation of the domestic servant offers no economic ground for the spontaneous growth of instinctive working-class solidarity. Attempts at economic organization among domestic servants have hitherto failed. The environment of the domestic servant offers no suggestion of the Socialist organization of production as the solution of his or her own labor problem. The "menial" cannot aspire to the full product of his menial labor under Socialism. The displacement of the traditional American private residence by the modern apartment house, the inroads of the factory system into the preparation of food, etc., tend to eliminate the domestic servant, even under capitalism, along with other survivals of the pre-capitalistic period.

The preceding ten social groups comprise 94 per cent of all self-supporting persons of both sexes enumerated in 1900. The remaining 6 per cent represented mainly those occupations whose description in census statistics was not sufficiently definite to bring them within any of the ten social groups, or whose description clearly indicated that they included both entrepreneurs and wage-workers (e. g., "turpentine farmers and laborers").

In the next article we shall examine the effect of the development of capitalism upon the relative numerical strength of the several social groups.

Socialism and War

By R. P.

War is now a more terrible scourge than it has ever been. The growth in the size of the armies has kept pace with the efficiency of weapons. The sacrifices of blood and treasure have so increased and the economic misery resulting from war has been so intensified that the dread of war has permeated nearly all classes of the population. But the proletariat alone manifests a strong will to resist war by resisting the imperialistic politics of the ruling classes. And the proletarian opposition to war has now become so dominant an instinct that it has impelled International Socialism to abandon its earlier policy.

The cry of "War against war!"; the bending of every energy toward the preservation of peace, has not always been the settled policy of Socialism toward war. Socialism was not formerly opposed to war in every instance and under all circumstances. Nor did it always assume an attitude of indifference as to the outcome of any particular war.

This is clearly pointed out in an article by Heinrich Weber which recently appeared in "Der Kampf," of Vienna.

In this article he traces briefly the history of the attitude of Socialism toward war.

When, with heavy blows, the French Revolution had shattered feudalism, destroyed the absolute monarchy, and elevated the bourgeoisie to be the masters of France, the princes of Europe joined hands to do battle against revolutionary France. The victory of the Revolution was not won in the streets of Paris, but on the blood-soaked battlefields where the valorous youth of France put to rout the armies of the princes of Europe. War was the mightiest lever of the Revolution. The armies of France swept through Europe, and in their train followed bourgeois ideas, bourgeois laws, the bourgeois state.

Russia alone was able to resist the revolutionary tide, and she remained the reactionary champion of legitimist authority the protector of absolutism and feudalism in Europe.

In 1848 the storm of revolution again broke over Europe. Russia threateningly moved her armies toward her borders. If Europe was not to be robbed of the fruits of revolution, the revolutionary peoples must of necessity combine against reactionary Russia.

Karl Marx was convinced that such an alliance was "the solution of the radical proletarian and progressive wing of the democracy of 1848. He was convinced that the last, the decisive victory could only be won in bloody war against the Tsar's authority, which stood as a protector behind all the forces of the past."

In 1853, when Russia was about to march on Constantinople, the democracy demanded war. Demonstrations in England in favor of peace were broken up by the Chartists, who cried: "Peace is a crime until liberty is won!" The essays of Marx and Engels written at that time always demanded war—energetic, relentless war against Russia. And Marx felt certain that when England and France drew the sword against Russia they would be acting as unconscious tools of the revolution. For "there is a sixth power in Europe which at the favorable moment asserts its supremacy over all the five so-called great powers and which causes everyone of them to tremble. This power is the revolution. Quiet for a long time and concealed, it is called into action again by the commercial crisis and the lack of bread. From Manchester to Rome, from Paris to Warsaw and Budapest, it is ever present. It raises its head and awakes from sleep. Manifold are the signs of its return, they are visible everywhere in the unrest which has seized upon the working class. It needs but a signal and the sixth and greatest European power is here again—in shimmering armor, sword in hand, as Minerva sprang from the head of Jupiter. This signal will be the threat of European war."

And thus throughout the last half of the nineteenth century, until the birth of Imperialism, "the policy of international Socialism was by no means a policy of peace. It regarded war as an inevitable result of capitalism. Peace remains a utopian dream as long as capitalism exists. But the proletariat cannot remain passive toward the warlike policy of the ruling classes. It must seek to force it into the direction which serves its own interests." That was the earlier policy.

But the policy of Socialism to-day is not determined by these considerations. Its highest aim appears to be the preservation of peace. Its policy has far less in common with the policy of Marx and Engels in 1853, than it has with the policy of the Free Trade party of Cobden and Bright at the time of the Crimean war, policies which were combatted by Marx.

Now, what does war mean to the development of peoples?

What is its significance to militant Socialism? Has Socialism the power to preserve peace? What weapons can it employ in its war against war? How can it take advantage of the situations created by war? What problems await it when a war is ended? International Socialism is now occupied with these questions.

"The competitive struggle of capitalism and the struggle for power of the capitalistic states impel to war. The proletariat opposes this tendency. What means can it employ to prevent war? In the discussion one proposition comes continually to the front—the general strike. Even the third congress of the old International (Brussels, 1868) discussed the general strike as a weapon against war. As soon as the new International began the war against war, the problem of the general strike in case of war was earnestly discussed. At the International Socialist Congress of Brussels, in 1891, Nieuwenhues, of Holland, presented a resolution which pledged the workers to respond to war with the general strike. But this resolution was voted down. The general strike in case of war remained the solution of the anarchists, which was opposed by the Social Democrats. In France, however, the propaganda of the general strike, as a weapon against war, began to be taken up even in the Socialist camp. Since 1900 the anti-militarist and anti-patriotic propaganda conducted by Hervé and the anti-militarist agitation of the Syndicalists have had a powerful influence upon French Socialism. At the congress of the United Socialist party of France at Limoges (1906), Guesde's Marxian resolution, which declared war to be an inevitable effect of the capitalistic method of production that could only disappear with the abolition of capitalism, was voted down, and the resolution of the Federation of the Seine, represented by Vaillant, which demanded international action of the proletariat against war, even to the general strike and insurrection, was adopted. From France this agitation spread into other countries. It met with the greatest opposition in those very countries where the organization of the proletarian masses was the strongest—in Germany and in Austria; even the majority of the British Labor party rejected this idea. The International Socialist Congress of Stuttgart, in 1907, and that of Copenhagen, in 1910, left the question open—they pledged the proletariat to make use of all effective means in the war against war, but they refused to make the general strike a duty in case of war. In the great European crisis of last year, the question of the general strike was discussed anew—at the

convention of the German Social Democracy at Jena, in 1911, and at the last conventions of the Socialists of France and of Switzerland. It is the conviction of the entire International today, that Socialism must do everything in its power to prevent the outbreak of war. The only subject in debate is what means are at its disposal.

"Socialism's capacity for action at the beginning of a war depends first of all upon the temper of the popular masses. This temper is primarily determined by economic conditions. At Jena, Bebel pictured this in the following manner:

" 'Millions of workers are taken from their families, who are reduced to starvation. Hundreds of thousands of small tradesmen are forced into bankruptcy because they lack all means for the continuation of their business. The values of all securities fall and tens of thousands of well-to-do families are thereby reduced to beggary. Export trade ceases, and our tremendous world-wide commerce is interrupted. Countless factories and commercial enterprises, provided they do not furnish the necessities of war, come to a standstill. Unemployment and failure of income on every hand! The importation of foodstuffs ceases entirely or nearly so. The prices of food become prohibitive. Actually, that means general starvation. At such a time the masses do not call for the general strike, they cry for work and bread.'

"To the economic pressure there is added the influence of national and patriotic passion. Prior to the outbreak of war, each government seeks to provoke these passions by all the means at its command. It spreads abroad the conviction that the fatherland is threatened, that the adversary desires to humiliate it, that the government is being forced into a war of defense, that war can only be avoided at the cost of honor and of the most important interests of the fatherland. The entire capitalist press saturates the people with this conviction. To be sure, the propaganda of the Socialist press and organization combats these ideas. But at the moment of the outbreak of war this propaganda is rendered very difficult; the calling out of the reserves tears great gaps in the proletarian organization, the poverty of the people makes difficult the circulation of the party press. In such a situation the Socialist propaganda, even in Germany with its widespread party press, will reach only a minority, and in other countries only a small portion of the people. The great majority of the people will be under the influence of patriotic and nationalistic suggestion.

"If, in spite of all this, an attempt is made to bring about a general strike, it will be suppressed by force with the applause of the popular majority, now drunk with national and patriotic passions. In countries with universal military service the government will 'militarize' the railroad employees; the workers in the arms and ammunition factories, whose labor is indispensable at such a time, will be compelled to continue at work by force of martial law, and all resistance will be broken down by executions ordered by court-martial. At the same time it will hurl against the press and organization of the proletariat the whole force of the power of the state.

"War is the last means of capitalist competition, the final expression of the capitalistic method of production. It cannot be prevented by the mechanical means of the general strike. We can only undertake to bring about a general strike where we are determined to convert it immediately into revolution, into armed insurrection. But the proletarian revolution is never less possible than at the moment when war breaks out, at the moment when there is opposed to it the concentrated power of the state, and the whole might of uncurbed nationalistic passion. If the proletariat were already strong enough to take the risk, then it is incomprehensible why it should not long since have freed itself of the barbarism of capitalism. Under present day conditions the prevention of a war by the general strike is a utopian dream.

"But although this weapon cannot be used, the proletariat has at its disposal other weapons against war. By every means of propaganda—from newspaper articles and parliamentary speeches to street demonstrations—the working class can make difficult the diffusion of a warlike spirit, can teach the masses of the people that war can be avoided, can turn public opinion against the lust for war. The Socialist protest saddles upon the ruling classes the heavy responsibility for all the horrors and all the effects of the war. The ruling classes then know that they will be held responsible by the masses—responsible for the shedding of blood, responsible for the poverty and suffering, responsible for any defeat which may occur. The fear of this heavy responsibility weakens their will. Hence, the action of Socialism is able to preserve peace.

"But if, in spite of the protest of the proletariat, the governments take the risk of war, then the whole weight of the responsibility falls upon them. Every battle in which thousands fall, every intensification of the suffering due to the war, every defeat

embitters the mass of the people against the ruling classes. Socialism's accusations, which at the beginning of the war met with the resistance of the unbridled nationalistic passions, find during the war loud echo in the masses. And thus the temper of the people is prepared for the class struggles which follow the war. If, on the day after the war, it is possible to concentrate the bitterness of the undeceived masses against the capitalistic state and the capitalistic order of society, which are the ultimate cause of every war, the victims of the war will not have fallen in vain. A war undertaken against the will, against the loud protest of the proletariat, may indeed become a mighty lever of history.

"The Crimean war was followed by the abolition of serfdom in Russia. The war of 1859 by the downfall of absolutism in Austria, by the unification and democratization of Italy, by the strengthening of Liberalism and the reconstruction of the Social Democracy in Germany. The war of 1866 resulted in universal suffrage in Northern Germany and the Liberal regime in Austria. The war of 1870 was followed by the Republic and the Commune in France and the Liberal regime in Germany. The Russo-Japanese war was followed by the revolution in Russia, universal suffrage in Austria, revolutionary movements in Persia, Turkey, India, Egypt and China. A European war to-day would be far more horrible than all these wars. But just so much mightier would be its social and political effects."

And what more natural than that war should be followed by the advance of democracy, both political and social? The proletarian movement is young and virile, keen and urgent. Its powers are daily becoming greater, it pushes with ever more force against the bulwarks of capitalism. It is never discouraged, defeat merely strengthens its determination to conquer. It takes advantage of every moment of weakness to which its aging opponent is subject. And when could capitalism be weaker than at the conclusion of a long and costly war, particularly a war ending in defeat?

The Singer

By Louise W. Kneeland.

"Tell me, singer, to whom then
Dost thou sing?"
The singer smiled
And, with a moment's pause,
"It is myself," he said,
"I see in every living thing."

Both

By Caro Lloyd.

Ask a child whether it will have this cookie or that orange; it will say "Yes," and promptly take both. Ask this child, now shedding her ink for the cause, whether she is an "Industrial Socialist" or a "Political Socialist" and she will promptly say "Both."

It takes courage to defend the despised vote; one runs the risk of being suspected of having the psychology of a capitalistic office-seeker. It takes courage to advocate economic action, for if you place the accent there, the comrades point their fingers: "Fie, for shame, he has denounced political action."

"Political action is futile," says the new "industrial Socialist," whatever he may be. "Elected judges issue injunctions restraining us, declare favorable laws unconstitutional or twist them against us. So we are driven to economic action."

"Economic action leads nowhere," says the new "political Socialist," whatever he may be. "We suffer and strike and suffer. With one hand the bosses give us an increase, but with the other they raise the price of commodities and take it all back again. So we are driven to political action."

Hear ye! Hear ye! Economic action and political action are the Socialist scissors. They cut together.

Once upon a time there was a huge pyramid called Capitalism. It was all wrong, it stood on its apex. On top was a crowd of fat men named after it and called Capitalists. They were struggling with each other, and the pyramid was rocking. On either side were "red" industrial Socialists and "yellow" political Socialists. The reds were hitting the pyramid with ever harder strikes, the yellows were pelting it with an ever heavier shower of ballots, and each gloried because they were teetering it.

"Piff!" said the Reds to the Yellows. "Paper shots! You are doing nothing."

"Just wait," answered the Yellows. "Give us another fifty years and we'll have it over. But you! Why, you would topple it over all at once some Monday morning, crush us too, and simply create vast confusion. Then what?"

But all the while it was the big fellows on top who were doing the rocking. They were getting fatter every minute and

fighting with increased ferocity, utterly oblivious of the ghastly way in which the pyramid was swaying. Suddenly it fell over with a crash that shook the round earth from Wall Street to Paris, to Shanghai, to Wall Street. Then what? Those who escaped rubbed their eyes.

"Are the railroads and the great machines smashed?" they asked, "and must we find our own hand loom and go-cart again?"

But as they looked they saw that the revolution had not gone backward. A new order of society was emerging into view. The child of the old, it bore some resemblance to it. It was evolving an organized expression of public will on the administration of the common wealth; it was political. The crash had put the Capitalists and their point of view in the ground, and nothing remained but workers and their point of view; the new society was industrial. And the industrial was political and the political industrial.

This, then, is the vision which is inspiring the industrials to-day as they strive to organize a mass protest on the economic field; this, the vision of the politicals, toiling to organize a mass protest vote. Neither method has been tested. The mass strike is in the stage of first rehearsals. The mass vote is not yet educated. The only mass vote in the war that is on has been cast by the capitalists and their retainers. Ask them whether electing their own Congress, legislatures, courts, has won them any economic advantage. But has labor ever tried a mass vote? Hear the never-ceasing cry of the A. F. of L. leaders: "Keep out of politics," which, being interpreted, means: "Vote, but vote as individuals." Hark to the wisdom of these labor leaders whose supreme idea is united action on the economic field as they preach divided action on the political. Are there then any so wise as to be Socialists who will cast aside without a trial the ideal of mass political action?

We are in the rushing currents of a great crisis. The vote is one of the means of escape, the heritage of every adult American man—*"Votes for Women!"*—won by the struggle of generations. Therefore, do I subscribe myself a political-industrial Socialist, and hereto set my hand and heart and seal.