

NOVEMBER 1913

Ten Cents

The New Review

A-MONTHLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

The Coming German Revolution	<i>Charles Rappoport</i>
Organization of the Unskilled	<i>Austin Lewis</i>
"Municipal Socialism"	<i>William English Walling</i>
The Glasgow Co-operative Congress	<i>Albert Sonnichsen</i>
Bebel and the Woman's Movement	<i>Richard Perin</i>
Story of the Putumayo Atrocities	
V. Report of Consul Casement	<i>W. E. Hardenburg</i>
The Monroe Doctrine	<i>Louis C. Fraina</i>
La Monte, Walling and Pragmatism	<i>Walter Lippmann</i>
Pragmatism Once More	<i>Robert Rives La Monte</i>
Letters And Art:	
The Musical Season }	<i>Andre Tridon</i>
The Curse of Sociability }	
W. S. Gilbert	<i>Felix Grendon</i>
The New England Farmer	<i>Harry Kemp</i>
Love's Communion	<i>Louise W. Kneeland</i>
Doctor Braun	<i>Per Hallstrom</i>
Correspondence between Marx and Engels	<i>R. P.</i>
To the Central Committee of Local New York	

150 Nassau Street

New York

The New Review

Published Monthly

by the

New Review Publishing Association

150 Nassau Street, New York City

Alexander Fraser, *President*
Bertha W. Howe, *Treasurer*
Robert M. Lackey, *Secretary*

Herman Simpson, *Editor*

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

One Year, . . . \$1.00 Six Months . . . \$.50
Canada 1.20 Foreign 1.50
Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered at the New York Post Office
as Second-Class Mail Matter

Sample Copies

We have each month a limited number of NEW REVIEWS which we will gladly send to any of our subscribers (outside of New York) who are willing to distribute them where they will do the most good. A request will bring you a bundle.

Ask For Them

The New Review

Vol. I.

NOVEMBER, 1913

No. 22

The Coming German Revolution

By CHARLES RAPPOPORT (Paris)

The strength of German Socialism does not consist solely in its four and a quarter millions of votes, its active army of one million organized and dues-paying members, its three million labor union members, its millions of members of co-operative enterprises.

This constantly increasing force is also animated by a lively, militant spirit. The Social Democracy never fears criticism, self-criticism. It knows that life will ebb in any party that does not dare to think and to tell its faults aloud. No Socialist should ever forget that we are living in a detestable environment—the capitalist environment.

Now, what does our scientific doctrine tell us? That the surroundings, the environment, exert a decisive influence on everything that it contains. Socialists form no exception to the law affirmed by Socialist theory.

We have to combat not only the capitalism around us, but often the capitalism within us also. This is why a live Socialist party, faithful to its doctrines, should hold to the principle: continual criticism of its members and of its tactics. It should, however, be noted that criticism does not mean personal attacks.

There is another reason for the necessity of this criticism—the alteration in our forces and historic evolution.

Socialist parties increase in size. That which was good for a weak party, for the infancy of the party, is no longer good for a party which has become large and powerful.

While the Socialist parties are growing, circumstances—the structure of the capitalist environment—are undergoing modification, are evolving. The capitalists are forging new arms for use against the proletariat—trusts, defensive leagues, lockouts, blacklists, new laws of exception, etc., etc. Other forms of ex-



A Monthly Magazine of Free Expression

Each issue is devoted entirely to the work of one man

The first issue—now out called

"Songs, Sighs and Curses"

is devoted to the songs, sighs and curses of ADOLPH WOLFF. These poems are a notable contribution to modern literature. Wolff's poems are typical of the "newer spirit" and are emphatically different from the usual run.

The subscription price of the GLEBE is \$3.00 per year
Single copies 60 cents

By special arrangement with the publishers of the GLEBE we are in a position to make the following offers:

One year's subscription to the GLEBE together with a year's subscription to the NEW REVIEW \$3.00

A copy of "Songs, Sighs and Curses" together with a year's subscription to the NEW REVIEW \$1.40

Send orders to

The NEW REVIEW

150 Nassau St.

New York

MAISEL'S BOOK STORE

Bernard Shaw's Plays

Are at present to be had at a price within reach of everybody. Some of the following 18 plays were previously published at \$1.50 net and sell at present bound in stiff paper wrappers at 40c, by mail 45c.

Widower's Houses
The Philanderer
Mrs. Warren's Profession
Arms and the Man
Candida
You Never Can Tell
The Admirable Bashville
The Devil's Disciple
Caesar and Cleopatra
Captain Brassbound's Conversion
Man and Superman
John Bull's Other Island
Mayor Barbara
The Man of Destiny and How He Lied to Her Husband
The Doctor's Dilemma
Getting Married
The Shewing-up of Blanco Posnet
Press Cuttings

Hundreds of Other New Books and New Bargains Came in Lately

We carry a complete stock of all the KERR & CO. SOCIALIST publications and supply most of the booksellers in the East. Locals and organizations can have all their books and pamphlets at specially low prices.

424 GRAND STREET, NEW YORK

NEW YORK READERS Please take notice!

We beg to inform our readers in New York and vicinity that The NEW REVIEW is for sale regularly on all the newsstands of the Manhattan and Bronx Subway System. The NEW REVIEW can also be had at all the stands of the Elevated System in Brooklyn.

Circulation Department

The NEW REVIEW

Kindly Mention the NEW REVIEW When Writing to Advertisers.

plotation are born and develop—imperialism, world-wide colonialism, excessive militarism and a burden of armaments.

The Socialists also are obliged to invent new arms, to plan the necessary modifications in tactics.

One of the reasons of the really extraordinary success of the German Social Democracy lies in the fact that it has never ceased to criticize itself, to hold self-examination, and to consider the best mode of fighting.

Without going too far back, let us return to the very beginning, in 1876, of the definitive unity of the party, the unification of the Lassalleans and the followers of Bebel and Liebknecht (the so-called "Eisenachers"), and cite an important criticism by Karl Marx of the theoretical bases of unity contained in his "Letter on Unity." Although, having as its most urgent legitimate task the ending of the Socialist civil war, the party was obliged to neglect momentarily the masterful criticism of Karl Marx, yet it took it under consideration subsequently, at the time of the elaboration of the Erfurt program (1890), by eliminating from the Socialist program all utopian idealism, every anti-scientific element.

Ten years had not passed before there began a new period of self-criticism. This was the criticism of the right wing of the party, of revisionism.

Progress and Socialist victories had inspired many comrades with optimistic ideas, with reformistic and democratic illusions. In good faith they believed that by putting aside "the final goal," the grand ideal of the Communists, and by concentrating every effort upon the immediate daily action, upon reforms, they would arrive more rapidly at the Socialist goal itself. They did not rely upon economic evolution and upon the class struggle—its inevitable effect—but upon democratic good-will, upon the co-operation of the classes. They desired to revise the theoretic and practical basis of Socialism.

The good feature of revisionism is its lively spirit, its critical mind, its desire to go forward, cost what it may, its passion for results.

But unfortunately it has mistaken the direction. The road that revisionism points out to Socialism leads backward, back to utopia. Socialist criticism has triumphantly replied to revisionist criticism. It has shown that class antagonisms are becoming accentuated, that our democratic ally is a very uncertain companion, subject to all sorts of weaknesses.

The economic and political life has justified the Socialist criticism. Capitalist concentration has experienced an enormous extension under the form of trusts. The great majority of the democrats have deserted their flag and joined the capitalist parties. Imperialism, colonialism and militarism have rendered impossible all serious and methodical work of reform. Instead of effecting reforms, capitalist Europe is making soldiers, building cannon factories, constructing military aeroplanes. Revisionist optimism has been a failure.

But Socialism continued to grow. Instead of isolated and powerless groups and sects, scoffed at and persecuted, we have become a great international force, a social and political factor of the first order. The German Social Democracy has made incredible progress, unexpected by the most optimistic. If we may count the women and children, it embraces a population of twenty million persons in a single country. It is a complete Socialist nation. It menaces the very foundations of the Empire. No party is equal to it in numerical strength, in the clearness of its conception, in the audacity of its politics.

True to the guiding principles of revolutionary Socialism, the Social Democracy is very supple in action. It has understood admirably how to reconcile immediate action with our fundamental demands, the "movement" with the "final goal." It has also known how to avoid the two reefs menacing the Socialist parties of the entire world: reformism opposing the "movement"—the minimum program or immediate demands—to the "final goal," and anarchism which, on the contrary, opposes the "final goal"—the social revolution—to the reformist "movement."

Its motto is: neither reformism nor anarchism! It is neither opportunist nor impossibilist. Devoted to our ideal of complete emancipation from the capitalist yoke, it neglects no amelioration, however small, that may be realized within the framework of the present society.

The marvellous development of industry assures it a solid unshakable proletarian base. The idealism and the absolute disinterestedness of its leaders, who have no other ambition than to increase the force and size of the party and who gave proof of their fidelity during the period of persecution under Bismarck, have forever welded together the leadership of the party and the most submerged of the laboring masses.

The Social Democracy marches from victory to victory. It

might be called a scientifically controlled mechanism. It has a formidable organization—a well-filled treasury, solid ranks, a well managed and widely circulating press, labor unions with about three million members, powerful co-operative enterprises. It has thus been able to reconcile all the forms of proletarian organization. It has made of them an invincible fighting force. It is in the way of conquering an entire country.

If we are seized with doubt as to the final victory of Socialism, we have only to look at the Social Democracy in order to regain hope. It was, then, only natural that the methods of German Socialism, which have given such brilliant results, should become those of international Socialism, being adapted in each country to the exigencies of the national territory. The Resolution of Dresden has become that of Amsterdam, which is the basis of the constitutions of the Socialist parties of all countries.

It is the duty of those countries where capitalism is furthest advanced to show the way to countries less advanced.

Our patriotism suffers little therefrom.

Capitalism is one. Socialism also. It knows nothing of one country's jealousy of another.

And how could it be otherwise? Does not a battle won by Socialism in one country increase our chance of victory in another?

We Socialists of all countries are firmly linked together by our victories and by our defeats. We can triumph only internationally.

Does the influence of the Social Democracy measure up to its forces? Has its powerful organization given political and economic results? The detractors of the Social Democracy reply in the negative. We are of the contrary opinion. The Social Democracy crushed the Iron Chancellor and put an end to the laws of exception made against it. It nipped in the bud any disposition for a *coup d'état*, with which the youngers (squirearchy) have never ceased to threaten universal suffrage. It imposed silence upon the too loquacious emperor, who, since the last Socialist victory, has not breathed a word against our friends—contrary to his habits. The Social Democracy has won liberty of movement and of propaganda, solely by the force of its organization. Elsewhere similar results have only been attained by revolution.

Indeed, in its regular parliamentary work the government is

constantly obliged to take into account the opinion of the Socialists.

When passing through France, one of the best-informed of the leaders of the Social Democracy cited to me as proof of this the following characteristic fact: The imperial government, before submitting its proposals to the Reichstag, informs itself, through the medium of a high functionary, of the probable attitude of the Socialists. And everyone knows that it is due to the power of the Socialists that the government was forced to make the rich pay the costs of the new military law.

As to the economic results, they are very important. The labor union movement supported by the Socialists has won undeniable advantages for the proletariat—an appreciable increase of wages, shorter working days and better conditions. The Social Democracy has wrung from bourgeois fear insurance laws of greater importance than those of France. The working class has been able to menace seriously certain imposts by boycotting alcohol.

Ignorance and bad faith alone can deny the importance of these results, which are proofs of the increasing economic and political influence of the Social Democracy.

There are two causes of the disparagement of the German Social Democracy: anarchism and opportunism. The anarchists always feel a profound hatred for the Social Democracy—which has not prevented it from becoming the greatest Socialist force in the world. The opportunists cannot pardon its unwillingness to compromise, its Dresden Resolution, its Marxist foundations. We have recently had in France a furious campaign against the Social Democracy, waged by a "Socialist" professor, Charles Andler. It must be said to the credit of Jaurès and his friends that they have not followed this ultra-opportunistic and ultra-nationalistic adversary of the Social Democracy. Andler has had the approbation of the capitalist press alone—enthusiastic approbation.

But on the other hand, we cannot, we should not deny that in spite of the increasing power of the Social Democracy, the quasi-absolute and semi-feudal régime stands firm. The German ministers are not even responsible to the Parliament. The youngers are the masters of the country. Militarism is all-powerful. It menaces international peace. Religious education is imposed upon the public schools. The Prussian Landtag—the second parliamentary body in Germany—is elected under a scandalous electoral system that gives an overwhelming parlia-

mentary majority to an infinitely small minority of electors. For the "crimes" of lèse-majesté and of the press the judges mete out sentences of hundreds of years of imprisonment. The number of Socialist deputies in the Reichstag is 110. Taking into account the number of voters it should be 150 and more. The State functionaries, the railroad employees and the teachers are the veritable slaves of the State.

All the Socialist protests against this state of affairs have so far been in vain. The result is an uneasiness that is increasing daily. There is an evident disproportion between the Socialist power and its political conquests of a general character.

The struggle against the régime of the youngers has become necessary. The Social Democracy is beginning to feel the need of enlarging, of fortifying its field of combat. A discussion is being carried on in the numerous organs of the Socialist press on the best tactics to be pursued. There has been advanced the idea of the general strike, or mass strike, to be adopted in principle as one of the means of combat. But in Germany the general strike is fated to be the "legal" form of the revolution which is to an increasing degree being forced upon the German proletariat.

There are those who say that the "German genius," the fact of organization, excludes any revolutionary struggle. This German "nationalist" theory is as false as the French "nationalist" theory, which considers the weakness of organization as inherent in the national character and therefore unavoidable. Organization cannot take the place of revolution. The strongest organization becomes weakened and demoralized if it does not succeed in crushing the principal obstacle that prevents it from advancing. We have never yet seen a political régime voluntarily concede its place to another régime. Revolution is indispensable. The "national genius" can accomplish nothing.

All the great countries have passed through this phase: France, Italy, Russia and even China. Austria owes her universal suffrage to the Russian revolution, aided by the menace of a general strike in Austria. Comrades of Germany, it is your turn! The Prussian régime is poisoning the whole of Europe, by obliging the other countries to follow in the path of military reaction. And as Socialist "patriotism" consists in inciting the Socialist party of each country to combat above all the government of its own country, our comrades of Germany will make it a point of honor to rid us as soon as possible of the Prussian political régime.

This doesn't mean that we are dictating to our German friends the means, or fixing the date of their revolution, which will change the face of Europe. Each section of the International is autonomous as concerns the particular means of combat. But our profound sympathy for the Social Democracy makes it our duty to salute with joy those German comrades who have understood the necessity of intensifying the struggle in order to give it the maximum efficiency. The German revolution has terrible difficulties to overcome.

Nothing can be done at a moment's notice. For the first time history will see a revolution prepared and organized long in advance. The forces of the enemy are formidable. But we know that the German revolution will come when its hour strikes. It is inevitable. The International has confidence in the Social Democracy. The German revolution will be the end of militarism and the commencement of the social revolution of Europe.

Relative to the tactics to be adopted for the approaching and inevitable struggles, three tendencies are appearing: that of Rosa Luxemburg, that of the adversaries of the mass strike, and that of the *Neue Zeit* and *Vorwaerts*, which probably is that of the majority.

The tactics proposed by Comrade Rosa Luxemburg resemble those of the French comrades. It is useless, she says, to prepare long in advance for the general strike, which should come through the force of circumstances. Centralized organization kills the revolutionary spirit. Nothing can be expected from above, from the leaders. The masses should give the signal for the movement which, overwhelming, will draw in the unorganized masses—the body of the movement, of which the organization is the soul. Rosa Luxemburg, of Polish origin and leader of the Polish Social Democracy, represents in the German revolutionary movement as much the French model as the Russian.

To this conception, too absolute and dogmatic, based upon logic and historical analogies, the ultra-moderates of the party—principally the organizers of the labor unions—oppose their opportunistic *non possumus*. Their sole argument is that "we are not ready." They probably are awaiting the moment when all the proletariat shall be organized before commencing . . . to negotiate a compromise with the dominant forces, which will have become accessible to reason.

The official organ of the party, *Vorwaerts*, and its scientific organ, the *Neue Zeit*, are adopting a line of conduct that is as

remote from the idealistic revolutionism of Rosa Luxemburg, born of fire and generous passion, as it is from the do-nothing opportunism of the ultra-moderates, too prudent and too patient. The mass strike requires a solid organization, the support of the masses and of the labor unions. We cannot improvise it. We have no illusions about it. The struggle will broaden and will become a political revolution. We should not oppose organization to the revolution or to the mass strike. Revolutionary enthusiasm is not sufficient. Let us discuss the strike, but above all let us prepare for it by organization and by the education of the masses.

Rosa Luxemburg wishes to separate the moderate partisans of the strike from the revolutionary partisans. Therein lies the dispute.

My opinion is that the general strike in Germany will be the signal for the great political revolution of Europe. This is why, while applauding the revolutionary passion and ardor of Rosa Luxemburg, I believe that absolute unity and methodical preparation are indispensable conditions of victory.

The revolution does not resemble a tradesman's account. Passion has a proper place therein, but success will be only to the strongest, to the best organized, to the best armed.

The Social Democracy has too much at stake to risk it lightly.

We do not oppose organization to revolution, nor masses to leaders, nor methodical preparation to revolutionary passion. Revolution is a compound; it has need of all these things. All its elements co-operate to bring it success. The lack of some dooms it to failure.

Let us not forget that the Social Democracy has not yet won over the peasants nor the administrative proletariat, who play an important role in our society. It could not paralyze the railroads as easily as was done in Russia in 1905, nor the army as in France in 1789, 1793, 1830, 1848 and 1871.

We are at one and the same time realists and revolutionists, that is to say Marxists, and we do not forget this historic law:

"If minorities make the revolution, the majorities defeat it."*

The majority in Germany will surely be with the well prepared for, well organized revolution.

* See "La Revolution sociale," Vol. IV of the "Encyclopédie Socialiste," by Ch. Rappoport, Paris, 1912.

Organization of the Unskilled

By AUSTIN LEWIS

The question of migratory unskilled labor has increasingly engaged the attention of the American Federation of Labor, particularly the California division of it. The State Federation of Labor, moreover, has given it some special care, owing to a realization of the tremendous part played in the development of the state by this species of labor and its injurious possibilities to the existing labor organizations.

A report made to the State Federation in 1912 says:

To organized labor of California belongs the credit of having conceived the plan of organizing the so-called unskilled laborers and of having taken the first steps to accomplish this end. It is true the movement up to this time has not met the success it deserves. The Federation has been greatly hampered by lack of funds for placing organizers in the field, and the organized working people have not rendered all the support they might. Besides, there is the ignorance and mistrust of the migratory laborers themselves to overcome. Your committee firmly believes in the possibility of organizing this craft, but that is a task which will require the undivided efforts and the fullest measure of support of the entire labor movement of the State.

This is a new effort and one which does not fall within the scope of the general work of the A. F. of L. On the contrary, it runs counter to all the preconceived notions of that body on labor organization and as such is worthy of more than passing attention. The various steps taken in the direction of organizing this class of workers in the State of California are accordingly here set forth.

At the convention of the State Federation of Labor in 1909, Delegate J. B. Dale introduced the following resolution (Report of Convention Cal. State Fed. of Labor, 1909, p. 55):

WHEREAS, There are in this country some three millions of agricultural workers and laborers, who seek work wherever it can be found, having no homes, chiefly because their earnings are such as to prevent them from assuming family responsibilities; and,

WHEREAS, These men need organization as much as any men now in our country; and

WHEREAS, It is to the highest interest of our movement that these men should be acquainted with our movement that they may learn to love it; and

WHEREAS, By reason of their condition they can do but little for themselves, especially in the beginning; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Committee on Organization be instructed to go carefully into the form of organization that might be useful to agricultural workers with a view of the American Federation of Labor putting forth all the force available to help organization amongst these men.

The resolution, on the strong advice of Andrew Furuseth, was referred to the Executive Council with request to investigate the working conditions of farm laborers and to organize the same wherever possible.

In 1910 a report was made on Migratory Labor, and the work of the Executive Committee in that regard was described. Two organizers were placed in the field. The plan as outlined was "to organize laborers' unions first in the large cities, where they may ultimately become self-supporting, then in the smaller cities and towns, and ultimately the agricultural laborers in the rural districts" (Proceedings Cal. State Fed. of Labor, p. 54). These organizations were to be called "United Laborers," they were to receive their charter from the American Federation of Labor, and there was to be a mutual arrangement for the exchange of cards and the transfer of membership from one local to another.

It will be observed that the idea had already taken a broader scope than that first projected by Delegate Dale. The miscellaneous unskilled labor of the cities which came directly into competition with the organized labor bodies of the A. F. of L. was to receive first attention. Municipal labor bureaus were also recommended in the larger cities, and a law making regular pay days at least twice a month was also suggested. The committee also stated, "We should also endeavor to secure further legislation, to place much restriction upon the disgraceful system of plunder practiced by many private employment agencies." So that it is apparent that the craft unionists engaged in the work were already beginning to contemplate the magnitude of their task, which indeed goes down to the very foundations of society. The organizations were established, but the committee was already in the apologetic stage. Thus it stated (p. 55):

It should be borne in mind that the greater part of the past year was taken up in preparatory work. During the early part of the year there was some uncertainty about our ability to finance the project. But we have an assured income to carry on this great work for the coming year without interruption, and your Executive Council presents this portion of its report to your earnest consideration. While many delegates may fear that this work is of a herculean nature, all must agree that the presence of a large body of workers in an unorganized state constitutes a standing menace to the conditions gained by organization in the mechanical trades.

We call particular attention to the last sentence as stating the actual impelling reasons for the organization of the unskilled.

Money was set aside for the organization and the enterprise was at last actually launched.

Reporting on his efforts in the work of organizing the migratory laborers, Organizer E. Thompson, reporting to the convention of 1910, said:

The work is difficult and slow, for the class to which my effort has been directed has so long been considered as industrial, and, to some extent, social jetsam that a psychological effect has been produced. They are heterogeneous as to language, intelligence, experience and standards of life, they are hard to approach, suspicious of my motives, heartsore at the failures of the past along lines of organization and doubtful of the efficiency of unions from the standpoint of the unskilled, and last and saddest in many instances they appear satisfied with their sphere and estate.

At the convention of the State Federation of Labor, 1911, the report on organizing Migratory Labor stated (Proceedings Cal. State Fed. of Labor, 1911, p. 76):

We think that the tangible results of our efforts in organizing migratory or unskilled labor justify an optimistic outlook for the future.

The actual paid up membership of the unions was said to be somewhat over three thousand. The fact that there were many lapses owing to the laborers moving away in search of work led the committee to say:

This shows the absolute necessity for the final adoption of our plan which is for state-wide and ultimate national organization as the only effective and practical method of protecting and generally improving the condition of our migratory workers.

We have prevailed upon these unions to keep initiation fees at a nominal figure, and we have insisted that all members of the organizations of a like nature must be admitted upon presentation of their membership card without the payment of an initiation fee.

In this report was incorporated a lengthy letter to Samuel Gompers and the members of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, written jointly by Andrew Furuseth and O. A. Tveitmoe. It is a remarkable document and should be read in full (p. 77). We extract some passages, however:

By what name are these landless, homeless men who travel from place to place, seeking opportunity to obtain remunerative labor, to be called if not "migratory"?

They have been called "hoboes" by others until many of them have accepted the appellation. The term "hobo" may be made as respectable as any other, it may be made of as much help as any other. If the men should be willing to keep the name given to them in their misfortune and signifying the dislike that was in the minds of those who used it in its original sense and make that name an honorable one, descriptive of men who will rather travel from place to place, picking up on the way such work as shall offer than to accept existing conditions which rob them of all that is usually held dear by man, then we are sure that no friend of theirs will have any objection, but will help them to make the name respected.

The writers, after giving a brief account of the break-up of the guild system, remark, "Unless the labor movement of this day is to go the same way as the guilds, the so-called unskilled or migratory workers must be organized. The organized workers must do it."

The convention of 1912 found those in charge of the organization of the migratory laborers in a chastened spirit. The President, in making his report (Proceedings State Fed. of Labor Convention, 1912, p. 72), said:

The movement toward organizing the migratory laborers of this state having been a success, so far as the meagre funds at our disposal for this purpose admitted, has received great help through the financial aid given by the American Federation of Labor.

The joint committee on Migratory Labor, however, consisting of delegates from the San Francisco Labor Council, the State Building Trades Council and the State Federation of Labor, had by no means a rosy report. Thus they say:

It is to be regretted that the results have not been as satisfactory as in previous years; this is partly due to the slackening up in contributions from the bodies which financed the Joint Committee in former years; also to the abnormal state of unemployment which prevailed throughout the State during the last winter.

Two new unions were nevertheless organized during the past year, one at San Jose and the other at Eureka. The two unions of United Laborers at Fresno were amalgamated, also the two unions at Stockton.

During the brief absence of Organizer Juan Ramirez of Los Angeles, the union of United Laborers in that city disbanded for the reason, it is said, that not sufficient support was given them by other unions. This, it may be said, is the same reason advanced by all laborers' unions in the State for their failure to build up more rapidly. While the charge is no doubt substantiated by facts, there should be no mistaken notion upon this point, for if the organization of migratory laborers is ever going to be really successful and a power in the land, it must learn to depend upon its own strength rather than the support of other unions.

The Secretary-Treasurer in his report pronounces in favor of State Employment Bureaus in the following words:

3. TO ESTABLISH STATE EMPLOYMENT BUREAUS.

Legislation on this subject failed at the last session. This time it will be of paramount interest to Labor to obtain it. The coming influx of immigration through the opening of the Panama Canal makes the establishment of State employment offices an imperative necessity. The system must not be in an experimental stage, but in full operation by 1915, if anything good for the migratory and unskilled workers of the State is going ever to be done. The private employment offices should not be permitted any longer to make this class of labor its special prey.

A bill has been prepared establishing such offices in the leading cities of the State, under the supervision and control of the Labor Commissioner. No doubt objections will be urged to show the impracticability in certain cases to safeguard the interests of employers; but the general interests of the workers must be chiefly taken into account, and the great good expected from

this measure will outweigh any risk assumed by the employer in dealing with the State; those risks, by the way, are the same when an employer deals with the private employment agent.

The foregoing shows the progress of the movement looking towards the organization of the migratory laborers in the State of California. There is no need to comment on the results achieved. They speak for themselves. But one fact stands out most clearly, that the organization of that class of labor is regarded as a most essential and indeed vital matter by the officers of the organization, and that the menace from the unskilled to the regularly organized trades is at once a terror and an incentive.

This is so evidently a fact that Paul Scharrenberg, the very able Secretary-Treasurer of the State Federation of Labor, as delegate to the convention of the American Federation of Labor, reported to his constituents on his return with respect to migratory labor that "the general interest taken in this subject and the efforts of the A. F. of L., during the past year to organize the steel workers seem to indicate that the organized workers generally are awakening to the vital importance of this problem."

II.

The foregoing represents the work given to the organization of the migratory unskilled in the State of California. It shows that the activities of the American Federation of Labor in this regard proceed from two main theories, the one being that the migratory unskilled are capable of organization by the A. F. of L., the other, that this class of workers must be organized for the benefit of the skilled craftsmen whose province they threaten to invade.

According to the underlying conception of organization of the A. F. of L., unskilled labor must be regarded as a craft. In fact the report of the committee quoted at the beginning of this article declares that it is so and says, "your committee firmly believes in the possibility of organizing this craft." But unskilled labor of the sort described is no craft. The man who is handling a shovel to-day may to-morrow be working with a machine, and six months from now be taking his place with a gang of lumber workers. If these men constituted a craft the work of organizing them in the A. F. of L. would not be so difficult, for the scope of their employment being limited, they could, without more than ordinary difficulty, be brought into

such a position that a union would appear advantageous to them. Moreover, if they really constituted a specific craft with recognized limitations on the scope of their employment, the A. F. of L. would not be very anxious to organize them.

The mere fact of their poverty would by no means be sufficient incentive for the spending of money and the placing of organizers in the field by an organization which is not engaged in the business of general charity to the working class. It has a very distinct policy in such matters, namely, that the component factors of its organization must be capable of maintaining themselves intact as separate individual crafts.

If the unskilled were such they would need no assistance beyond the use of the skilled organizer. They would organize spontaneously in terms of their specific craft and thus form a part of the Federation.

Speaking of the disbanding of the Los Angeles union and the reason given, that it so disbanded because the other unions did not support it, the committee said, "If the organization of migratory workers is ever going to be really successful and a power in the land it must learn to depend upon its own strength rather than the support of other unions." But that is just what these unions have not done since their inception. They have come into being artificially as the product of the labor and money of the other A. F. of L. unions, and have perished wherever artificial sustenance has not been forthcoming.

Briefly the organization of the unskilled is not compatible with the A. F. of L. for the reason that the latter in its essence is a federation of individual crafts, whereas the unskilled cannot by any means be so classed.

Moreover, the organizations themselves recognize this fact. They are anxious to organize the unskilled, not, as has been already remarked, because they are poor and ill-used, but because they are dangerous. Andrew Furuseth and O. A. Tveitmoe, than whom there are no two better informed labor men in the entire West, regard the organization of the unskilled as an absolutely necessary step. Toward what? The development of labor and the merging of all factional and jurisdictional differences in one great solidified labor organization? By no means. The object is the maintenance of the crafts as they now exist against invasion.

The unskilled, for the most part, are products of the machine industry and operate in terms of the new system. The crafts are tottering before the assaults made upon them by the machine

industry. Therefore the unskilled must be organized to form a screen between the crafts and the operation of the machine industry. The unskilled must remain classified as unskilled, in order that the crafts may maintain their prestige as skilled, and their pay in proportion.

And this notion is by no means confined to the American representatives of the craft notion in labor organization. Even such a radical syndicalist as Tom Mann cannot rise above the notions of a lifetime when he deals with the unskilled labor problem. He regards the problem from the point of view of the skilled craftsman, he appears to concern himself as to how far this unskilled labor group actually threatens the existence of trades organization, as at present constituted, and there is evident the same lack of ability to really comprehend the position of the unskilled laborer. The reader will easily detect the weakness. Mann says in No. 3 of the *Industrial Socialist*:

The reason that many men are graded as semi-skilled or unskilled is because the capitalist system will not permit of all engaging in skilled work—no matter what the amount of skill men may possess. There must be no lowering of the standard of the skilled, but there must be a raising of the standard of the lower-paid man. The position of the latter must be made worthy of a man; and as he serves society not in the manner he desires, but in the manner society compels him, he must in future be counted as a man and a brother. The skilled men must throw off that silly notion of superiority which still characterizes a number of them.

That the same notion is generally prevalent among trade unionists, even the most radical, appears also from the pamphlet entitled "Syndicalism" by Earl C. Ford and Wm. Z. Foster (Chicago, 1912). These writers are affiliated with the Syndicalist Educational League, which is the American counterpart of Tom Mann's English organization. Its purpose is the extension of Syndicalist action and organization among the unions as they already exist. The Syndicalist League denounces the formation of any labor organization outside of the A. F. of L. In accordance with this idea the unskilled laborers must be brought into the Federation, and the Syndicalists so-called are confronted by the same set of circumstances and the same difficulties as the California State Federation of Labor has faced.

It is easy to say that the unskilled must be taken into the unions. The question after all is, will they join the unions? The above writers say:

The skilled workers in the large industries are in such a minority that they cannot seriously disorganize these industries—and without this disorganization of industry they cannot win concessions from their employers. To be able to win they must pool their demands with those of the unskilled workers,

and by sticking with them bring whole industries to a standstill. This involves letting the unskilled workers into their union.

It would appear as if these writers already regarded the matter as accomplished, as if all that had to be done is for the unions to declare their readiness to accept the unskilled and the question would be immediately solved. But as we have seen, this is not the case. The unskilled do not see their way to joining the unions even when they are actually persuaded to do so and even when the unions have expended money on behalf of their organization.

The organizers admit this and attribute the refusal to a callous indifference to their own degraded condition on the part of the laborers and a refusal to recognize the benefit which would arise from association with the A. F. of L.

This is hardly the case. It may apply to a certain extent to that portion of the unskilled proletariat which has, so to speak, become sodden with misery and which has lost the impulse to struggle, owing to the continued pressure of miserable circumstances. But such people form but a very small fraction of the great army of the migratory unskilled.

On the contrary, this body of men consists for the most part of young bachelors in the full flower of youthful vigor. No others could do their work or endure the hardships which they daily face. It is the poorest sort of sophistry to speak of these men as passive and disinclined to rise. On the contrary, they form some of the very finest fighting material to be found anywhere and will go readily against odds, if once they have learned the trick of solidarity and organized movement.

The consciousness that they cannot achieve their solidarity with the American Federation of Labor is one of the chief reasons why they do not join the United Laborers' Locals which have been instituted in their special behalf. They know that there is no identity of interest between themselves and the craft organizations; that the latter will use them when it is convenient to do so, otherwise they will repudiate them or will refuse to make any effort to help them gain better conditions.

This has been made apparent time and time again. The molders not so long ago had a strike in which were involved also the molders' helpers. The latter were ignored when the time of settlement came. The crafts, when a strike is declared, do all in their power to persuade the unskilled men in the shops to quit their employment. Indeed, they must do so, for if the unskilled remained at work it would be useless for the crafts

to strike, for as has been already shown, the position of the craftsmen is so uncertain that their places can be readily filled by the unskilled. But when the time for settlement comes these unskilled men whose sacrifices have been necessary to the success of the strike are completely left out of consideration. It cannot be expected that men who see this sort of trick constantly played upon them will show any great enthusiasm for the organization whose members so behave.

Besides, the unskilled men are not fools. They know that the margin of skill upon which the crafts rest their claim to superiority and to their higher wages is very slight. The helper and the unskilled man knows that in the great majority of cases he is able to perform the work or could perform it satisfactorily with a slight amount of practice. He sees in the United Laborers an attempt to keep him in a perpetually subordinate position. The union rules are such that he cannot join the skilled crafts, for he cannot pay the required initiation fee. He may be discriminated against in the matter of the technical examination required by the membership as a necessary preliminary to admission to the craft. He may be, and in fact is, placed at a great disadvantage at every turn.

This man sees; or thinks he sees, in the United Laborers an attempt to bring him into permanent subjection as a member of the unskilled class, and to discipline and control his union by the united forces of the associated crafts either in the Central Labor Council or in the Building Trades. Thus, in my particular locality, the United Laborers are attached to the Building Trades, the great organization of so-called highly skilled craftsmen, which is actually by virtue of its own well-established position and petty-bourgeois tendencies, the one least able to comprehend and sympathize with the unskilled laborer.

The prospect of permanent subjection does not appeal to the imagination of the unskilled, particularly when he recognizes that such position is purely artificial, that the superiority of the crafts does not proceed from any inherent quality, but that it is transient, evanescent, and only maintains itself to-day by a designed partial monopolization, that it will be obliterated by the natural process of economic development.

Besides, the unions have been by no means impartial in their attention to the organization of the laborer, and in cases where they have aided such organization they have been inclined to favor such elements as could offer direct assistance to the leaders. This has been very apparent in San Francisco, where

such laborers in the Building Trades as could readily exercise the electoral franchise or were affiliated with such an organization as the church have received special attention. The difference in the treatment of the Irish and Italian laborers is clearly in point. The former have been assisted so that the hod-carriers form a really very important organization while the laborers in cement who are for the most part Italians are in no such comfortable state. The former are of course for the most part voters, the latter are not.

(To be concluded)

"Municipal Socialism"

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

Any one who wants to understand the economics of "Municipal Socialism" and the mentality of Municipal Socialists within the Socialist parties of this and other countries should read Frederick G. Howe's latest book, "European Cities at Work."

No more reliable guide can be found to this movement than Frederick G. Howe. He has an advantage over the British Fabians in his clear grasp of the fact that such reforms are neither Socialism nor any part of Socialism. On the contrary, while favoring the nationalization and municipalization of many industrial functions—together with all the other radical reforms, including the appropriation of all land-values by the State—Howe realizes that their net result will be "to put capitalism on a firmer foundation than at present," to use an expression of Marx. Howe's own way of expressing it is that these radical reforms will regenerate capitalism and raise the struggle between capital and labor to a higher plane—but will allow that struggle to continue indefinitely (see Howe's "Privileges and Democracy in America," p. 277).

Now, it would be a colossal error to underestimate the ability or impugn the motives of State Socialist reformers like Howe. As to ability, he must be given the credit of understanding the economic interpretation of history and of often sticking to it. It is only occasionally that he lapses into loose talk about the "average citizen," general welfare, etc., and in his last volume

especially he devotes his attention very largely to the relation of municipal reform to the conflicting interests of various social classes. Nor is he attacking "plutocracy," the trusts, and the largest capitalists merely. He sharply criticizes also "the business interests" generally, and especially "banks, business and professional men, members of clubs and agencies of public opinion."

Neither should we doubt the motives of such radicals as Howe. For surely we can't accuse the revisionist wing of the German Social Democracy of any form of actual corruption. And Howe is able to quote Dr. Albert Südekum, the opportunist leader in the German Reichstag, as holding the same views as he holds. Doctor Südekum, who is the editor of the *Kommunales Jahrbuch*, is quoted by Howe as writing: "City administration in Germany is becoming the science of *community living!* Our cities are trying to utilize art and science, the improvements of steam and electricity, in the service of the *people (!)*. *We are aiming to socialize industry and knowledge for the common good (!)*."

The mere fact that the German cities are made a monopoly of the business interests by law does not bother either Comrade (!) Südekum or Democrat Howe! The case of Berlin, where every wealthy voter has the same voice as 435 ordinary voters, is typical of the overwhelming majority of German cities, and some such inequality prevails in all of them. But what do Socialist Südekum and Democrat Howe care if 361,000 out of Berlin's 394,000 voters elect only one-third of the electors? To them Berlin is nevertheless evolving "the science of community living," and is administered "in the service of the people," and "for the common good"!

Anti-Socialist Howe, however, seems to be a shade more radical than Socialist Südekum, for the latter's statements just quoted show a belief that the class-struggle is already nearly or entirely ended in these progressive municipalities, whereas Howe merely expects that municipal ownership will *in the future* put an end "to the class conflict that now aligns the privileged few on the one hand, and the great mass of the people on the other." Indeed, Howe says municipal ownership is the *only* way this beautiful class harmony can be brought about.

Howe, like Südekum, has democracy for an ideal, but it is evident that, no matter what they say to the contrary, they both hold democracy to be of almost infinitesimally small importance in actual practice. At the very end of his new volume in which

he lauds the reactionary-controlled German cities to the skies. Howe remarks, quite parenthetically, that "the cry of the almost disfranchised German worker is for more democracy." But the reader can't see why democracy is needed in cities that are already "in the service of the people." Howe admits that our American schools are equal or superior to the German, while we are better provided with libraries and parks. We are left to assume that if Germany followed our cities as to parks and libraries and if we followed theirs in other matters (except schools) we would be making very satisfactory progress in "the science of community living" and be well on the road to the "socialization of industry and knowledge"! Howe confesses that our American system of taxation, of which he is a notoriously radical and bitter critic, is less backward than that of his beloved German cities. But taxes, like votes, are considered as relatively small matters by such men as Südekum and Howe.

The condition of the German schools Howe keeps well in the background, but he unintentionally gives us figures (without any interpretation) by which we can see how the case lies in "progressive" Frankfort. There nearly half the money spent on schools goes to higher schools that are practically inaccessible to the masses on account of their poverty—a matter not even worthy of remark from Howe's standpoint, and evidently of small consequence to Comrade (!) Südekum. Are the lower schools of Frankfort getting all the money they need? Or do the workers of that city have no difficulty in supporting their children while they pursue the higher courses of study?

The German city is indeed a strange place. It is "democratic, even socialistic in its services," says Howe, "but not in its political machinery." "Despite the political power of the business men they do not legislate in the interest of their class as they do in America. That is one of the anomalies of Germany, for I know of no other country in the world of which this is true. Political power is almost always used to promote the economic interest of the class which rules. Men seem unable to detach their public from their private interests when elevated to positions of trust."

Howe proceeds to give numerous and excellent examples of class rule in other countries than Germany. Why, then, does he suppose the German business men rule their municipalities in the public interest? Merely because their policy is collectivist and because it goes in for making labor more healthy and efficient!

Howe recognizes that this municipal ownership and labor reform are good business for business men. It is only necessary, in Howe's opinion, for the business man to cease to work for himself as an individual and to work for business men as a class. He is then working for the good of everybody, thinks Howe. So we read of the German business men who rule the German cities:

"They have built cities for the people, all the people. They have administered them for business, but for all business, rather than that of a limited class."

One of the most "anomalous" things about these anomalous German business men, who administer their cities for the people, but fight like tigers to keep the people from getting an equal suffrage, is that "they have shifted the burden of taxation on their own shoulders." Strange indeed, for as Howe himself points out, not only are the taxing methods even more backward than ours, but the suffrage makes "land-owners and real estate speculators unduly prominent in city affairs," and he admits that this has "prevented the increase of taxes on real estate," "accounts for the *universal* prevalence of the tenement and apartment house," has kept up "city rents and urban land values," and has confined suburban planning largely "to sections available only to the well-to-do." Howe does not mention the additional fact that Germany has not as yet changed a large part of its indirect taxes into direct and so shifted the burden from the shoulders of the masses to those of the well-to-do. What Germany has done in the direction of democratising taxation municipally is a drop in the bucket to what she has failed to do nationally, and national and municipal taxation added together is what really counts. As the national and state governments take all but 40 per cent. of the land tax, while they allow the cities to use inheritance and income taxes, the latter have no choice in the matter. They raise a large part of their taxes in these progressive forms. But it should be noted that they are very careful to tax incomes even as low as \$225. (In Munich, one of the least undemocratic of German cities, it takes an income of \$300 and \$37.50 in cash to vote, which effectively includes the mass of the taxpayers and excludes the mass of the wage-earners.) And the ruling business interests see to it that every cent expended by the cities pays—*i. e.* pays the ruling business interests.

Indeed the admitted principle upon which the most unequal municipal suffrage of all, that of Prussia, is based, is that the

chief tax-payers must have a majority so as to protect themselves in the levying of taxation and secure a share of the benefit of expenditures proportioned to the taxes paid.

"The attitude of the German business man," says Howe, "is different from anything I have ever known. Men talk of the city as they do of their homes, as they do of their private business." As the German cities literally belong to the German business men, why is it surprising that they should speak of them as of their private property and treat them accordingly? For, however enlightened German city government may be, its main purpose—as Howe himself confesses—is profits. And the development of the profit system has always meant certain *incidental* benefits to labor.

Even esthetic expenditures have a bearing on profits. "Beauty," as Howe says, "is treated as a commercial asset and is justified as a means of promoting the city's growth. Tax-payers do not question the outlay for the opera and the theatre, for gardens, art galleries, and museums. . . . The German city looks upon happiness as a public obligation. It freshens the artisan and relieves the dull monotony of his work."

That the happiness of the artisans pays employers—provided it can be so cheaply bought—cannot be questioned. Howe does not note any case where the German employers have enabled their workers to eat meat instead of sausages. This would cost about 100 times as much as the esthetic improvements he mentions. But, relatively unimportant as these benefits are, they are enough to bring workers from the backward country to the more progressive cities. And this alone is economic justification enough—from the employer's standpoint.

All such expenditures, as Howe says, "increase trade," so officials and business men vote heavy taxes for these and similar purposes. For "industry seeks those cities that do the most to encourage trade," "employers are attracted by educational opportunities which produce skilled workmen," and "all these things bring money to the town, promote business, and increase land values."

"The burdens of taxation are regarded as a kind of investment from which dividends will be realized in the future." So even "the leisure hours of the people" must be under public direction and control—no doubt so that they may be spent in a way that leads to that ambition for promotion which is so valuable to employers, to greater expenditures along approved capitalist

lines, and to an accumulation of energy to be put forth in the factory.

Like all far-sighted employers, the German business men want also to abolish unemployment. The competition of the lowest paid labor for better positions is quite sufficient for their purposes, and far less wasteful than an army of unemployed. So the unemployed are "invited" by many German cities to work for their board and lodging. The magnificent hospitality provided is valued by the cities themselves as being worth *12 cents* a day. As many German workers don't have this sum with them when unemployed, they are "invited" to earn it—at the rate of *3 cents an hour for four hours!* Howe says that under this régime vagrancy has almost disappeared. So have the tramps left many districts in America where they receive similar treatment. But their places of rest are called jails in this country instead of "inns", as in Germany. And here they don't usually have to work four hours under kindly police guidance. Also, Howe says nothing about penalties being provided for wealthy vagrants.

Howe shows that the German business men approve of workmen's insurance as a business proposition, and that the Government Insurance Department has saved an immense amount to the tax-payers by its large expenditures and splendid success in fighting tuberculosis. Also, model dwellings for the workmen have paid both tax-payers and employers.

Yes, Mr. Howe, every reform that increases profits (the exploitation of labor) is sure to succeed. For, no matter how much such reform may benefit employees, it increases the income of employers and therefore their power as a *politically organized class*. These collectivist and labor reforms may be costly to certain groups of large capitalists, but they increase the profits of the capitalists as a whole, and especially of the small capitalists who are now beginning to control all the more advanced governments—by means of their superior numbers and the strategic advantage of their political situation between the masses and the large capitalists. As you favor the regeneration of capitalism, why don't you say that the *main* purpose of all democratic collectivism and labor reform is to help the small capitalists economically and to give them the dominating voice in government?

And you, Comrade (!) Südekum, can't you confess that the present municipal reform in Germany, even at its best (*e. g.*, in Bavaria), only admits a few of the skilled workers into the circle

of privilege and power, and treats the rest like so many more or less valuable farm animals—on whom money is expended and the best scientific methods employed *solely* to the degree that such measures enable employers to get more out of them?

And what an army of Howes and Südekums we are getting to have in this country! Let us force them all to confess what classes they really represent, namely the small capitalists and the aristocracy of labor.

The Glasgow Co-operative Congress

By ALBERT SONNICHSEN

“And now we meet in our ninth congress, fortified and encouraged by our past experience and conscious that it is in our power, if we are only sufficiently in earnest, to secure the triumphant realization of a future co-operative international commonwealth which we believe will one day be co-equal and co-extensive with the whole civilized world. The remarkable growth of the co-operative movement in Germany, Great Britain, Denmark, Finland, Ireland and elsewhere, since the day when we laid the foundation stone of this great Alliance, justifies our confident expectation that the day of a new social order is at hand.”

It was with these words that Earl Grey, formerly Governor-General of Canada and the representative of one of the oldest families of the British nobility, opened the ninth congress of the International Co-operative Alliance, on the 25th of last August, in Glasgow, Scotland.

Men of Earl Grey's class and training do not usually utter such sentiments, but that fact in itself was not what created the sensation among the assembled delegates to the congress. What was really significant to them, and to all who are familiar with recent co-operative history, was that the keynote of the new tendency in the movement toward a really revolutionary program should have been sounded by the chief representative of those conservative elements within the movement which have always opposed it. It was Earl Grey who opened the first congress of the International Co-operative Alliance, in 1895, when it rep-

resented profit-sharing in industry and one of its chief purposes was to combat the rising tide of the “red International.” Certainly at that time he would not have stood for his utterances quoted above. But then, as he confesses later on in his address, “I am aware that large numbers of co-operators hold opinions which are opposed to those held by the majority of co-operators who founded the Alliance in 1895. We have no desire to stem the full stream of free ideas.” In those days it was held that the function of co-operation was to supplement capitalism, to bolster up its weaknesses. The stores would put the small store-keepers out of business and be the steady customers of the big capitalist manufacturers and middlemen, who would also condescend to pay bonuses to their workingmen, if they would behave themselves and not go on strike.

When, in 1904, the Alliance definitely declared itself a means to bringing about a universal co-operative state and denounced capitalism as anti-social, it was thought, even by many of the radicals, that a dangerous split would follow. Most of the conservative elements did, in fact, desert the organization, but the conservatives who remained, such as Earl Grey, were still strong, not because of their numbers, but because they were individuals of undoubted sincerity, respected even by their opponents for their devotion to what they considered the true principles. It was, in fact, Dr. Karpeles, the Austrian Socialist, who rose to thank Earl Grey, in the name of the foreign delegates, for his address and for the sacrifices he had made for the Alliance.

That the declaration of war on capitalism did not diminish the forces of the Alliance was never better demonstrated than by the attendance at this recent congress. Over six hundred delegates were present, the greatest number that has ever attended, representing ten million organized heads of families among twenty-four different nationalities. Of these representatives it was estimated that 340 were British, 100 German, 100 represented French constituents in France, Switzerland and Belgium, 50 were from Austria and Hungary; and Russia, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Rumania were especially well represented. The first delegate to represent a consumers' co-operative society in the United States was sent by the Co-operative League in New York.

On the platform with the congress officials and among the speakers, were George N. Barnes, the Labor representative in Parliament of the district in which the congress was being held,

a representative of the Lord Provost of Glasgow, to deliver a welcoming address, in the name of the city authorities, to the foreign delegates, and an official representative of the British Board of Trade. That same evening all the delegates were the guests of the Lord Provost, the Magistrates and the city corporation at a banquet in Glasgow's City Chambers. The official reception by the city authorities was a sharp contrast to the reception extended the previous congress by the Hamburg authorities in 1910. Then the authorities had been represented by a solitary Socialist alderman, who stated that "my colleagues had no time to come, though they always find time to open our dog shows." But then, over half the population of Glasgow is enrolled in the local co-operative society, while the Scottish Wholesale Society has subscribed heavily to the municipal bond issues with which the many municipal enterprises are financed.

The four days during which the congress was in session were taken up mainly with internal organization business, which included some revision of rules, the general tendency of which was to democratize more thoroughly the system of representation on the Executive Committee of the Alliance, the body which carries on the work of the Alliance between congresses. Of all the resolutions that were passed, there was only one not needing some special interpretation to outsiders, and that was a unanimous declaration in favor of world peace, carried with all the delegates on their feet, cheering madly. The most salient thought expressed in this resolution is:

"The Congress further desires to impress upon the public opinion of all nations the fact that the reasons for the continuance of armaments and the possibility of international conflicts will disappear as the social and economic life of every nation becomes organized according to co-operative principles."

But the appearance of a new and growing problem, that will loom up big some day, not only in the co-operative movement, but possibly in the political Socialist movement as well, was broached in the reading of a paper on "Co-operative Production," by Herr Kaufmann, representing the German Wholesale Society in Hamburg. The essence of his essay was that the agricultural co-operative societies, as now organized, could not solve the problem of co-operative supply in the future; that these various groups of farmers' selling societies were inherently opposed in interests to society at large, and that logically agricultural production must be carried out by the organized consumers, just as the industrial productive plants which supplied

the stores with their manufactured commodities were capitalized and controlled by the organized consumers.

This definite statement brought all the old conservative elements to their feet again. One after another they arose, reiterating the principle that farming must continue under the individualistic system, each farmer an independent unit, co-operating with his neighbor only in marketing his produce, selling it to the consumers' societies at a "fair profit." But Herr Kaufmann's point of view found defenders quite as convinced and as determined as the opposition. "We do not want to renew our acquaintance with profit-sharing," said one of the French delegates, and "there is no limit to consumers' co-operation except the thoughtlessness of the people themselves," said Dr. Karpeles, he who moved the resolution in the last International Socialist Congress, indorsing the co-operative movement. Apparently the same old bitter controversy that once waged itself out in the field of industrial production, ending only with the continued failures of the co-partnership enterprises, will now be renewed in the field of agricultural production.

Unfortunately for the supporters of the consumers' theory, they have not the big successes to point to that they had in the domain of industrial production, ten years ago. So far the consumers' federations, the wholesale societies, have not ventured far into collective agriculture, though so far as they have gone they have been successful. The cultivation of tea on their Ceylon plantations by the British wholesalers furnishes the most conspicuous experiment in this line, and the raising of its own fruit on its own estates by the Scottish Wholesale has also developed into a successful enterprise; so successful that the English Wholesale has now followed its example by purchasing several thousands of acres of fruit lands in England.

It is perhaps fortunate for the unity of the co-operative movement that this controversy will not be settled by argument; no controversy ever is settled that way. Each faction will have it in its power to demonstrate its theory. By that method one system must succeed and displace the other by actual working out. Undoubtedly it was in this way that so staunch a conservative as Earl Grey was convinced.

Realizing perhaps that so big a problem will have to be worked out, rather than talked out, the delegates passed no resolution indorsing either theory. Almost simultaneously with the discussion came the announcement that the English Wholesale was purchasing new land in Ceylon at a cost of \$125,000, and a

farm in England, at a cost of another \$50,000, to be used for dairy purposes.

The next congress of the Alliance, according to a resolution passed just before adjournment, will be held in Basle, Switzerland, in 1916.

Bebel and the Woman's Movement

By RICHARD PERIN

The name of August Bebel was known and loved in every civilized land. When the news of his sudden death was flashed around the world, the proletariat of every country felt and expressed a sense of personal loss. There had passed away one of those tremendous personalities who by their heroic labors, boundless self-sacrifice and iron strength of character have broken the difficult road over which the proletariat must pass to victory.

Those who know the history of the awakening and rise of the German working class know Bebel's history also, for they are one. And if the proletariat of the world owes honor, respect and love to the German working class as the vanguard of international Socialism, it owes the same honor, love and respect to the memory of August Bebel, as one who could have claimed, but never did, a very large part of the credit for having made possible the marvellous advance of the German workers.

For this Bebel's name will be immortal. But in this, although it in no way dims his own, he must share the glory with others.

It is upon another field that Bebel stands out splendidly unique. It is for his fight in another, although an allied cause, that his name and memory are enshrined in millions of hearts—his championship of women. And it is undoubtedly the women of the proletariat upon whom his loss has fallen most heavily, most personally. Others must and will take up his work in the general proletarian struggle, but where shall the women find another Bebel?

Not alone in Germany or in Austria did his loss cause grief in women's hearts; all over the world, in many unsuspected corners, the news of his death brought a feeling of personal loss to those of whom he was such a valiant champion.

What his life and his death meant to the women of the proletariat is best expressed by themselves. In her words of farewell at Bebel's funeral Clara Zetkin gave it strong and tender expression:

"In the name of the Socialist women of all lands I give you, August Bebel, the assurance of our undying gratitude, and I dare to declare here that our deep grief is shared even by those from whom at other times we are separated by the deepest gulfs—the women of the bourgeoisie. For August Bebel was the foremost champion of the rights of the female sex. He made clear to them the many-sided injustice that has been the portion of women in history. He has taught us to struggle upward into the sunlight, he has vivified our hopes like the Star of Bethlehem. August Bebel, you arose as an incomparable defender of our rights, when few, even from the ranks of the women themselves, dared to brave the ridicule and contempt of the public. You made us strong in hope and faith in the unshakable strength of your lofty Socialist ideal of humanity, which calls forth the women's cry of yearning. None has with holier wrath than you fought all the injustices and disadvantages of our sex. Bebel has thrown a light over the future for us. And hence he has been to us more than a mere path-finder and guide, he has been the awakener of millions of women, whom he taught to remember their humanity, which has constantly renewed the strength of all our hopes. We not only know him as the inspired party leader who with compelling force gathered together the masses of the disinherited; he showed us the most beautiful vision of the future and directed our eyes toward the social revolution. He would not have done this had he not been a pure, good and great-hearted man, as we knew him and loved him; for we women had no honors to bestow nor votes to give. We had no political power, but it was enough for him that he was fighting for us. He represented not what is, but what shall be. Like the great Norwegian poet, he recognized the fact that the workers and the women will be the great world-moving, historic forces of modern social evolution; it is we who are developing the longing of the men of antiquity and of Christianity for a purer humanity into the empire of Socialism. Bebel pointed it out to the women as the land toward which they must aspire. He taught them to hope for this land, to work for it and to fight for it. Thereby he gave our lives a richer meaning and a loftier goal than the mere demand for equal rights for man and woman: equal, free humanity for all! He made the struggle for

the emancipation of women one of the strongest weapons of the proletariat. To-day millions of class-conscious, Socialist women of the proletariat are sorrowfully grieving over the loss of their leader and friend, to whom they were accustomed to look up. In you, August Bebel, there passed away a grand pattern of humanity. We are comforted in our grief by the joy of the knowledge that you were ours, the knowledge that the influence of your earthly life will endure for aeons! A free people, men and women, shall stand upon a free earth, and that will be your work! You are immortal in the records of history, and you shall be immortal indeed, for you will live on in the inflexible wills of the men and women who remain your followers as deadly enemies of the capitalist order. The greatest and most enduring memorial of your life and deeds will be the Socialist order of society, the home of freed humanity. August Bebel, leader, counselor and friend of us women—farewell!"

And the Austrian, Adelheid Popp, writing in the *Gleichheit* (the great Socialist women's weekly published in Stuttgart and edited by Clara Zetkin), says of August Bebel:

"In the hearts of the thoughtful women of the proletariat, struggling for their emancipation, no name is so deeply rooted as is that of August Bebel. In comparison with his, what signify the brilliant names of the history of the women's movement, the names of all those who were the first and most famous standard bearers of the demand for the emancipation of women? A John Stuart Mill, a Mary Wollstonecraft, the immortal figures of the women of the great French Revolution? The woman of the proletariat names them over, she is full of admiration when she hears of these pioneers of women's rights, reads of their work and their deeds, but they are not close to her. But they all know August Bebel almost personally. They mention his name as they do that of a close friend, even when they have never seen him. We often hear working women say "Unser Bebel" (Our Bebel) when they have read his book. Nor has any other book done as much to arouse women to the consciousness of their humanity as has Bebel's book "Woman and Socialism." The German comrades call August Bebel "their Bebel," but we with no less right regard him as "our Bebel." For we have all learned from him, even those who have never read his splendid book.

"When we wish to tell of Bebel's influence upon the movement of the working women of Austria, we have, perhaps, said too little when we state that he has given us impulse, knowledge

and enthusiasm. His book had an instructive and clarifying influence upon us. In the early nineties, when our agitation was still very young and our army was hardly more than a few hundred in number, how often we used to declare, afire with enthusiasm: 'August Bebel says.' We cited portions of his book, we read from it, every woman comrade in training to become a speaker studied it. And it is still so to-day. The working women's movement is still learning from the most prominent pioneer of the women's movement. Longingly, we have often said: 'Oh, if all men would speak so!' We have always felt that it was necessary, not only that women should read what August Bebel has said about women, but that men should also read to learn how feelingly he has pictured the slavish existence of woman as wageworker and housewife, how convincingly he points out the road to her emancipation in common with the struggling proletariat. We have always wished that the many men who admired August Bebel as an agitator, parliamentarian and party leader might also learn to know him as the champion of the enslaved women possessing no rights. The words of one who enjoyed so much respect and honor as the champion of the proletariat must find respect on any field, must bear fruit. . . .

"When the news of Bebel's death reached us in Vienna, the women comrades gathered of their own initiative in our headquarters, because they instinctively had the feeling that they must be represented at the funeral of their champion; they wished to give expression to their grief and sorrow among those of congenial minds. And in the most remote localities of Austria the women comrades gathered together to listen to some other woman, who, perhaps, had first found the gift of speech in her grief over Bebel.

"And so we are justified in saying that Bebel was ours also, that we too have lost him. With the working class of the whole world, the proletarian women of every land may well grieve for the most valiant champion of their rights. May the feeling of gratitude be so deep in all that each individual will find strength in his example to bring it about that his spirit shall live in every place where the suffering of the proletariat drives it to fight for emancipation from the evils of capitalism. The flames have consumed Bebel's body, but the world must feel and must proclaim that his work is immortal, that it lives on and becomes ever mightier. To have a part in that is the best thanks that we can render him."

Such was Bebel's influence upon women of the proletariat. Such was the love and veneration which they bestowed upon him. His influence and their love are the most convincing proof that Bebel had a marvellously clear insight into the hearts of women, their needs and their aspirations. It is but a natural question to ask: "Whence came this deep insight?" Was it due solely to his mentality and his character? Or was there still another source?

Bebel's own words supply the answer. In his memoirs he writes of his wife Julie Bebel, who died on November 22, 1910:

"To a man who in public life is fighting with a world of opponents, it is not a matter of indifference what the woman who stands at his side may be intellectually. According to her intellect she can either be a support to his efforts or a leaden weight and a hindrance to them. I am happy to be able to say that my wife belongs to the former class. . . . I have never had to regret my marriage. I could not have found a more loving, devoted and constantly self-sacrificing wife. If I accomplished what I have accomplished, it was, to begin with, only possible because of her untiring care and readiness to help. And she had to live through many difficult days, months and years before at last the sun of happier times shone upon her."

Indeed it is only necessary to study Bebel's whole life and work to realize how much was drawn from the strength and courage of this unassuming woman.

Comrade Greulich, of Switzerland, who delivered the funeral oration at Julie Bebel's funeral, said at that time that Bebel's life-work, but above all his book, "Woman and Socialism," is also her work and that in these her memory will live.

Women, at least, will not regard these facts as detracting in the slightest degree from the honor and affection due from them to Bebel on account of his comprehension of them, their needs and aspirations. On the contrary, it will add to the honor due him and increase their respect for him. In their undying gratitude to "Unser Bebel" they will not forget to revere the memory of that one of their sex who held up his hands.

Story of the Putumayo Atrocities

By W. E. HARDENBURG

V.

The Report of Consul Casement

With the departure of Consul Casement to the Putumayo, there came a lull. Public opinion, at first highly incensed at the horrors of the *Truth* revelations, had forgotten—as it usually does—the grim story of the Putumayo forests. Cargo after cargo of the blood-stained rubber continued to arrive with monotonous regularity, and the directors of the Peruvian Amazon Company still maintained their apparently unconcerned and defiant attitude.

It was not until early in January, 1911, that Consul Casement returned to London and delivered his report. And then, with a few dry official sentences, the whole fabric of lying denials and abominable counter-charges with which the lords of "The Devil's Paradise" had met the disclosures of the atrocities, fell to pieces, and the justice and accuracy of the charges were incontestably established.

The following is taken from Consul Casement's preliminary report, dated January 7:

"The condition of things revealed is entirely disgraceful, and fully warrants the worst charges brought against the agents of the Peruvian Amazon Company and its methods of administration on the Putumayo,

"My conclusions are chiefly based on the direct testimony of Barbados men in the company's service, who brought their accusations on the spot, who were prepared to submit them to investigation, and to make them in the presence of those they accused, and whose testimony, thus given to me, was accepted without further investigation by Senor Juan Tizon, the Peruvian Amazon Company's representative at La Chorrera, on the ground that it was sufficient or could not be controverted.

"It was equally potent with the members of the Peruvian Amazon Company's commission, who expressed themselves as fully convinced of the truth of the charges preferred, they themselves being often present when I interrogated the British witnesses.

"There was, moreover, the evidence of our own eyes and

senses, for the Indians almost everywhere bore evidence of being flogged, in many cases of being brutally flogged, and the marks of the lash were not confined to men nor adults. Women, and even little children, were more than once found, their limbs scarred with weals left by the thong of twisted tapir-hide, which is the chief implement used for coercing and terrorising the native population of the region traversed."

The following is from a detailed report, submitted to Sir Edward Grey in March, 1911:

"Flogging was the least of the tortures inflicted on the failing rubber-gatherer, but it was the most indiscriminate and universal. Every section had its stocks and its duly appointed flogger in ordinary. Indians were often flogged while actually confined in the stocks, but the general method of flogging described to me by those who had themselves administered the lash was to apply it on the bare buttocks, while the victim, male or female, lay or was forcibly extended on the ground, sometimes pegged out. I am inclined to think that it is correct that fully 90 per cent. of the population bore traces of these floggings.

"Indians were frequently flogged to death. Cases were reported to me where men or women had actually died under the lash, but this seems to have been infrequent. Deaths due to flogging generally ensued some days afterward. In many cases where men or women had been so cruelly flogged that the wounds putrified, the victims were shot, or, with maggots in the flesh, were turned adrift to die in the forest.

"To ninety-nine out of every hundred Indians flogged the lash was applied as an instrument of torture and of terror, not to correct or chastise for some wrong-doing, but to make the Indian bring in more rubber, or stand in salutary dread of the local agent. Those who ordered its application to this end were agents of a trading company which paid a commission on results. The more rubber they could send to Chorrera, the higher their income.

"Deliberate starvation was again and again resorted to, but this not where it was designed merely to frighten, but where the intention was to kill. Men and women were kept prisoners in the stocks until they died of hunger. No food was given to the Indians, and none could be given save by the chief of the section. One man related how he had seen Indians thus being starved to death in the stocks, 'scraping up the dirt with their fingers and eating it'; another declared that he had actually seen Indians

who had been flogged and were in extremity of hunger in the stocks 'eating the maggots from their wounds'.

"Every one of these criminals kept a large staff of unfortunate Indian women for immoral purposes. Even *peons* had sometimes more than one Indian wife. The gratification of this appetite to excess went hand in hand with the murderous instinct which led these men to torture and kill the very parents and kinsmen of those they cohabited with.

"These men were murderers and torturers by profession—as their crimes swelled so should their fortunes. Whole tribes were handed over to them by a lawless syndicate which had no title deed to one yard of land or one sapling rubber tree, and they were supplied with the armaments necessary to reduce these people to a terrified obedience and given a wholesale interest in the terror."

During his investigations, Consul Casement had occasion to examine Stanley Sealey, a British subject. The following is typical of this man's evidence:

"'Bring me some leaves—some dry leaves,' he said, and he put these under the feet of the old woman as she hung there, her feet about a foot or so above the ground; and he then take a box of matches out of his pocket and he light the dry leaves, and the old lady start to burn. Big bladders (blisters) I see on her skin up here (he pointed to his thighs). All was burned; she was calling out. Well, sir, when I see that, sir, I said 'Lord, have mercy!' and I run ahead that I could not see her no more. I stayed a little ways off to where she was. I could hear him speaking. He say to one of the boys, 'Loose her down, now' and they loose her down, but she was not dead. She lay on the ground—she was still calling out. He tell one of the Indians: 'Now, if this old woman is not able to walk, cut her head off' and the Indian did so—he cut her head off."

The following is from the testimony of James Chase, another British subject:

"Fonseca had him put in the *cepo* (stocks) with one foot only, the other being free. Fonseca came up to the *cepo* with a stick with a club-head much bigger than the handle of the stick. He put one of his legs against the Indian's free leg and stretched it apart from the confined leg. He then pulled off the man's *fono* or loin-cloth made of beaten bark, so that he was quite naked, and then struck the man many times with the club end of the stick on his exposed parts. These were 'smashed', and the man died in a short time."

Another deposition, sworn before Consul Casement by Stanley Lewis, states:

"I have seen Indians killed for sport, tied up to trees and shot at by Fonseca and others. After they were drinking they would sometimes do this. They would take a man out of the *cepo* and tie him to a tree, and shoot him for a target. I have often seen Indians killed thus, and also shot after they had been flogged and their flesh was rotten through maggots."

In his final summary of the net results of the "brain-work" of Arana and his assistants, Mr. Casement says:

"The value of these, roughly speaking, 4,000 tons of rubber . . . must have considerably exceeded one million pounds, and possibly may not have fallen very far short of 1,500,000 pounds.

"The number of Indians killed either by starvation—often purposely brought about by destruction of crops over whole districts or inflicted as a form of death penalty on individuals who failed to bring in their quota of rubber—or by deliberate murder by bullet, fire, beheading, or flogging to death, and accompanied by a variety of atrocious tortures, during the course of these twelve years, in order to extort these 4,000 tons of rubber, cannot have been less than 30,000, and possibly came to many more.

"A population officially put at 50,000 should in ten years have grown by natural increase to certainly 52,000 or 53,000 souls. By computations made last year, the existing population of the entire region is now put at from 7,000 Indians (the lowest calculation) to 10,000, the highest."

Although this report was not made public until July, 1912, it must be stated that the British Foreign Office lost no time in acting upon it. A copy of it was immediately transmitted to the Peruvian government with a demand for the abolition of the conditions revealed and the prompt imprisonment of the guilty parties. The Peruvian government reluctantly appointed a commission of inquiry, but none of the criminals were apprehended owing to the dilatory action of the Iquitos authorities.

Another copy was sent to the United States government, which was requested to support the British Ambassador at Lima in insisting that action should be immediately taken to eradicate the abuses. After some delay the American government consented to make "informal representations". These, however, evoked no practical result, for the principal criminals had already escaped to Brazil and other parts.

Meantime, in England, the Peruvian Amazon Company had

received the report of its own commissioners, which, needless to say, fully confirmed the charges which had been "purposely misstated" by the writer and others "for indirect purposes". The result was that at an extraordinary general meeting, held in September, 1911, it was decided to wind up the company. The chairman, however, held out hopes of eventually reorganizing it, remarking that its total extinction would mean "the removal of a beneficent influence, so far as the Putumayo Indian was concerned". This remark, together with the appointment of Arana as liquidator—Arana, the leading spirit in the whole ghastly business—is illustrative of the feelings of the majority share-holders in this matter. We shall see later how Arana carried out his duties as liquidator.

By this time the report of the Peruvian commission of inquiry had been received and the last excuse of the Peruvian government for disbelief in the charges had been swept away. Dr. Paredes reported that:

"The practices are completely proved. Not only the slaughter of the Indians during the expeditions to enslave the natives of the Putumayo under pretext of civilizing them and obtaining their services as laborers for the Arana Company and the Peruvian Amazon Company is proved, but numerous other murders by the lash, firearms, machetes, the stocks, starvation and even by burning alive. These murders have not been committed through necessity or in personal defence, but simply to satisfy criminal instincts and the most sordid avarice. All this has been completely verified, and, further, that the employers delighted to violate native girls of eight years of age, many of whom died in consequence of their treatment. Pregnant women have been cut to pieces with machetes and shot, and thousands of Indians have been beaten. . . . Corpses of Indians who have been assassinated and thousands of Indians who bear marks of the lash have been found in proof of these statements, and the statements of civilized men support the evidence of the natives. . . ."

Upon Dr. Paredes' return to Iquitos, he issued 237 apprehension warrants. By this time, however, all those who did not feel sure of their safety had, of course, escaped; but numerous others remained unmolested in Iquitos, and no attempt was made to put the warrants into execution; still others returned to the Putumayo and again entered the service of Arana. Out of the total of 237 warrants only nine arrests were actually made, all, with one exception, being inferior agents who had merely

carried out the orders of their superiors, and had derived no direct profit from the crimes with which they were charged.

Very illustrative of the methods employed by the hirelings of Arana to protect the interests of their masters, was the case of Pablo Zumaeta, a brother-in-law of Arana. This individual was the Iquitos manager of the company, and Dr. Paredes had issued a warrant against him. The warrant was never served, for the Superior Court of Iquitos annulled it and, at the same time, dismissed Judge Valcarcel who sought to have it enforced.

Speaking of this matter, Consul Casement in a subsequent report to Sir Edward Grey, says:

"The evidence that I obtained at Iquitos, coming as it did from many quarters, induced in me the conviction that the punishment of the wrongdoers was a thing not to be expected, and from a variety of causes I need not dwell on here, possibly a matter beyond the ability of the local executive to ensure.

"It was abundantly clear that the company, or those who locally controlled the Putumayo in its name, having recovered from the shock of exposure and fear that followed the visit of the commissioners and myself in 1910, had determined to retain forcible exploitation of the Indians as their right by conquest and their surest means of gain."

These facts were communicated by the British Foreign Office to the American government, and, at the request of the former, the ministers of both countries at Lima again took up the matter with President Leguia. The "President alluded to the judicial authorities being independent of the executive, and said that liberation of Zumaeta on appeal was stated to be due to lack of evidence against him", according to the British Minister's report to Sir Edward Grey.

Seeing, finally, that the power of the Arana gang was too strong for the Peruvian government to overcome, both countries appointed permanent consuls at Iquitos, with instructions to report periodically on conditions in the Putumayo, in the hope that their presence might, to some degree, restrain the activities of the "civilizers". At the same time, Sir Edward Grey suggested to the United States government that Consul Casement's report be made public. Although Secretary Knox thought "that it would be most conducive to the attainment of the ends desired" to still further delay this action, the British Foreign Office thought otherwise, and in July, 1912, the results of Consul Casement's patient investigations were given to the world.

The Monroe Doctrine

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

The Panama Canal, sired by imperialistic plutocracy, was initially considered chiefly as a tool for the commercial conquest of the Orient. Since President Wilson repudiated the "Six Power Group" China loan, his Administration has shown that it considers the Canal chiefly in relation to Latin America. The Democratic Administration aims to unlock "the double-bolted door of opportunity" for the lesser capitalists, who, while not powerful enough to engage in imperialistic adventures in China, may still draw good profits from trade with South America, which is a big field for small exporters. There is less risk and a freer opportunity for all. The result is a new and larger interest in South America.

While most of the Caribbean states, notably Santo Domingo, Nicaragua, Honduras, and even Venezuela, are a satrapy of American high finance, American capital faces the unpleasant fact that it secures no more than 15 per cent. of South America's foreign trade. The activity of American interests in Central America has been that of financial brigands. This has aroused the antagonism and distrust of South America. Nor does the United States adopt efficient methods in its trade with South America. While England, France and Germany have a chain of banks in South America, there is not an American bank south of Panama. A growing sentiment, however, considers the Monroe Doctrine the most important factor in the situation. For South America sees in the Monroe Doctrine an insult and a menace, and suspects the United States to be scheming a Pan-American empire. Prof. Bingham's book* is an interesting contribution to this view.

The point stressed in this book is that the new Monroe Doctrine, developed for the commercial and political supremacy of the United States in the New World, has failed of its object; that while potent in Central America, it has greatly injured our trade with South America, and practically banded Argentina, Brazil and Chile against the United States.

* The Monroe Doctrine: An Obsolete Shibboleth. By Hiram Bingham. New Haven: Yale University Press.

As originally laid down, the Monroe Doctrine contemplated the exclusion of "future colonization by European powers" on the American continent. The young Republic, fearing the monarchical reaction in Europe and the schemes of the Holy Alliance, aimed to protect its own independence by protecting that of the other American republics. Later, however, the Doctrine became an instrument of aggression. In 1895, during the Venezuelan dispute with Great Britain, Cleveland's Secretary of State Olney proclaimed a new principle and new version of the Monroe Doctrine: that the "United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and that its fiat is law upon the subject to which it confines its interposition." This was followed by the spoliation of Spain in Cuba, in 1898, thereby violating that clause in the original Doctrine providing that the United States "shall not interfere" with "the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power."

Thereafter the United States has continuously terrorized Latin America. Mr. Bingham treats this phase very mildly. As a matter of fact, President Roosevelt not only turned the Monroe Doctrine into such a totally new thing as to suggest a new name, the "Roosevelt Doctrine," but his Administration also established a virtual and ubiquitous protectorate in Central America. Mr. Bingham slurs over the vicious facts of the "Roosevelt Doctrine." Indeed, he largely though indirectly condones its policy in Central America. Of the seizure of Santo Domingo's customs houses, which act turned the United States into a debt-collecting agency for Europe, he says, "We may seem to have been justified in our course." Surely mild language!

Prof. Bingham objects to the Monroe Doctrine because the antagonism it rouses in South America reacts injuriously upon United States trade. Argentina, Brazil and Chile are strong enough to resent United States tutelage. They consider the present Monroe Doctrine a "petulant and insatiable imperialism," the "shield and buckler of United States aggression." They believe the United States wishes to dominate the American continents. A vigorous sentiment urges them to ally in defense. And while Bingham scoffs at the legitimacy of these fears, he holds that they injure the United States commercially. "Why spoil the game by an irritating and antiquated foreign policy which makes it easier for our competitors and harder for our own merchants?"

South America is a vast field for trade. Mr. Bingham indicates that it is commercially more important to the United

States than the Orient: "Our imports from China and Japan in 1910 amounted to 81 million dollars. Our imports from Argentina and Brazil amounted to 129 million dollars." Argentina and Brazil "imported \$650,000,000 worth of goods last year (1912) and had \$200,000,000 left over." Chile spends millions on internal improvements. Argentina exports more agricultural products than the United States. Great Britain has \$4,573,243,200 invested in Latin America, \$2,973,760,000 in Argentina, Brazil and Chile alone. Bingham fears that the United States may be left out in the cold. He emphasizes Germany's "peaceful conquest of South America," and the rising tide of Oriental immigration. Argentina and Brazil offer inducements to Japanese immigrants, and there are 15,000 Chinese in Peru who "readily assimilate with the Peruvians."

In view of all the facts, Mr. Bingham urges an alliance between the United States and Argentina, Brazil and Chile, which shall preserve "America for the Americans." The Monroe Doctrine should be buried, and friendship supersede tutelage.

It appears that this new policy would not include Central America and the small Southern republics. The new alliance would lord it over the rest of the continent, assuring peace—and the spoils. Except this exclusion from the scope of the Monroe Doctrine of Argentina, Brazil and Chile, the *status quo* would be maintained. The brigands of high finance in Central America need have no fear!

Is Mr. Bingham's suggestion the precursor of a new Latin-American policy, or is he a voice crying in the wilderness?

The development of the Monroe Doctrine parallels the development of American capitalism into plutocracy. While Polk and Grant modified the Doctrine, it was not until the late '80's and early '90's that the Monroe Doctrine was fundamentally changed and turned into a travesty of the original. The dominantly plutocratic administration of Roosevelt completed the change. It might be reasoned, accordingly, that a non-plutocratic, Democratic administration would let fall the later imperialistic implications of the Doctrine into harmless desuetude.

There is, however, involved another and corollary fact. The Democratic party has never opposed imperialism in Latin America. The Democratic Cleveland as much as the Republican Roosevelt turned the Monroe Doctrine into an imperialistic instrument. Imperialism in the Orient has been exorcised by the Wilson Administration, but blessed in Latin America. Secretary

of State Bryan proposed an American protectorate over Nicaragua. In October the American Minister to the Dominican Republic compelled warring factions to make peace. This "first successful application of our new Latin-American policy" implies that "in future any uprising will be stamped out as criminal without a conference being held between the opposing factions, the United States supporting the constitutional authority." The Democratic Congress voted larger naval appropriations than its Republican predecessor; and the Democrats now propose three battleships a year, while the Secretary of War urges a larger and more efficient army. This is imperialism with a vengeance!

There is another important fact. John Barrett, Director-General of the Pan-American Union, recently pointed out that United States trade with South America since 1900 has increased 197 per cent., while European increase was very much less. The largest gain was in trade with Argentina and Brazil. The new tariff has encouraged South American exporters, particularly Argentinian, and they are studying our markets. The American capitalist, compelled by the new tariff to meet foreign competition, is organizing systematic invasions of foreign markets, and has decided that South America offers a great opportunity. Indications, accordingly, point to a phenomenal increase in trade between South America and the United States. With this condition, and Democratic imperialism, the usually short-sighted American capitalist may let well enough alone, and not tamper with the Monroe Doctrine.

An alliance with Argentina, Brazil and Chile would undoubtedly prove advantageous to the commerce of the United States. And as this alliance would not necessarily mean the end of American imperialism, the Monroe Doctrine may be modified accordingly, but not immediately. A modification must take place sooner or later. The suggestion of such a modification is another symptom of the readjustive trend in American capitalism.

La Monte, Walling and Pragmatism

By WALTER LIPPMANN

The July issue of the *NEW REVIEW* contained an article by Robert Rives La Monte which was enough to make a man dizzy. It was a review of Walling's book, "The Larger Aspects of Socialism." I had read Walling's book with a good deal of care for a review in the *Call*, and I turned to La Monte's article eagerly,—it would be interesting to see what kind of reception the book received in a monthly that devotes itself primarily to the philosophy of Socialism. I read La Monte's article and wondered; I read it again and wondered. I put it away for a month in the hope that after a good rest it would be more digestible. This is what I have gathered from La Monte:

Walling has written a book in praise of pragmatism. Pragmatism has long been familiar in proverbs, in a saying of Jesus, and a sentence of Paul Lafargue's that was printed in the *NEW REVIEW* of March 29. "It is difficult to overstate the importance of the pragmatic idea that a speculative theory that will not stand the test of practical experience is worthless." In fact La Monte once showed in the *Call* that Engels and Marx believed in this "true and practical pragmatism." Walling does not realize how much James was anticipated by Dietzgen. But there is danger and serious danger in Walling's unqualified glorifications of pragmatism, for some theories that seem to be founded on experience are not really founded on it, and therefore do not work out (that is to say, unpragmatic theories don't work, which is what every pragmatist would say). Pragmatism is dangerous because it can be used by people who cling to comfortable lies. It may become the teaching of those people who neglect sound theory in the movement. "In fairness to Comrade Walling be it said there is not a line in his latest book" to support this view. But he is supporting the only philosophy now being used to give the support of dogma to the popular crusade against dogma.

I challenge La Monte to show where I have done his logic any injustice. Does he not begin by saying that it is difficult to overstate the importance of the pragmatic idea; does he not show that Marx, Engels and Dietzgen used it; and does he not

end by saying that it is a dangerous philosophy which will lead us away from Marx into the support of dogma?

William James once said that a truth passed through three stages: First, it's dangerous; second, it's unimportant; third it's what we've all been saying all along. Well, in four pages La Monte amends that description: First, it is a great idea; second, Marx, Engels, Dietzgen and I have always believed in it; three, it is a dangerous idea.

The only part of that performance that need really interest us is why pragmatism should be called a dangerous idea. This sentence explains it: "Pragmatism may but too readily be converted to the uses of those who prefer to believe in comfortable lies rather than to face disturbing truths." Now if there is one philosophy in the world whose whole spirit and purpose is to test theories by experience, that philosophy is pragmatism. In fact, that is what La Monte said of it on the first page. The sentence I have quoted is from the fourth page. To test ideas by their results, that is the very heart of the pragmatist's plea. To every comfortable lie it opposes actual experience: that, oh, La Monte of the first page, is what you forgot by the fourth.

The only way I can explain La Monte's somersault is that he suddenly discovered that the application of the pragmatic method to present society would result in conclusions not anticipated by Marx forty or fifty years ago. Hence, while pragmatism was all right for Marx, we must beware of it. We must in short abandon the spirit of Marx in the name of his conclusions. I merely offer this explanation of La Monte tentatively, for I cannot force myself to believe that his article is as empty of meaning as it is execrable in logic. He couldn't have turned around in the way he did just for the sake of exhibiting his confusion of mind. That confusion of mind must have its source in some belief of his which he is trying to defend from the disturbing questions of the pragmatically minded Socialists.

There is a good deal of evidence in the article to support this theory about La Monte. He doesn't trouble to deal with Walling's views on the culture of State Capitalism, evolution, history, ethics, education, but there is an unforgettable passage which aims to sum up Walling's book. It is done in a metaphor: Walling is the blithe pilot, pragmatism is both his compass and his ship, the seven seas he navigates are modern thought, and the landlubber of a passenger is La Monte. I am not abusing La Monte; I am only quoting him. The metaphor is

tortured for a whole page, and so is La Monte, and so is the reader, and the net result is that La Monte seems to have felt slightly seasick on his voyage through modern thought and after that La Monte has the courage to say, "I cannot use up my space in minor criticisms." Does he think a summary of the titles of Walling's chapters embedded in a maritime metaphor is a major criticism?

Enough: it is a sad story. A well-known theorist about Socialism has exhibited his less inspiring qualities. (La Monte, by the way, suggests towards the end that he is one of those who "never let go their hold of the saving truth that without sound theory there cannot be a sound movement"). After this article, I should be inclined to say: "If yours is the quality of our logic, never, never shall we have a sound movement, La Monte." An extremely significant book has been smeared with inanity in what might claim to be the most serious magazine in the American movement. No honest effort has been made to meet an honest thinker honestly, a new vision openly: no effort to assimilate the suggestion of a new book; no eagerness to suck out its message. Only feebleness, only satisfaction with what is already known, only the vices of intellectual decay.

Pragmatism Once More

By ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE

Thanks to the courtesy of the editor of the NEW REVIEW I have had the privilege of reading the proofs of Comrade Lippmann's somewhat passionate defense of Walling's "Larger Aspects." There is a generous warmth, one might almost say chivalry, in Lippmann's attitude which I cannot but admire. But I was, I confess, shocked and grieved to discover that I was already suffering from "intellectual decay." Fear lest the decay spread so rapidly as to incapacitate me altogether, impels me to snatch a few moments from a very crowded day to venture a few words of explanation to Comrade Lippmann and the readers of the NEW REVIEW. I shall be as explicit and direct as possible.

I do not and have not failed to take Comrade Walling seriously. On the contrary, I believe his former book, "Socialism As It Is," to be the most valuable contribution to Socialist thought and literature yet made by an American. I do not think this book

has yet been adequately appreciated by his countrymen. I believe that with the lapse of time the value of this book will become more and more fully recognized. Were Walling never to write another line, this book alone would make his fame secure.

Walling's later book, the "Larger Aspects," was a very bold and ambitious attempt to cover a very vast field. I felt and feel that it was far less successful. It showed an enormous amount of thought, reading and study. But the book appeared to me, and still so appears, to have been written before the results of that study and reading had been thoroughly digested and assimilated. This was what I meant to imply by my poor, much abused and rather crude metaphor about sea-sickness. In spite of this I was glad to recognize that the book was fruitful in stimulus and suggestion.

I have read Comrade Lippmann's article twice, and endeavored to read it calmly, impartially and without prejudice, but I still fail to see any inconsistency in my admission of the value of the root idea of Pragmatism with my warning against the possible and prevalent abuse of that idea. Pragmatism may be rightly or wrongly used just as alcohol may be.

I ventured to suggest that Marx and Engels appeared to me to have used it wisely. I now hasten, before intellectual decay claims me for its own, to add that Walling in his last book, and even more obviously Lippmann in his very readable "A Preface to Politics," appear to me to have distorted and abused it, with very dangerous results.

I refer here to the contention of both that our thought, our philosophy, our politics should be "anthropocentric"; that our old Eighteenth Century friend, "human nature," should be the hub around which all else must revolve. This, they tell us, is the very essence of Pragmatism. If they are right, and they know far more of the literature of Pragmatism than do I, then I do not hesitate to say that such Pragmatism is neither more nor less than a reversion to the pre-Marxian Utopianism of St. Simon, Robert Owen and Fourier. Whose human nature is to be the hub? Lippmann's "human nature" is the human nature of the middle class intellectual leader. Haywood's human nature is something far other. Which are we to take for our centre of anthropocentric circles? Is it not plain enough that this Walling-Lippmann pragmatism removes all certitude from sociological thought and leaves the investigator "up in the air" without any criterion his neighbor will acknowledge as valid? But I must not waste time and space developing this argument. Nor is it

needful, for the work was done long ago by master hands in Engels' "Anti-Duehring" and Plechanoff's "Anarchism and Socialism."

It is true the terminology of the new Pragmatism is very different from the terminology of pre-Marxian Utopianism, but the substance remains the same just as surely as Jacob's hands remained the same under the hairy gloves which deceived that ancient victim of intellectual decay, the patriarch Isaac. And Engels' and Plechanoff's arguments are valid to-day against the anthropocentric philosophy of Walling and Lippmann.

I would not for a moment imply that Walling and Lippmann have not advanced beyond St. Simon and Fourier and Owen. They have truly. They are children of their day and period. And their anthropocentrism is far more tintured and penetrated by the spirit of realism, by the breath of living actuality, than was the philosophy of Rousseau. But this is true in spite of, not on account of, their theory.

I shall not dwell further on this here. I hope to return to the subject in a review of Lippmann's brilliantly written book which I hope soon to have the pleasure of writing for the *NEW REVIEW*.

Before closing this brief note I would like to enter a plea for taking ourselves and each other gaily as well as seriously. The two are not inconsistent. No one will dispute that Comrade Lippmann takes himself seriously, and he deserves to be so taken. But I for one feel his usefulness would be greatly increased if he would cultivate the gentle art of smiling at himself and others.

May I add a plea for courtesy? We Socialists profess to be above all else democrats. Yet when we disagree with a comrade we straightway cast aside our democratic good manners and accuse our erring brother of cowardly opportunism, violent anarchism, intellectual decay or what-not. Good manners, as Matthew Arnold pointed out long ago, are only possible in a democracy of equals. Is it not also true that professed democrats who retain the bad manners of a class-divided society have somehow failed to assimilate the very spirit of democracy? I am painfully conscious of the relevancy of the scriptural injunction, "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone." But even so I refuse to be deterred from entering my humble plea for more of the spirit of gaiety, more of the sincere courtesy that springs from honest, loving hearts in the relations between Socialist comrades.

Letters and Art

By ANDRE TRIDON

The Musical Season

After the hypermusical season that is staring us in the face, messenger boys and expressmen will probably cease to have those fits of St. Vitus dance in which they shake their feet while howling syncopated rag; I expect to see them by next April, those exponents of the latest in tuneful music, strike tenor-like poses on the curb and render "Celeste Aida" or "Signori, Signore, scusate me."

With four grand opera companies in town for periods ranging from eight to thirty-five weeks, we shall be saturated with opera. The Metropolitan will once more give us the hackneyed things which barrel organs have made infamous, with one or two moderately successful novelties at the end of the season.

I hope Campanini's presence at the head of the Chicago-Philadelphia company will not cause us to miss Andreas Dippel, thanks to whose aggressiveness Chicago, Philadelphia and New York heard something a little more recent than "Huguenots" and "Lucia."

Then we have the Century Opera. This new home of opera owes its existence to several factors. Sargent and Milton Aborn, two shrewd and silent old fellows who have been giving opera at low prices everywhere from Yazoo City to Brooklyn and who, therefore, must know pretty well the operatic pulse of the nation, had decided this year to invade New York City. They had almost completed arrangements with Felix Isman to build them a theatre for that special purpose and they were going to take a ten-year lease of the building. Just at that time there was heard some stirring and snickering on the steps of the Victoria where immortal Oscar is wont to sun himself while pulling at his hand-rolled stogies.

Mr. Otto Kahn and a few Metropolitan directors who love music, but love Oscar much less, got together and decided to spoil Hammerstein's game. They hit upon a perfectly absurd idea, but one that was bound to thrill jingo hearts: Opera in English. If they had said, "Opera at low prices," the thought

behind their "noble undertaking" would have been apparent. Opera in English was a convenient cloak.

They approached the Aborns and made it possible for them to secure that monument to the artistic stupidity of moneybags, the New Theatre. And on September 15th the curtain went up on the first act of "Aida." Within thirty-five weeks we shall hear thirty-five operas or so, from the "Tales of Hoffmann" to "Salome," from "Martha" to "Parsifal." Quite a programme. And tickets will cost from two dollars to 25 cents. For that price the Aborns offer to the public a few remarkably good singers, a few not quite so good, a brilliant conductor, a horrible chorus, a more or less disorderly ballet, and a frankly inferior orchestra.

The orchestra consists of only fifty men and for modern compositions that is absolutely insufficient, as it only provides for two clarinettes, two oboes, two trumpets, etc., and compels the conductor to leave out all the parts for third instruments. Finally, although the musicians' union rates the Century as a second class opera house, frequent rehearsals would cost money. . . . In the hands of a man less experienced than Szendrei, the young Hungarian who conducted Wagner's works with the Chicago-Philadelphia company, singers, ballet, chorus and orchestra would get into a fearful tangle. Fortunately Szendrei is cool-headed and knows his scores by heart; that enables him to keep his eye constantly on the more or less heterogeneous ensemble which is constantly trying to get away from him.

All these defects will be remedied in time. The second season of the Century Opera will be very satisfactory, I am sure. Ballet, chorus and orchestra will learn their parts while "trying it" on the public eight times a week. And among the principals there are really fine singers. Kathleen Howard has a beautiful contralto voice, is a clever actress, and the experience she gained on the German and English operatic stage, where she was very successful, stands her in good stead. Lois Ewell is a magnificent soprano whose talent thus far had remained buried in the service of small opera companies. Elizabeth Amsden, another gifted soprano, comes from the Boston Opera House where she had held only small parts. Mary Jordan, a Junoesque young woman with a magnificent stage presence and a very musical voice, will do remarkably well as soon as she acquires the necessary experience. She is a newcomer in the field of opera, and as an oratorio singer could hardly be expected to develop the action and fire that certain parts demand.

The men are not quite as good as the women. Morgan Kingston and Walter Bergman are pleasing tenors as long as their voice lasts, but they are apt to show fatigue at the end of the last act. Stage fright is giving John Bardsley no end of trouble. By the time this article goes to press Louis Kreidler will have shown himself to be the best baritone singer of the company. Alfred Kaufman, basso, is doing notable work.

As I said before, the training all these singers are receiving now from the mere fact of their continuous appearances will develop very rapidly their latent powers. Some of them show temperament; some don't; this does not prove that the latter haven't any; several of them have been wasting their life singing in church or with oratorio societies, and nothing could deaden more surely whatever inner fire an artist may have. When we behold the splendid group of women the Century Opera has revealed to us, we feel heartsick at the thought of the countless others, who, less fortunate or less aggressive, have drifted into teaching or keeping house for a provider; unfitted for the star work the Metropolitan requires, they couldn't bear the thought of the sloppy singing little road companies are satisfied with and for which they are paid starvation wages. I say starvation wages, for after a singer has paid her accompanist, her music bill, her advertising bill, her dressmaker, her throat specialist, her press agent, there is very little left even out of a large salary.

The fact that every opera is to be sung in English is not of transcendent interest. English is a vile language to sing in, as too many of its vowel sounds are quite blunt musically, and no note, however purely emitted, could soar very high when dragging along the dead weight of a *th*. Furthermore, librettos are so inane that little pleasure is derived from understanding their exaggerated, pompous, stilted platitudes. Finally some librettos, like those of Wagner's operas, were written with the aim to preserve the most perfect mental and phonetic harmony between music and text. Why then ask an underpaid librettist to vie with the Master, handicapped as he is by the fact that he is to translate the text from a singable language into an unsingable one? The result is that Brunhilde says to Wotan: "*Thou, who this love within my breast inspired,*" or "*Soften thy wrath,*" and other horrors.

Of course we find bankers a-plenty on the board of the Century Opera House. We fail to find one poet, though almost all operas are written in verse; one painter, although the scenery has something to do with the effect a work produces; we don't

even find one musician. . . . In this age of specialization, what would Mr. Otto Kahn say of a banking house managed by literateurs? The feudal spirit is still rampant among us. Mr. Otto Kahn, having successfully launched several bond issues, is perfectly fitted to tell us what our musical diet shall consist of. Thus the baron of the year 1000, having repelled successfully some other baron who wanted to prey on his serfs, set a norm for the conduct of every slave in every act of his life, and in virtue of the *Droit du Seigneur* he even had the right to father the serf's first-born.

Hammerstein is fortunately immune to the feudal bacillus, and so is Andreas Dippel who, sooner or later, will also raise the standard of revolt in the operatic world. Hammerstein is once more to open an opera house. Thanks to him we shall hear some new works; we shall feel that music is forging ahead as fast as every other art, a fact Gatti-Casazza and his bankers never helped us much to realize. Whether the Hammerstein house is on Lexington Avenue or on 34th Street, we will go there with keen expectation and I think we shall seldom be disappointed. Not only will Hammerstein bring new works, but also new artists. Thus far the conductor and the singers he has engaged are unknown in this country, but so were Campanini and Tetrizzini before he imported them.

It is only through an overdose of opera such as we shall have this winter that any advance will be brought about in that musico-dramatic form of art. People must, through familiarity with it, lose the awe that opera inspires in them owing to the fact that it is accompanied by a display of precious stones, costly gowns and well-massaged flesh on the part of the wealthy. Few people enjoy operas; they only enjoy sitting in the Metropolitan. Few operas indeed are enjoyable; three-fourths of them are deadly bores; to concede that, however, sounds to many like a painful admission of social inferiority; and in order to admire something genuinely, they go into raptures over Caruso's voice.

We must first get rid of that feeling toward opera. When opera is no more fashionable than coffee and rolls, people will select operas as they do coffee and rolls. At least they do not bother to find out whether Mr. Otto Kahn uses Java or Mocha. Let people hear inferior opera because they like it; that they should hear it, however, because a banker said they should, is preposterous in the extreme; and that they shouldn't hear "*Salome*" because Anne Morgan objected to it cannot be qualified except in unprintable Anglo-Saxon monosyllables.

While the Century Opera was encouraged by spiteful narrowness, it will do good work and defeat beautifully the spiteful and narrow minds who helped start it. We should never inquire into the motives of art. Art is like fire; it may destroy, but it does not leave pestilence in its wake.

The Curse of Sociability

A few months ago I wrote somewhere that our young novelists were fizzling one after another and I included Jack London in the list of fizzles. Not the Jack London of "The Call of the Wild," but the Jack London of say "The Valley of the Moon." From Glen Ellen, California, came a mighty shot that caught me between the eyes: I was a damned fool; this was followed by an invitation to spend a week on Jack's ranch. I answered. Jack answered calling me among other things a maggot (mark the word), and generally speaking, we had a delightful time of it; at least I had.

I knew there was something the matter with London's stuff. His vocabulary was apparently gone, his imagination seemed to be failing him, he repeated himself frightfully, his stories were becoming as safe as those of any popular novelist.

Read "John Barleycorn" (The Century Co., New York), and you will soon enough discover what ails him. He will tell you himself, and the tragedy of it is he does not even seem to know how far gone he is. I admit, of course, that his narrative is straight and not rouged or hennaed for effect.

London never liked booze and to this day can never get over the unpleasant sharpness of the first gulp, but he can't get along without it. About three million times London tells us that he doesn't have "the chemistry of an alcoholic," that he drinks whiskey for the "kick" there is to it, and that too much of it sends "maggots" into his brain. If that chemistry, that kick and those maggots could be edited two million and a half times out of the book, it would be more readable.

Also he tells us that besides never liking the stuff he never really needed it. When he slaved endless days at coal passing, outdoing two normal passers, he never thought of drink. It was in ease and idleness that he developed the thirst that has grown to be a craving. At last the cat is out of the bag. Why did London drink the 19 rounds when he and the 18 other fools

stood at the bar after their Pacific cruise? He wanted to be as much a jolly good fellow as anyone of those 18 asses. Why did he go on that beer bust with cheap London down-and-outers? To prove that he was as much of a drinker as anyone of those pieces of jetsam. Why did he drink with the oyster pirates? To be sociable. Why does he drink now with his visitors? To be sociable. Not once in the 343 pages of "John Barleycorn" does London have the courage to damn sociability good and hard. Drink is too accessible, he repeats *ad nauseam*. Miserable excuse. Ice cream is accessible even more so than whiskey.

Sociability demands alcohol and sociability is above discussion. Why? Who will deliver us from the tyranny of the absurd word? Who will deliver us from the sociable idiots, thieves of our time and energy, with whom we have to compromise intellectually for fear a discussion might delay their departure; deliver us from the gregarious feasts at which food talk and drink talk are even more depressing than the overfeeding and overdrinking they entail; deliver us from the vapid chat around the fire place or the flat-gilled radiator, which deprives us of a brisk walk along the street or of valuable rest; deliver us from those conventional occasions upon which, to please our host, we must spoil our stomachs by absorbing either coarse, savage drinks, such as whiskey or gin, or such abominable Anglo-Saxon concoctions as root beer, sarsaparilla and ginger ale, all the while munching dusty crackers or peanut sandwiches. I even remember a feast of beerless welsh rarebit and cocoa.

Does Jack London still enjoy those things when his knocking about every country and every sea has shown him the broader side of the world's life, or does the former roustabout enjoy going to "people's" houses and having "people" at his own house? I wonder. These are the things, then, that have led him to drink. No wonder they did. Oh, Jack! cease to abuse alcohol. It isn't alcohol that is troubling you, it's people, the small, nice, human, uninteresting, hearty, loyal, trashy people with whom you drink. Alcohol may have something to do with your temporary downfall, but people have had and are having more to do with it. For one thing your friends should be damned. They have killed your wonderful vocabulary. Only a solitary man can preserve a beautiful choice of words. As soon as you express your thoughts in conversation you are compelled to relinquish all the fine shadings and to use the words that go with primitive uncultured whiskey or farmer-like root beer.

"John Barleycorn" is not an arraignment of alcohol. It is,

or rather it should be, a frank, open arraignment of the miserable, boresome fetish called sociability.

May I suggest a cure for London's ailment? To live in some large city where "people" are so cheap a commodity that we don't go to their houses nor let them come too often to our lodgings, and we enter sociability under the heading of dissipation or profit and loss. Some day London is bound to find people out; some day his ego will grow to such size that he will no longer try to be as much of a drinker as any of his callers; he will no longer remember people and places "glass in hand." And then we shall have once more the London we idolized, whose memory we still idolize, who stood before us as an example of simple virility in life and in art.

W. S. Gilbert

By FELIX GRENDON

Mr. Goldberg has undertaken the rather thankless task of gratifying a curiosity that does not exist. In his study of William Schwenck Gilbert,* he exhumes the corpses of Gilbert's defunct plays and librettos and obliges us to take a peep at them. "Death owing to natural causes" being the only verdict our post-mortem examination justifies, we bring this in and escape as speedily as we may.

We are tempted to tell Mr. Goldberg that he is well-intentioned. But we shall say nothing so malicious, for he deals entertainingly with the surviving librettos and even writes imaginatively about the evolution of a full-grown "Mikado" or "Pinafore" from an embryo "Bab Ballad." It is nevertheless unfortunate that he conceived and executed this *Handbook of Gilbert and the Gilbert-Sullivan Operas* on the strength of a conviction that Gilbert was an audacious social reformer and fearless satirist whose wittiest quips and maddest levities terrorized the consciences of the tyrant, the hypocrite, the pandar, and the snob.

* Sir William S. Gilbert. *A Study in Modern Satire*, by Isaac Goldberg, A. M., Ph. D. (Harvard). Stratford Publishing Company, Boston, 1913.

The truth is that Gilbert's raillery is to real satire what comic opera is to "grand" opera, or what the caricatures of de Zayas or Hy. Mayers are to the narratives of Hogarth. This is not to disparage Gilbert, de Zayas, or Mayers—all masters in their own departments. It is simply to state that Gilbert was no more a satirical moralist, than Sullivan was a Wagner or a Strauss. No doubt, in such delicious badinage as "when a coster isn't jumping on his mother, he loves to live like any other man," deeper truths are meant than meet the ear. But we need only read Gilbert's satirical passages in their full context to understand how he aimed his shafts at individual foibles rather than at social crimes. Even so, he sweetens the philosophic pill until it is ninety-nine parts sugar and only one part philosophy, so that the sugar no longer merely gilds the philosophy but the philosophy lies embalmed in the sugar. Our Wallace Irwins, Walt Masons, and other newspaper rhymesters, with weaker inspiration and less ingenuity than Gilbert, do the same thing every day.

What is Gilbert's claim upon the regard of the intellectual world? It must be admitted that his eye for the profounder ironies of our civilization was far from penetrating. He could whimsically draw the attention of people to the discrepancy between their professions and their conduct. But the very nature of society was such that people couldn't live up to their professions, even if they would; or that their professions wouldn't be worth living up to, even if they could—these deeper matters were beyond the scope of Gilbert's artistic power.

But Mr. Goldberg wastes his time when he tries to make out a high intellectual case for Gilbert and couples that author's name insinuatingly with the names of Shaw, Molière, and Swift. Why quarrel with what Gilbert is not, when what he is, is all to the good? For he is a master of the burlesque, the comic rhyme, and the light satirical verse, and his enduring monument was long since erected in "The Bab Ballads and Songs of a Savoyard." There is a Latin proverb which says that nothing is more odious than too much learning. The reader who scoffs at this proverb will probably yearn to acquaint himself with Gilbert's many plays in prose and verse. Before he does so, let him consult the summaries in Mr. Goldberg's handbook. He might go farther and fare worse.

THE NEW ENGLAND FARMER

By Harry Kemp

Along a slope of stony ground, where niggard nature yields
A scant return from rocky ridge and age-exhausted fields,
I see a farmer turning slow behind a yoke of steers
The furrow that his fathers clove in far colonial years.

The railway is an incident to him who turns the clod;
He has the limp that Cato had when Tuscan fields he trod—
Coeval he with Romulus whose plow was sire to Rome,
Though snugly set 'mid apple trees he owns his Yankee home.
Last scion of a hardy line whose children run to seed,
He ever goads the wretched soil to half-supply his need;
Alone he toils from day to day—his offspring dead, or gone
To wrestle for existence in the million-peopled town,—
Dyspeptic, full of ancient tales of things that used to be,
Of times more thriving, brighter suns, he chatters garrulously—
And then again a silence falls. . . . He turns to face once more
The battle with the barren land his fathers drained of yore.

LOVE'S COMMUNION

By LOUISE W. KNEELAND

When day beyond earth's distant rim concealing
Her glorious star, to night resigns the peaceful hour,
Then through the silent shades of evening stealing,
Thy soul exhales its fragrance like some mystic flower.

O, gently, as to fond hearts recollections
Of old time pleasures come and May-day joy,
Now come to me divinely-hued reflections
Of all the spirit's bliss when freed from life's alloy.

All tender things, all beautiful and holy
Do from thy inmost thought enfold and comfort me,
Thine is this hour, Belov'd, and O, thine solely,
Secure from earthly ill, the heart that longs for thee.

Doctor Braun

By PER HALLSTRÖM

(Translated by Jacob Wittmer Hartmann)

Translator's Note on Hallström.—Although nothing from the pen of Per Hallström has ever before appeared in English, he is a writer who ought to be of interest to Americans because a number of his short stories deal with the life of the intellectual proletariat in America. For there is no doubt that the formation of this intellectual proletariat is rapidly progressing, and in a fashion it has been with us always, in the persons of those educated foreigners whose culture has been so bound up with their own language and customs as to render adaptation to American conditions very difficult. Probably much of the very best material that Europe has sent us in the way of new recruits to our population, has been wasted as far as mental contact with the rest of the nation is concerned, because of this barrier that the diversity of language raises between men. It is with this foreign element of our impoverished classes that Hallström's American sketches, of which the following is an example, are most concerned.

Per Hallström, who is still living in Sweden, was born in Stockholm on Sept. 29, 1866. His education was largely of a scientific nature (chemistry and engineering), and at the age of 22 he settled down in Chicago, Ill., as a factory chemist. During the period of this residence in Chicago he probably acquired most of his familiarity with the life of the poor in America. In 1891 he returned to Sweden, where he has been living, engaged chiefly in literary work, ever since. He is one of the numerous band of Europeans who have returned to that continent after a stay in America and find that they like the old home best. But Hallström's temperament is too much that of the melancholy observer to call forth any very bitter comments on the new civilization, such as were made by the Norwegian Knut Hamsun, who visited our country about the same time, in the latter's book on "Spiritual Life in America" (no English translation).

Hallström has not the titanic childishness of the aged Strindberg, who retained the faculty of indiscriminate rage to the very end of his life. But he resembles his more celebrated fellow-countryman in his ability to make correct naturalistic observations in spite of a strong idealistic bias. The delicate irony of his disposition is almost always apparent, yet it does not prevent him from seeing and describing the facts under observation with a neatness that would make them serve as well in a story with quite a different aim. His treatment, both of humans and landscapes, is predominantly analytic. He is one of the most mature writers of the present day: his titles and his epithets are seldom sensational, and the impression given by all of his work is that it belongs to that limited catalog of things that are written for men and women above thirty. Which some may interpret as meaning that it contains some pretty strong stuff; nothing could be further from the truth than such a surmise, however; the following story, simple as it is, is more objectionable, conventionally speaking, than most of his other short stories.

"Doctor Braun" was written twenty years ago, and was published in 1894 as the first story of a collection called "Birds Astray" (*Vilsna Faglar*). The excellent German translation of this collection, *Verirrte Vögel*, omits "Doctor Braun". If this omission was due to the innocent joke on the Hohenzollerns, it is a sad light on the intellectual outlook in the "Land der Dichter und Denker." The Insel-Verlag of Leipzig issues a number of beautifully translated and printed volumes by Hallström: *Der tote Fall*, *Frühling*, *Eine alte Geschichte*, and others.

The Hohenzollern dynasty has had many serious enemies and has usually made short work of them, but never did any of them fare so badly as Doctor Braun.

"The King of Hanover," he used to say, "lost his crown, but then, he had no head to put it on; Napoleon III lost many batallions, but I am sure he had more than one pair of trousers remaining; soon I shall have none, and what shall I then have to live for?"

His dejected glance bore witness to sleepless nights and bitter care, and the garment mentioned also had traces of his solicitous attention. Doctor Braun's procedure was like Münchhausen's with the rope attached to one of the Moon's horns. It was to cut off upward and splice on downward, but the method cannot be applied indefinitely. The color of the garment also was a source of annoyance, for the streets of Philadelphia are anything but clean, and Doctor Braun never took a vehicle. What was he doing in Philadelphia? Why wasn't he coming up for his Doctor's examination at Heidelberg? Alas, why do they celebrate the anniversary of the Battle of Sedan in Germany? The celebration makes many old embers glow afresh, timid fellows whose insignificance makes them prefer the side streets feel themselves swelling with the consciousness of national greatness, but in Doctor Braun's mind the day was connected with the memory of two brothers "who croaked in the general slaughter," and, in addition, he had drunk some rather poor beer that evening.

Bad beer always had this peculiar effect on him: the first swallow made him angry, and mindful of the homeopathic doctrine that all ills must be dispelled by similar ills, he would work himself into a senseless fury, which was the only application he ever made of homeopathic theory.

So he expressed himself rather freely to his friends in the café, spoke of "a couple of slaughtered brothers," about the Royal Imperial family, which he found just a little too numerous—"why, they multiply like rats,"—and of other matters that he soon forgot.

It is unfortunate that poor beer should still be served anywhere in the city of Hanover, but shall the Hohenzollern dynasty be permitted to suffer for this? Certainly not. A few of Doctor Braun's friends, recognizing this, put him onto a train for Hamburg as fast as they could, very much to the dismay of two uniformed gentlemen who called at Doctor Braun's

lodgings the next day to discuss the political situation with him, and who even traveled after him as far as the steamer-pier, unfortunately arriving too late, however, to dissuade him from going to America, whither he was setting out in order to qualify and practice as a physician there.

The diploma was in his pocket, somewhat worn at the edges, but how about his practice? "How on earth can I get up a practice? Look at my trousers! I've got only one instrument, a catheter; and only one book, an old obstetrical handbook, which the second-hand dealer refused to take, as he considered it immoral. I have a room in 47th Street; but who would call on a doctor there?"

"The other day I wrote on a sheet of paper: Doctor Braun, 10-12 A. M. Might just as well have written: P. M. Happened to have a butt and sat down in a corner to smoke it. I wasn't in bad humor, although it did seem to me that I was maliciously lying in wait for some one, so I didn't sit boldly in the middle of the room. First I heard light mincing steps, the typewriter from No. 26; would she call? What luck! But no, when I saw her pretty little head move across the window, I also perceived that she had been laughing at my shingle. Then a child's step. Sudden illness perhaps, father out, so they send the little boy. Quite right! I hear a voice: 'Doctor,' I am about to run out; the voice continues: 'B-r-a-u-n, B-r-a'—the boy was spelling, but evidently couldn't make it out; he therefore began to sing it and called two other boys to help him. There stood the rascals having a fine time with my name and my hours; I felt like going out and giving them a little massage. Time passed, cigar went out, no one showed up. I was angry at myself, when two o'clock came, for not having written three or four instead. But although I rewrote the thing several times, it was no use. Got a cigar?"

He had a few friends, all poor, but occasionally they blew him to a meal and gave advice: "Why don't you become a laborer? At least it's a living." But he felt that this would be too humiliating. One afternoon he dropped in on an acquaintance who was a clerk in a drug store. It was a gloomy day, and the fog without seemed to adhere to his long brown beard and his careless clothes. With his little face and his large moist eyes he looked like a tuberculous horse.

There was a coffee-pot on the table, which he raised over his head, keeping the spout in his mouth. "Merely Brazilian!

Never anything else! Ugh, grounds! And now, my court and body apothecary, how about a sandwich?" And while chewing it: "I can't enjoy it; I'm still too angry; just think of what I've had to bear! I went to see a physician of my acquaintance; for lunch, in fact, and the rascal proposes that I become a homeopath! These dogs need intelligent men: 'One drop stirred in fifteen liters of water, and then two milligrams of the mixture in one wineglass.' They give you free board and all you need, just for engaging in their damned decimal calculations and dividing up diseases and pills for the future. 'That would be something for you,' he said, 'an easy life; think it over.' I felt as if I had the entire pharmacopoeia in my mouth and couldn't spit it out. I couldn't afford to be insolent, for the lunch was still ahead of us, but I said that homeopathy was as incomprehensible to me as the sacraments, and that I didn't believe in it. He must have been angry; I saw him fall into such deep thought that the lunch was lost in abstraction, and so I left him, ashamed at not having said anything stronger. Got another sandwich?"

The druggist felt sorry for him and sent for some beer, which made Doctor Braun feel better. With a borrowed comb he smoothed his beard before the mirror.

"I once had a funny job—this proposition makes me think of it—traveled around with a baroness, who was fond of me, and I didn't dislike her either. Theoretically I had charge of the children, but as she occasionally beat them herself, I didn't have much to do. At Bingen she wanted me to row her out on the Rhine. The current is rather dangerous there, but the thought of the danger made her all the more eager—romantic folly, of course. Thoughts of shipwreck, rescue and noble feelings! I said: 'My dear baroness, you love emotion and tears in your eyes, but don't forget the snuffles, the tears of the nose! And imagine my falling on my knees, on the pebbles, just as your eyes reopen in consciousness! Have you ever seen a man on his knees when his trousers were drenched? It's not at all romantic, it's excruciating.' That was the end. I wonder whether she really wanted to see me on my knees in that condition. Give me a little carbona."

A few weeks later Doctor Braun had a run of luck. He got a few little jobs from other doctors, the dirty work at some operations, and was in pocket-money. He paid for his room, bought cigars, and began to look into the tailor shops, where

garments and diagrams to prove their durability were displayed, but then came a reaction. One day he ran across a friend (it happened to be the Day of Sedan) for whose benefit he roused himself temporarily from his despair, in order to blurt out the following:

"For what I have done to-day I shall surely go to heaven! But what a misfortune! It's all up with me! The doctors had handed over a fellow to me for treatment, broke his leg a few weeks ago, and I was to put him through a final set of rubbings. I'd have had a visit a day, enough to live on, but—can you imagine such fools?—the leg wasn't healed, broken lengthwise like a split tree-trunk, and if I had got at it, the leg would have been ruined. I was on my knees, ready to begin, when I noticed it, but after thinking it over a bit, I explained the thing to him. He did not even pay me for the visit, for what had I done to earn it? The two doctors are naturally down on me because of their stupidity. It's all up with me."

He could not refrain from talking about his benevolence, which he developed along very general lines: duty to one's fellow-men; he felt better when talking and thought he deserved a little encouragement. But he got gloomier and gloomier, and soon surprised himself speaking of his own person in the past tense, in a cheerful, indulgent tone, as if he were discussing some dear friend departed. "Yes," he concluded, "yes, my friends, it's all up with Friedrich Wilhelm Braun. He wasn't permitted to stay in the Old World because he was not on good terms with his Christian names and in the New World because his trousers weren't creased. His temper was light and cheerful, as his diet was very light, and his eye was clear and sharp, for he never drank more than he could stand. To the last his heart was proud and independent, and he forgave his enemies, for he knew not what they did. Up here, where tailors' bills do not exist, no one can violate his spirit, and we may therefore assume that he is soon to migrate to a higher sphere. But here is our apothecary with a face so cheerful that it seems to forbode a cheerful talk—and maybe a seidel of beer. Going to treat, Mr. Poisoner?"

The drug clerk ran to meet them in the doorway, a newspaper in his hand. "I'll treat as much as you like." Braun's face beamed with joy. The clerk went on: "Have you heard the great news? Our empress to-day presented her consort, the kingdom, and the empire, with—"

Doctor Braun turned pale. "What! Triplets! Three at a time!"

"No joking!—to the great joy of all, with a bouncing—"

And then the door closed with a bang. Doctor Braun's coat-tails were caught in the crevice and he bent down to loosen them, and then, his head still bent, he disappeared around the corner. His hat was so small for his head that it didn't really come down far over his forehead.

I don't know whether he is still living. He always carried some aconitia with him in his pocket-book, in fact, it was the only thing he had in it.

Correspondence between Marx and Engels 1844—1883

The attention of the American Socialist public should be called to one of the most important of recent German publications, namely the correspondence between Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels during the years 1844-1883 inclusive.

The work of collating and editing the correspondence between the two founders of scientific Socialism was performed by August Bebel and Edward Bernstein, whom Engels in his will constituted his literary executors, expressing in this connection the wish that the correspondence between Marx and himself might be given to the public. The editors had the co-operation of Franz Mehring, in his capacity of confidential representative of Laura Lafargue, Marx's literary heir.

The chief historical value of the correspondence consists in this, that (to use the words of Bernstein) it forms a supplement to the works and essays published by the authors themselves, it reveals the motives for the writing and publication of those works, it affords a deeper insight into the intellectual life, the scientific labors and political influence of the writers and hence contributes to a better comprehension of their work; it gives us accurate information as to their more intimate judgments upon friends and enemies, upon social and literary events, and as to changes in some of these judgments.

The correspondence is published in four octavo volumes, and is arranged chronologically. The first volume covers the years from 1844 to 1853, these being divided into two sections entitled "The First Years of the League" and "The London Exile to the Dissolution of the Communist League."

The second volume (1854 to 1860) deals with the "Crimean War," "The Commercial Crisis of 1857," "New York *Tribune*," the "Italian War."

The third volume (1861 to 1867) is divided as follows: "The American Civil War," "The Liberal Era," "Schleswig-Holstein," "Austro-Prussian War," "Lassallean Movement," "North-German Reichstag," "Capital."

The fourth volume (1868 to 1883) embraces the following subjects: "Party Evolution in Germany," "Dühring," "The Franco-Prussian War," "Engels' Residence in London, 1870," "Marx's Illness and Death."

The publishers of this important work are J. H. W. Dietz Nachfolger, of Stuttgart, well known for their publication of most important Socialist works of all kinds. Being unwilling to make this work a subject for speculation, the publishers have limited the edition to a few hundred copies, each sharing equally the cost of production. The price of the four volumes is 40 marks (\$10.00) in paper, with an additional charge of 4 marks if bound volumes are desired.

R. P.

A Protest

To the Central Committee of Local New York, New York City.

Comrades:—Through the Socialist press and otherwise it has come to the notice of the Board of Directors of the New Review Publishing Association that the Central Committee of Local New York (Manhattan) has promulgated an order forbidding the Branches of the Local from selling or distributing the *New Review* at public or propaganda meetings.

While comprehending perfectly the motives underlying this order, the Board of Directors of the New Review Publishing Association desires to protest vigorously against it. The members of the Board, who are also members of the Socialist Party, deny the right of any authority in the party, even the highest, to dictate to the smallest subdivision of the party what kind of So-

cialist literature it may or may not use in its propaganda of Socialism. This Board regards the action of the Central Committee as a usurpation of authority which, if permitted to stand, threatens to destroy within the party all freedom of speech and press and to suppress all honest and free discussion.

Free speech and free press are the most fundamental of all democratic rights, antedating the birth of the Socialist movement. And no progressive movement, least of all the labor movement or the Socialist Party, can thrive without the freest discussion of principles, policies, tactics and methods of procedure.

It has been asserted that this act of the Central Committee is not a violation of free press because it relates only to public meetings. The members of this Board deny that any valid distinction can be drawn between propaganda and other meetings. In the first place, the sale and distribution of literature takes place almost exclusively at propaganda meetings, hence to prohibit the sale of the *NEW REVIEW* or any other publication at such propaganda meetings is equivalent to prohibiting its sale at practically all meetings. Secondly, to prohibit a minority from disseminating its views among those not yet members of the party is practically to prohibit that minority from propagating the ideas of Socialism in accordance with its own lights. In the Roman Catholic Church the reading of the Bible by the laity is discouraged by the Church authorities. Hitherto we have not been accustomed to think of audiences at Socialist meetings as divided into two classes, of which one (party members) may read certain publications with profit, while the other (non-members) are to be denied access to these publications.

The members of this Board realize that to some narrow and inexperienced minds it may seem harmful to circulate among the general public publications in which appear occasional criticisms of party principles and tactics. But this view is based on two false assumptions. First, that the Socialist Party is a petty sect of the elect and not a mass movement of the working class, or striving to become such. Secondly, the assumption that internal differences in the Socialist Party can be kept from the knowledge of the general public by an artificial process of smothering. Both of these assumptions are totally false. The falsity of the first requires no argument. In regard to the second it is only necessary to call attention to the fact that the subject matter of the article in the *NEW REVIEW* that appears to have led to the high-handed action of the majority of the Central Committee has been widely discussed, not only in the Socialist but also in the non-Socialist and capitalist press.

In conclusion the members of this Board reiterate their protest and demand that the high-handed and usurpatory order in question be reconsidered and rescinded. The *NEW REVIEW* is published to further the cause of Socialism and the Socialist Party. There may now and then be an honest difference of opinion as to the advisability of publishing this or that article, but there is never any justification for promulgating anathemas.

As affects the subdivisions of Local New York, we leave it to them to assert their rights. We speak only as members of the Board of Directors of the *New Review* Publishing Association and as individual members of the Socialist Party.

Fraternally yours,

ALEXANDER FRASER, President.
 BERTHA W. HOWE, Treasurer.
 ROBERT M. LACKEY, Secretary.

New York, Sept. 24, 1913.