

---

***"A little more verification, a little less assertion, would be so much to the health of the Socialist hypothesis."***

"When the NEW REVIEW arrives upon the heights to which it is destined," writes Max Eastman, "I trust we may establish in connection with it a bureau of economic research. It would be worth much to revolutionary science."

And that is not all we hope to do when we "arrive." We have already begun with the work of sincere and fundamental criticism which must precede any real unanimity in thought and action. In that work, which the Socialist movement in America at this period most needs, the NEW REVIEW will continue to take a courageous and responsible part.

The development of a sound and original theoretical literature, germane to our economic, social and political conditions and temperament, to back up and give discipline to the current activity of the Socialist movement, is another work to which the NEW REVIEW pledges itself to lend its strongest efforts. The American movement should lead the International in the power and originality of our Socialist literature.

The discovery of more and more new writers capable of expressing original thought in the social and economic field with precision and power, is one of the chief opportunities of such a magazine as the NEW REVIEW, and it is one which we shall not neglect.

***We are co-operating to make these things come true. Will you co-operate with us?***

*Louis C. Fraina,*  
Business Manager.

---

# *The* New Review

---

Vol. II.

AUGUST, 1914

No. 8

---

## A FEMINIST SYMPOSIUM.

### FEMINISM

BY MARIE JENNEY HOWE

No one doubts that women are changing. We need an appropriate word which will register this fact. The term feminism has been foisted upon us. It will do as well as any other word to express woman's effort toward development.

No one movement is feminism. No one organization is feminism. All woman movements and organizations taken together form a part of feminism. But feminism means more than these. It means woman's struggle for freedom. Its political phase is woman's will to vote. Its economic phase is woman's effort to pay her own way. Its social phase is woman's revaluation of outgrown customs and standards. Feminism includes the misdirected as much as the well directed efforts of women.

Anti-Suffrage is a phase of feminism. It is the struggle of conservative women to defend their temperament. For the sake of conviction they enter public life. They are impelled to study, speak, write, publish and organize. Anti-Suffrage is the effort of a group of women to express themselves. The effort is developing. It redeems them from inertia and makes them part of that process of growth which is feminism.

English militancy is equally a phase of feminism. It is the same struggle on the part of a different group to defend a different temperament.

Feminism is not limited to any one cause or reform. It strives for equal rights, equal laws, equal opportunity, equal wages, equal standards, and a whole new world of human equality.

But feminism means more than a changed world. It means a changed psychology, the creation of a new consciousness in women.

The essence of this new consciousness is woman's refusal to be specialized to sex. The evolved feminist does not find all of life in a love affair. She knows that any normal woman can recover from an unrequited passion. She is able to be happy though unmarried.

She does not adjust her life according to the masculine standard of what is womanly. She decides for herself what is womanly and what is natural. She thinks for herself. She lives according to her own convictions. If married, she retains her own identity. Underneath her wifehood and motherhood she knows herself a human being with human capacities for work, service and impersonal ideals.

Woman's effort toward freedom cannot be won without man's willingness. The awakening of women involves an adjustment on the part of men. Feminism strives to put right whatever is wrong in the changing relation between men and women. Many leading feminists are men. Men are helping woman to evolve. In so doing they are helping their own evolution. The feminist evolution is the evolution of women and men. In so far as woman is behind man, it means catching up to man. And where woman is ahead of man, it means holding her own until man shall catch up to her.

Feminism is woman's part of the struggle toward humanism.  
After feminism,—humanism.

---

## FEMINISM AND SOCIALISM

BY LOUISE W. KNEELAND

The Socialist who is not a Feminist lacks breadth. The Feminist who is not a Socialist is lacking in strategy. To the narrow-minded Socialist who says: "Socialism is a working class movement for the freedom of the working class, with woman as woman we have nothing to do," the far-sighted Feminist will reply: "The Socialist movement is the only means whereby woman as woman can obtain real freedom. Therefore I must work for it." Granted the Socialist is not necessarily a Feminist, nevertheless the bona fide Feminist must be, or become, a Socialist, as an analysis of the conditions will prove.

Feminism has been called a middle class movement. And so it is, in its origin. The reason is not far to seek. The machine that binds the working class woman and her children to its wheels sets the middle class woman free from the drudgery of the old-time home and gives her unwonted leisure. A leisure hers, not in the

sterile, enervating environment of an Eastern harem, but in the complex, stimulating surroundings of modern civilization. But this of itself would be of no value to her without the ability to profit by these advantages. That this ability is hers woman's place in the larger social life of to-day gives sufficient testimony. The home no longer absorbs all her energies. She reaches out after a broader life. She struggles for what she wants, develops her capabilities, becomes ever more conscious of her power and desirous of wider fields for its exercise, at the same time arousing in her working class sister an uneasy consciousness of like demands.

Feminism is the result of human energy set free by machinery to find new outlets in a rapidly developing civilization. That its most striking manifestation takes the form of a Votes for Women campaign is but natural, considering that the movement itself is a middle class product and that political power is the most effective weapon the middle class possesses for the attainment of its ends. The ends in this case are the enlargement of individual opportunity for middle class women and an influential voice in matters that affect the general status of women as well as in the enactment and administration of humanitarian reforms. And in conjunction with this we must not forget that political power offers many opportunities for efficient self-support, which a constantly increasing economic pressure makes desirable to some of these rebels in a class accustomed to comfortable incomes.

This middle class origin and character it is that accounts for much of the antagonism to the Feminist movement among timid and cautious Socialists in and out of the Party. We should expect, of course, that a working class movement would be more or less hostile to middle class activity of any kind, especially when that activity seeks an extension of political power. And if middle class men fear and dislike the incursion of women of their own class into what has hitherto been considered their own peculiar province, politics—how much more must working men resent the intrusion of the increasingly capable and dominant middle class women into the working class movement. A few such women, it is true, are a valuable asset, because of their energy and ability. But the acquisition of any considerable number of them must be regarded with even more apprehension than an infusion of middle-class men. The latter give to the Party, as is well known, a reformist cast that weakens and confuses it, and this tendency would be still further complicated and aggravated by Feminist activities which would tend to divide the movement on sex lines. Not until the Socialist movement has reached such a degree of maturity as renders it stable enough to absorb, or co-operate with, this by-product of capi-

talism without danger to itself, can Feminism expect a friendly, helping hand from Socialist organizations. In Germany that degree of maturity seems to have been reached, and in several of the smaller European countries as well. Where this stage of development has not yet been attained, Feminism is apt to become violent, as in England, although there these conditions are aggravated by the outnumbering of the men by the women and the consequent fear on the part of some of the men of a reversal of the present sex domination.

The question now arises how in spite of all the opposition and antagonism to their movement, Feminists proceed to obtain the political power they must have, and what the ultimate outcome will be. Their main lines of attack are four. First, the appeal to woman as woman, that is, practically, to woman as a class in the sense that she as a mother performs certain special work for society which has resulted in her being treated as different from, if not inferior to, men. It is on the ground of freeing her from such discriminations and also of enabling her to protect herself and her children that this appeal is made. Second, the appeal to all those who are susceptible to the influence of a high social ideal. Third, the appeal to those to whose advantage on the political field the influence and activity of the movement can be used. Fourth, the appeal through terrorism to those who are obdurate to every other argument or influence. Who can doubt the success of efforts as varied and appeals as powerful as these when made by determined and capable women growing ever more skilful in the use of their tools?

Say, then, the vote is won. What next? The application of political power to the enlargement of opportunities for women of the middle class; the removal of all sex discriminations against woman as woman; and the carrying out of such social reforms as are possible under capitalism. And then? Then the true condition of affairs is made clear. Then it is plainly seen that the working class woman is still a working class woman who has but helped her more favored middle class sister to obtain still greater advantages, but remains herself, together with her children, in spite of all middle class reforms and the removal of sex discriminations, a slave to the capitalist machine. From this slavery there is but one thing that can set her free—Socialism, the common ownership of the means of production and distribution. And further, as the ever increasing economic pressure forces numerous members of the middle class down into the working class and accentuates competition among the remaining members of the middle class, Feminists will come to see that in spite of all the freedom they have won, and

the development of their ability, middle class women have become nothing more than upper class servants of capitalism into whose hands is confided largely (but under strict supervision) the care of the health, morals, education and recreation of the rising generation, and to a considerable extent of the public in general. A sorry task that of keeping slaves in good condition so that they may be all the more thoroughly plundered by capitalist parasites! What, considering all the circumstances, can the bona fide Feminist do but turn to Socialism?

And the narrow-minded Socialist? Oh, he has been working hard all this time to perfect those Socialist organizations that are to give woman the very freedom he doesn't want her to have.

---

## SOCIALISM AND FEMINISM

### A REPLY TO BELFORT BAX

BY MAUD THOMPSON

It need not surprise us to find over the signature of one who calls himself a Socialist the same arguments used by the advocates of chattel slavery, the opponents of popular government, and the critics of Socialism. For every social movement, especially after it is in full swing, draws to itself those who see of it only the segment which suits their temperament. They conceive of a social revolution as altering a single political or economic system without transforming those social, moral and intellectual conditions that adhere to our economic system as the flesh to the bones of the living creature. So we have in the Socialist movement some who do not believe in political democracy, some who cling to their race prejudices, and some who oppose sex equality.

For instance, in Mr. Bax's article ("Socialism and Feminism," NEW REVIEW for May) we find the suggestion that intellectual or moral inferiority to the ruling class (judged, of course, by the ruling class) is sufficient reason for excluding a group from any share in the government. The Internationalist may note also the inference that Socialism concerns itself only with nations and races "on approximately the same level of development." These notions make an excellent setting for anti-feminism, but there is no grouping that would include them in any comprehensive view of Socialism.

It is probably quite futile for their own sake to answer these

fragmentary thinkers, for the other Party members it is unnecessary, but for the masses outside the movement, whose notion of Socialism is vague at best, we must reject the segments offered under the name of the whole.

The argument of Mr. Bax's article is that feminism is not an essential part of Socialism, because Socialism implies economic and political equality between classes and nations, not between sexes. As proof of his argument, he refers (1) to the contrast between the way class differences and sex differences have arisen; (2) to the difference in goal between the movement for sex equality and the movement for class equality.

Differences between classes, he says, were "created by economic conditions and social environment"; between the sexes "we are concerned not with a sociological but with a biological difference." The difficulty here is merely a lack of definition. Sex differences which are biological are differences of sex function. Sex differences which are sociological are "created by economic conditions and social environment."

The only important difference in sexual function is that the woman bears and nurses the child. It is recognized now that the physiological differences which accompany this function are in healthy women of slight import as far as their effect on the physical or mental powers goes. Such physiological differences may, therefore, be disregarded in considering woman's social or political functions. There remains the one supreme difference of biological function, the power to bear and nurse a child. Whatever difference in social function there is between the two sexes must connect with this.

Sex privileges doubtless arose in a savage and warlike society from the unequal ability of the two sexes (due to this one difference in sex function) to adapt themselves to that form of society. Unequal physical strength can scarcely have determined the difference in the social functions of the sexes, for there are tales enough of warrior women to show that woman was not regarded as incapable of defense or even of attack. But better proof of her physical endurance is found in the heavy burden of labor which she bore throughout the ages and still bears.

Nevertheless, her sexual function did, in primitive society, limit her social functions. She who bore and nursed the children had to stay within reach of nest or lair or home. No hunt far afield for her, no long trails after the foe. To her fell naturally the agricultural and industrial duties close to home.

But among primitive people community service and the power that springs from opportunity for service was largely that of the

hunt and the chase. It was with later civilization that agriculture, industry and the home became community affairs. Government has not only come home now from the battlefield and the hunt, it is in part the home. So complex have our civic duties become, so efficient our means of communication, that every citizen, whether kept at home by a baby or at the shop by business, can do her or his full duty through some of the many channels of community life.

Yet the old alignment persists. And it will persist, like the alignment of economic class, until a social revolution casts society anew. It is the business of Feminism to adapt law and convention to the new community life and community service. And this is the business of Socialism too.

But the goal of Socialism is not merely equal opportunity, not merely the abolition of classes. So that if the abolition of classes still left any group of the people deprived of social opportunity, the goal of Socialism would not be attained. But a group of people who are deprived of the same social opportunities through exclusion from the same social privileges do constitute a subject class. In the case of woman, the dependent position of woman in the family has relegated the various members of their class to the different economic classes to which the heads of their families belonged. These cross-currents of family and social organization have separated women from each other by barriers of differing economic conditions, but brought them together again in a common economic dependence on men. This is their economic class, the class whose common economic status is a dependence within the family. To deny the possibility of more than one kind of economic class, or of a double economic dependency, is to construct a paper society on lines of theoretical simplicity instead of analyzing society as it really exists. Only by abolishing special privilege in all classes, not merely between two classes, can Socialism reach the goal of equal opportunity.

Mr. Bax's argument as to goal is as follows: Socialism aims at the extinction of classes, feminism does not aim at the extinction of sex; therefore they are not identical in goal. If goals are to be used as tests of identity, it does not seem logical to compare what one goal is with what another goal is not. The goal of feminism is not a negative. It aims at the abolition of sex privilege. The aim of Socialism is to abolish all class privilege. Feminism aims at removing one barrier to equal opportunity, Socialism at removing all. Feminism is, then, a part of Socialism, though Socialism is more than Feminism. And as Feminism means much more than the enfranchisement of women, draws in its train, in fact, all the liberty that frees the woman socially, sexually, intellectually, as well

as politically and economically; so Socialism means not merely the removing of political and economic barriers that now keep men from their true opportunity, but the opening of the gates of individual opportunity to all humanity.

## SOME ANTI-FEMINIST VAGARIES

BY FRANCES G. RICHARDS

Many persons regard the woman movement as an emergence from passivity to activity on the part of half the human race. However, except in a technical biological sense (and Lester F. Ward assails the validity of the exception) woman's passivity has been a delusion—and, sometimes at least, a snare. This is well shown in the Evelina type of eighteenth century novel, in which the author, the heroine, and the reader chase a man through three to five hundred pages of incident pre-ordained to end in his capitulation.

Heroines are different from Evelina to-day, and the immediate cause of woman's unrest (second, of course, to the economic urge), is her changing attitude toward man. She has done what Lassalle exhorted workingmen to do: she has increased her wants, or rather, education has increased them for her. And it is this change in attitude toward the matter of sex that irks the anti-Feminist man. He likes to be woman's "favorite phantom," and who can blame him? His ambition to be the leading figure in the pageant is commendable, perhaps; yet the Feminist has a case against him in that, in times past, this same anti-Feminist man has accorded woman second place and then regarded her with more or less friendly contempt because she was secondary. Thus it has been that an element of condescension, repugnant to the Feminist mind, has always been traceable in chivalry and in the sentimental arguments adduced to oppose every step in woman's advancement. And thus it has been, too, that in estimating human excellence a masculine standard has been established and those who have failed to measure up to it have been pronounced "inferior." Occasionally a world-weary pessimist has referred to the "eternal duel" between the sexes, whereupon some sentimental anti-Feminist has amended the phrase by substituting *duet* for *duel*, but usually with the subtle implication that the bass was too strong for the soprano and the soprano was inferior, anyway, because it was not bass.

The invidious masculine criterion has been employed in estimating woman physically, mentally, and morally; and your confirmed

anti-Feminist never concedes that the sexes are equal in any respect, though he (or she) may darken counsel with honeyed words of compliment. Thus, in the days when Grant Allen, Goldwin Smith, and other gentlemen of the old school, by their discussion of the woman question rendered the *North American Review*, the *Popular Science Monthly* and other American and English magazines anything but polite literature, we heard much—oh, so painfully much!—of "women's smaller heads and brains," "women's inferior nervous organization," "the futility of women's beating their little heads against the solid wall of male supremacy," and other distressing feminine disabilities. Methodists may recall, too, that when Frances Willard and another woman went to take their seats as the first women delegates to the governing body of the church, their physical disqualifications were discussed by very wise men, seriously sometimes, flippantly at others, and, I am sorry to say, indelicately upon more than one occasion.

Owing to our strictly masculine standard of human worth, the poets, from times remote, have attested woman's mental and moral inferiority. Occasionally, it is true, an Orlando has hung his chivalric effusions upon the trees. However, some sagacious European has declared that no man should write about the fair sex until he is too old to be interested in the subject; and the veriest tyro in literary criticism can see that the sonnet indited by a youth to his sweetheart's dimples is less expressive of the poet's lasting conviction than the utterances of a Dante or a Milton. Now, old Hesiod probably meant to sum up woman's mental vacuity and moral turpitude in one sound, water-tight dictum suitable as a "starter" for all future anti-Feminist argument, when he said, with admirable candor, be it admitted: "Woman is an accursed brute." And one may be sure there were in Greece gentle dames who concurred in his opinion. Again, Virgil's "*Varium et mutabile semper femina*" sounds convincing, but loses weight when one recalls that it was Æneas, not Dido, whose vows were "writ in water." But perhaps Milton ought to be regarded as the anti-Feminist laureate. The masculine standard was always present to his mind, as for example when he sang:

". . . God set thee above her, made of thee  
And for thee, whose perfection far excelled  
Hers in all real dignity."

In this Puritan press pearl we have a permanent contribution to anti-Feminist literature. Even the mild and lovely Tennyson played into the hands of the enemy, as when he thought it desirable that woman should grow more and more fit to be man's helpmeet,

"Till at last she set herself to man  
Like perfect music unto noble words."

Why the poet did not suggest that man set himself to woman we can only conjecture. Goethe, too, seems to have entertained the set-herself-to-man idea. To be sure, he credits the Woman Soul with leading us upward and on, but he also says, "A wife is a convenient loaf of brown bread." One might pursue the upward way on a diet of brown bread, but we have reason to believe that the great Johann Wolfgang preferred white bread and cake.

Sidney Lanier is said to have left the following pathetic memorandum in a note-book: "I have been in Boston. I have written a poem. It is not like the poetry of Longfellow. I am damned." Woman might make a similarly touching confession of failure: I have lived in a world of endeavor; I have made my little effort; it is not like the efforts of man; I am condemned. But before long our time-honored masculine standard will be relegated to the limbo of outworn ideas, and whereas we have known the blessed relations of mother and son, father and daughter, brother and sister, lover and sweetheart, husband and wife, with clear vision will come mutual respect and we shall achieve this also—to be friends. In other words, our love will ripen into friendship.

## DIRECT PRIMARIES

By ISAAC A. HOURWICH

The primary election laws which have lately been enacted in several States mark a new era in American politics. The control of the election machinery has been wrung from the oligarchy of party "organizations" and vested in the voters themselves. The latest to fall in line is the State of New York. At the coming election all candidates of each party will for the first time be nominated at a primary in which every voter will have the right to participate. The "organization" is at liberty to propose a candidate, but he must be approved by the voters at the party primary. If there is opposition among the party voters to the choice of the organization, an anti-organization candidate may be placed in nomination by three per cent. of the enrolled party voters. The name of the candidate receiving a plurality of the votes at the party primary is placed on the official ballot to be voted for at the general election as the official party candidate.

No doubt, the party organization will in fact continue to control the elections, by virtue of the advantage enjoyed by an organized minority over an unorganized majority. But whenever divisions arise within the ranks of the party voters, the organization will be careful to name its strongest men who may enlist the support of the voters. Nor will the stigma of disloyalty to the party attach to the opposition candidates at the primaries, since the splitting of the party vote among the competing candidates for the nomination does not jeopardize the chances of the successful party nominee at the general election.

The New York Primary Law is not free from defects, of which the most serious for the pending election is that no opportunity is afforded to the voters to enroll for the first primaries to be held under the new law. At previous elections a great many voters failed to enroll for the primaries. It is doubtful whether any of the Socialist voters, except active party workers, ever enrolled for the party primaries. This defect, however, will be cured at future elections, as every voter will have the opportunity on registration days next October to enroll for the party primaries to be held in September, 1915. This delay of nearly a year will enable the county committee of each political party to remove from the enrollment books of its official primaries the name of any voter who "is not

in sympathy with the principles of the political party with which such person is enrolled" (Election Law, §24).

The great merit of the new direct primary law is that it has in effect introduced in the State of New York the French system of elections which affords to the voter the opportunity to register his first and his second choice of candidates. The New York "primary election" corresponds to the main election in France, the "general election" corresponds to the French by-election. At the primary election every voter casts his vote for the candidates of his own party. The aggregate vote polled by all opposing candidates for the same office at the party primary forecasts the potential vote of the party at the coming general election. A "third party," having made a show of strength at the primary election, need not repeat the performance at the general election. It may as a body throw its support to one of the two candidates who have a chance of election, or its members may individually vote as they please.\*

The policy of the European Socialist parties, in those countries which have the French system of elections, has not been uniform. In Germany, where only the two candidates who have polled the highest votes at the "main election" are voted upon at the reballoting, the party organization at times, especially in the early history of the party, enjoined its members from participation in any reballoting where no Socialist Party candidate was running. The strictness of this rule, however, was soon relaxed, for the very good reason (stated by Bebel at one of the party conventions in the early '90's) that the rule could not be enforced. Liebknecht was very outspoken in his condemnation of "horse swapping," but like every other "thou shalt not," whether in religion or in criminal law, the very inhibition was the best evidence of the frequency of the transgression. It is known to every one, except to the rank and file of American Socialists, that in most European countries fusion between the Socialist and "bourgeois" (capitalistic) parties at by-elections is to-day a common practice.

The argument in favor of this policy is that a Socialist, while anxious to help swell the Socialist Party vote, is at the same time, like every other citizen, vitally interested in the political issues of the day. To have a striking example, had Taft or Roosevelt been elected president in 1912, this country would by this time have been embroiled in a war with Mexico. Will any Socialist seriously claim that this would have been a matter of indifference to an American citizen, albeit a Socialist? Under the new election law the New

\*The difference between the New York and the French law is that in France a by-election is held only in case none of the opposing candidates has polled a majority of all votes cast, whereas in New York a second election must be held in any event. This, however, is not essential.

York Socialist voter who would rather see Woodrow Wilson than Theodore Roosevelt in the White House, will cast his vote for the Socialist candidates for presidential electors at his party primaries, and for Wilson at the general election.

The New York direct primary law has a decided advantage over the Wisconsin non-partisan primary law. Under the Wisconsin law, had there been any Socialist candidate to contest with Emil Seidel for the nomination for Mayor of Milwaukee, the Socialist vote might have been so split that neither of them would have been entitled to run in the general election. Such a contingency is precluded by the New York law. The latter has also some advantage over the system of preferential voting adopted, under the new charter, in Jersey City, in that a period of five weeks intervenes between the first and the second choice in New York, which enables the voter to make his second choice with full knowledge of the chances of each candidate in the final contest. Moreover, the party organizations are given an opportunity to agree on fusion candidates for the various offices. With the abundance of elective offices in all American elections, a minority party which holds the balance of power can in this way gain some representation.

For example, the Socialist Party of the State of New York has nominated Prof. Karapetoff for the office of State Engineer and Surveyor. While this nomination doubtless confers credit upon the Socialist Party, no one expects him to be elected, and it is really a matter of indifference to the working class of this State, which party candidate will be elected Engineer and Surveyor, as the office is a purely technical one, which ought to be filled by a competitive civil service examination. At the same time it is of vital importance for the working class of New York that the Socialist Party shall be represented by a few delegates at the Constitutional Convention, whose work will govern the legislation of this State for a generation. Would it not be a fair exchange, after having cast a complimentary vote at the Socialist party primaries for Prof. Karapetoff, to swap him with some party for a few Socialist delegates to the Constitutional Convention?

I am fully cognizant of the fact that I have violently shocked the sensibilities of the Socialist Mrs. Grundy. Said the *New York Call* in the issue of April 12, 1914, in discussing the new primary law:

Many Socialists do not realize the danger to real democracy that there is in the pseudo-democracy that is sweeping the country. There is, for instance, the direct nominations and the Primary Law under which Socialists have to nominate candidates for office at the November elections. It is the rule of the people, and the rule

of the people is democracy, and the Socialist Party is a strong fighter for democracy, and yet the Socialist Party is opposed to the so-called Direct Primary Laws.

It is a political axiom that the capitalist political parties in America are hopelessly corrupt. . . . Hence, to get away from that corruption, the tendency is to get away from party rule.

The Socialist Party alone is different. It is the political expression of the majority of the people, the working class. It is democratically organized. It cannot be other than democratic in its organization. **BUT IT MUST BE ITS OWN BOSS!** The moment a capitalist Legislature permits a voice in the control of the party to those good-hearted, well-wishing outsiders who take it into their heads to vote our ticket, but who do not want to share the burden of our organization by joining it—from that moment the integrity of the party is gone, done to death by pseudo-democracy.

The Socialist Party has a goal, and to allow the general liberal outside thought to dominate the party will swerve us from the path. We must be governed by Comrades who see nothing but the class struggle to-day, and the Co-operative Commonwealth to-morrow.

In their eagerness to get the reputation for being democrats, those pseudo-democrats who are running things just now want to break up political parties. If they really wanted to have real democracy, they would pattern parties after our party, a group of earnest men and women who have a definite aim; high tariff, low tariff, expansion, free tolls, or anything in the world that they may want to impress upon the political unit that they are fighting to conquer. Then let every man and woman who really believes in that aim get into the party and work.

We have the precious Primary Law. Under that law the control of our party is taken out of the hands of the men and women who have worked so hard to build it up, and put into the hands of the enrolled voters, many thousands of whom are not party members, and cannot understand the needs of the party.

No doubt, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Barnes would cheerfully endorse this political theory. There is, forsooth, little virtue in the boast that a party which has no share in the public pie is free from corruption. The consensus of opinion among students of American political parties is to the effect that the corruption of the capitalist political parties is bound up with their form of organization. There are capitalist political parties in Europe, and yet no charges of corruption are made against them by Socialists. A conspiracy for plundering the public, like any other conspiracy for an unlawful purpose, must be led by a small clique of insiders, by a machine. Admit the general public into the organization, and the conspiracy becomes impossible. This is the object of "the so-called" Direct Primary Laws. (By the way, why "the so-called"? Are they "not laws"? Are they not "primary laws"? Are the primaries not direct?)

Would the *Call* enact one law to govern the capitalist political parties and a special law for the Socialist Party? On what ground

would the exemption be granted? On the showing that the membership of the Socialist Party "are men and women who have worked so hard to build it up"? Are not the workers of Tammany Hall also men "who have worked so hard to build it up"? Or should the exemption in favor of the Socialist Party be claimed upon the theory that Tammany Hall is "hopelessly corrupt," whereas "the Socialist party is different," *i. e.*, upon the "good men" theory, which has so often been severely criticized by the Socialist Party?

Nor can the Socialist Party claim an exemption from the general law on the ground that it aspires to be "the political expression of the majority of the people,"—so does every political party. In point of fact, the Socialist Party is to-day the political expression of but a very small minority of the working class, whereas the great majority of the American wage workers support by their votes the Republican, Democratic and Progressive parties.

It must be clear to any one who has an elementary conception of law, that there cannot be one law for one party and another law for another. If the Socialist Party is opposed to the Direct Primary Laws, then it is in favor of continuing the control of election machinery by party organizations, *i. e.*, by small minorities. In other words, the Socialist Party is in favor of prolonging the hopeless corruption of the capitalist political parties, *i. e.*, of our present government, until the time when the Socialist Party will eventually have gained control of the government. The most sanguine Socialist does not expect it for a generation, so meanwhile the fourteen million voters outside of the Socialist Party must be content to be governed by political parties which are "hopelessly corrupt."

But the Socialist Party offers us, "pseudo-democrats," a remedy: Let us pattern our parties after the Socialist Party, to wit: "Let every man and woman who really believes in that aim (of his or her party) get into the party and work." As a matter of fact, not every man or woman who is a member of the Socialist Party actually "works" for the party, as witnessed by the small percentage of the party membership who vote on party referendums, let alone other forms of activity involving greater exertion. So might we not let every man and woman "get into the party," and be done with it? That is precisely what the Direct Primary Law aims at. Comparison of primary returns with general election returns shows that where the Direct Primary Law has been enacted, practically all voters do vote in the primaries. It has been forcibly shown by Ostrogorsky that party government in the United States has developed into a monopoly of privileged private associations analogous to the guilds of the mediæval cities. The real question is whether the party organization should be patterned after the private cor-



poration, or should be considered a part of the governmental machinery. The Socialist Party would rather continue the party organization along the old lines, whereas "the pseudo-democrats" maintain that inasmuch as the "party" is vested with the power to perform a governmental function, *viz.*, to nominate candidates among whom the voters are compelled to choose their government, the performance of this governmental function should be supervised by the government.

The claim that the Socialist Party is "democratically organized" is refuted by the plaint that under the Direct Primary Law "the control of our party is taken out of the hands of the men and women who have worked so hard to build it up, and put into the hands of the enrolled voters." The party builders seem to claim a proprietary interest in the party machinery,—presumably upon the theory that the workers (the party workers) are entitled to the full product of their labor (the party built up by them), as against the enrolled voters, elsewhere described as "outsiders who take it into their heads to vote our ticket." The "Boers" of the Socialist Party would thus deny to its "Uitlanders" the right to say whose names shall appear on "our" ticket, which "they" are nevertheless exhorted by stump speakers to vote for. And why? Because, not being party members, they "cannot understand the needs of the party." According to this theory, the 900,000 Socialist voters are to be divided into two classes: (1) the party members, about 100,000 in number, who are to have a deciding voice in the nomination of candidates, and (2) the outsiders, 800,000 in number, who "cannot understand the needs of the party," though they "take it into their heads to vote our ticket."

Dr. Lyman Abbott has never argued so strongly in favor of a restricted franchise. Here are the salt of the earth, the Socialist voters, who are presumed to be above the level of the old party voter whose party affiliation was determined for him by his grand-dad—and even among these few who are "called," only one in every nine is "chosen"; the other eight may have a fancy to vote for "our" ticket, but they "cannot" understand the needs of the party which they "take it into their heads" to support by their votes.

Still, it costs very little to gain an understanding of the needs of the party—only one quarter per month. Any one who is willing "to share the burden of our organization by joining it," albeit he "cannot understand the needs of the party," is given "a voice in the control of the party." It sounds very much like the Southern election laws which grant to the Negro the franchise if he understands the Constitution of the United States, or if he pays a certain amount of taxes.

But it is feared that the Direct Primary Law may lend itself to abuse by scheming politicians. Says the *Call* (April 5, 1914):

The danger in the present law is that it may be easy for some scheming politicians who covet the Socialist party nominations to secure signatures of alleged enrolled Socialist voters and then run against the nominees of the dues-paying organization. In such case, unless a majority of the enrolled voters voting at the primary elections register their vote for the regular candidate, the politician will become the regular candidate of our party, and on election day he will have the benefit of being designated the candidate of the Socialist party.

These apprehensions have so far not been justified by the experience of the Socialist Party with direct primaries in Los Angeles, Milwaukee and other places where the Socialist movement is much stronger than in New York. Where the bulk of the voters take part in the primaries, as well as in the general elections, it is impossible to palm off upon them a "scheming politician" of one of the old parties as a Socialist candidate. A voter may be a Republican, or a Democrat by heredity, but he becomes a Socialist by his own choice, after reading Socialist literature, or attending Socialist meetings. No candidate but one who has won for himself a reputation as a Socialist can expect the support of the majority of the Socialist voters. The less active the Socialist voter is in party affairs, the more dependent he must naturally be upon the opinion of those who represent the party organization. It is only when the candidate running against the nominee of the organization is a man like Job Harriman or William D. Haywood, who had been prominently identified with the Socialist movement and subsequently severed his connection with the party, that the rank and file of the enrolled Socialist voters might prefer him to the "regular" candidate. This is as it ought to be, it being obvious that in such an event the Socialist Party organization would not be "the political expression of the majority" of the Socialist voters.

The Direct Primary Laws do not encroach upon the "integrity" of the Socialist Party, as an educational institution. No one but its dues-paying membership is given "a voice in the control of the party" in matters concerning the organization alone. It is at liberty to extend or deny its membership privileges to whomsoever it sees fit, and to expel its members for breach of discipline; to elect its own officers; to hold conventions, to adopt platforms, and to recommend candidates to the voters. The only thing this educational organization is no longer permitted to do is to run the election machinery. For that purpose the law has created a separate body, called "party," which comprises all the enrolled voters of each political school. Any voter who is in accord with the general princi-

ples of a given political school and intends to support them by his vote may enroll for the primaries of the "party." This legal body is governed by the voters themselves, who elect a State Committee and a County Committee and nominate all "party" candidates. This is true democracy, not pseudo-democracy. The rule of eight voters by the ninth is not even pseudo-democracy, it is simply oligarchy.

## MOVEMENTS OF MIGRATORY UNSKILLED LABOR IN CALIFORNIA

BY AUSTIN LEWIS

The migratory laborer in California has come under the public notice of late by reason of the Wheatland hop pickers' cases. The events at Wheatland, California, consisted in a revolt of the unskilled labor engaged in hop picking on the ranch of the Durst Brothers, and culminated in the killing of four men, among them the District Attorney of Yuba County and a deputy sheriff. The other two men were unknown hop pickers—one of them a Porto Rican and the other an English boy of about eighteen years. A trial resulted in the conviction and sentence to life imprisonment of two leaders of the strike, Richard Ford and Herman Suhr. The whole matter has been much discussed and Dr. Carleton H. Parker, of the University of California, and secretary of the state commission of immigration and housing, has issued reports on the matter to the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations as well as to the Governor of the State of California.

The people who constituted the crowd consisted of some twenty-seven different nationalities, unskilled laborers, aliens and Americans. Of the latter Dr. Parker says:

The Americans were in the main a casual-working migratory class, with an indifferent standard of life and cleanliness. They were recruited in part from the improvident population of near-by cities, in part from the poor of the country towns and in part from the impoverished ranches and mining camps of the Sierra foothills. A small but essentially important fraction were American hoboies.

Leaving aside the conditions on the Durst ranch, which were admittedly atrocious and which can be best learned from Dr. Parker's report to the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations, we are brought to the question why organization was so immediately achieved by this horde of migratory laborers made up of so many diverse elements.

The work on the ranch began on Thursday evening and by Saturday evening the hop pickers, embracing practically the entire

working force of the ranch amounting to some two thousand four hundred people, were in open revolt. They had held a great mass meeting at which they had listened to speeches in seven languages and had in accordance with the request of Ralph Durst appointed a committee to present their demands. These demands they made through their committee on Sunday morning and at five o'clock on Sunday evening occurred the collision with the sheriff's forces which resulted as stated.

This is the first instance in the State of California of any such spontaneous action on the part of the migratory unskilled. In fact it would be very difficult to find a parallel case.\* It must be remembered that there was no rioting, that the crowd, on the testimony of the sheriff, was orderly when he arrived, that such disorder as occurred was subsequent to the coming of the posse, and that up to five o'clock on Sunday evening this heterogeneous mass of strikers was an organized body capable of acting in unison.

The prosecution declared that all this was due to the energy and organizing ability of Ford and Suhr, but such a contention cannot be seriously regarded. Ford and Suhr were Americans and did not know any language other than English. Of the two, Ford was the speaker. It is impossible to conceive of any one man being able to infuse into that crowd of mixed nationalities such a spirit of law-abiding solidarity in their strike. Ford and Suhr were unquestionably leaders of the strike, but to contend that they could have brought it into being and could have controlled it when it occurred is absurd on the face of it.

Dr. Parker finds the co-ordinating force in a body of about thirty men who constituted a camp local of the Industrial Workers of the World. He says "It is a deeply suggestive fact that these thirty men through their energy, technique and skill in organization unified and dominated an unhomogeneous mass of two thousand eight hundred unskilled laborers within two days." He says that there were about seven or eight hundred hoboies of whom some four hundred knew roughly the tenets of the I. W. W. and could sing its songs, and that of these more than a hundred had been actual fighting members of that organization at one time and had served in the jails in free speech fights. When the fracas with the sheriff's posse

\*In his minority report on the Wheatland Hopfields Riot, Paul Scharrenberg, secretary of the commission of immigration and housing of California, says: "There have been other sudden strikes among unorganized workers in this State—strikes in which I. W. W.ism was not even heard of. The strike of unorganized alien workers at the McCloud Lumber Company's Camp in June, 1909 (which by the way also brought out the state militia), showed conclusively that in California as elsewhere unorganized labor will revolt if sufficiently oppressed. Revolt in such instances grows out of the facts without reference to any question of leadership."

occurred the crowd was singing an I. W. W. song called "Mr. Block," which it is obvious a large number must have known. This knowledge of I. W. W. songs, says Dr. Parker, is widespread among the hoboes and migratory laborers of the state and is a new phenomenon, certainly not more than three years old.

We now arrive at a more satisfactory solution of the question of the rapidity and power of the organization on the Durst ranch. It was not an isolated phenomenon; it belonged to a chain of events in the history of the migratory laborer in the State of California.

These migratory laborers are of tremendous, indeed, of surpassing importance in the economic growth of that state. They are seasonal workers who, starting in the south, pick the fruit and reap the harvest. Without them California could not maintain its existence. They are in the lumber and construction camps; they build the roads, they perform that multiplicity of tasks by which California is being gradually transformed from the land of great ranches and large expanses of desert into a settled and prosperous modern community filled with great cities. But these migratory laborers work under the most disadvantageous conditions. They are badly housed. Their camps are unsanitary. Their pay is small and insecure. They are ill protected against the risks of their calling, for although the law has recently improved conditions, the ignorance of these workers and their distance from the state agencies are impediments to their taking advantage of the law.

It is, as Dr. Parker says, about three years ago since the agitation among these migratory laborers began. The first signs of such a movement arose in connection with the free speech fights which broke out at Fresno and later at San Diego.

The position of Fresno rendered that town a strategic point in the agitation of the unskilled. It is situated at the southern end of the San Joaquin Valley and is the center of a rich farming country where there are also the great vineyards which supply the largest part of the raisin crop of the state. These vineyards are the typical working places of the seasonal migratory workers. The heat is intense here in the summer months, and the camp conditions have been and still are beyond description bad. The migratory workers began an agitation and used the streets for the propaganda of their doctrines. To this the citizens objected and hence arose a conflict between the nomadic agitators and the municipal government, such as had formerly occurred at Spokane.

The same tactics were employed at both places—a policy of sullen non-resistance on the part of the Industrial Workers and a wholesale jailing by the authorities. The latter were cruel and on one occasion the fire hose was brought into requisition and the men

in jail were swamped under heavy streams of water. The campaign went on for some months and ended in a sort of compromise by which the Industrial Workers retained to a limited degree the right of free speech and the authorities prevented street speaking on the scale on which it had formerly been practised.

But from the point of view of the migratory workers, the Fresno free speech fight was a distinct gain. Large numbers of men had flocked into the town from all parts of the country. The attention of the state had been strongly aroused. Sympathy with the men began to appear even in the ranks of the American Federation of Labor, which was and is bitterly opposed to the propaganda of the Industrial Workers, and the Fresno local of the organization grew in power and importance. Moreover, large numbers were brought into contact with the propaganda of the Industrial Workers, and their songs and ideas became widely known throughout the rural districts of the state. Also, from this conflict developed another which, though but little known, has been a very important factor in the development of the movement. This was the Big Creek strike in Fresno County, which occurred in 1913 and to which reference is made later.

Following the Fresno free speech fight came that in San Diego. Superficially there was not the same inducement to risk imprisonment and ill usage in a contest at San Diego, as at Fresno. San Diego is not the center of any great farming or industrial activity. It stands at the extreme southern end of the state and is dominated largely by Los Angeles, so that even American Federation of Labor unionism has had hard work to establish a footing. There was some construction work going on, but not of sufficient importance to warrant the starting of a fight. Moreover, San Diego's limitation on free speech in the street was confined to a comparatively small district.

But San Diego is the winter resort of large numbers of migratory laborers who come from the Imperial Valley and from many other sections of the southern country. So that the fight was precipitated and on this occasion the Industrial Workers were supported by their two greatest enemies—the Socialist Party and the local organizations of the American Federation of Labor.

The resulting contest was one of the most bitter and brutal in the history of such troubles. Each side employed the same tactics as formerly. The Industrial Workers who took the brunt of the jail-going followed the tactics of passive resistance, went to jail, sang songs in jail, "made battleships" (which means that they beat upon the bars of their cells with tin cups), and in many ways made themselves a nuisance to the authorities. The jails filled up and the

expense to the city mounted. On the other hand, a number of citizens organized themselves into Vigilantes. These Vigilantes treated the prisoners with the utmost barbarity. They took them out of the jails with the connivance of the city authorities and subjected them to the most barbarous punishment. They beat them severely, stripped them of their clothes, and violated their persons in various disgusting and unspeakable ways. The scandal grew so great that the Governor of the State appointed a special commissioner, Harris Weinstock, at present Commissioner of the Industrial Accident Board of California, to report on the state of affairs in San Diego. Mr. Harris made a lengthy and complete report in which he denounced the acts of the Vigilantes and at the same time attacked somewhat vigorously the tenets and tactics of the Industrial Workers. He found, incidentally, that none of the men imprisoned had been charged with drunkenness or a breach of the peace.

Here is one of the interesting facts in connection with all this agitation. The participants in the violation of municipal ordinances who go to prison for their offenses and who, when driven out of town and beaten by Vigilantes, return again and again to subject themselves to the same treatment, are not criminals or inebriates; on the contrary, they seem to be exceedingly manly types. The same thing was observable during the course of the trial of the hop pickers at Marysville. A body of young I. W. W. came to watch the trial. They were about eighty in number. During the whole of the three weeks spent by them in the town not one of them went into a saloon, and the library at Marysville was hard beset to meet their demands for books.

It may be mentioned in passing that the Industrial Workers, in spite of the strictures of Mr. Weinstock upon themselves, yet considered him so fair and impartial an investigator that they desired his appointment by the Governor to investigate the conditions and occurrences at Wheatland.

The San Diego free speech fight aroused general attention to the organization of the migratory workers. The excesses of the Vigilantes caused a feeling of indignation throughout the whole coast, and the unions of the American Federation were drawn more closely into sympathy with the struggling organization. This led not only to the actual donation of money for carrying on the fight, but also provoked much individual interest in its tenets. At least the effect has been that while the official element in the American Federation of Labor is opposed as much as ever to the Industrial Workers, the sympathy of a great portion of the rank and file has caused the unions to be liberal of their support when the organization is actually engaged in conflict. An additional impetus in the same direc-

tion arose from the fact that the State Federation of Labor was itself endeavoring to organize unskilled and migratory labor, and while not practically successful itself had nevertheless done much to prove its necessity to the mind of the average union member.

The results of the San Diego free speech fight were apparently entirely to the disadvantage of the migratory workers. The restriction on street speaking was maintained by the authorities; many men had been beaten and cruelly used; many had been confined to jail for months; well-to-do supporters of the movement were arrested, tried and sent to prison for conspiracy to violate the ordinance, and the whole movement would seem to have collapsed ignominiously.

This conclusion does not, however, appear to be sustained when we come to consider the actual significance of these free speech fights. They were but incidental to a much more important and broader campaign looking towards the organization of unskilled and migratory labor throughout the state. As such they cannot be overestimated. It is very problematical if an organization could have been effected in any other way, and they were, in all probability, a necessary precursor to the unskilled campaign. At all events they had the effect of acquainting large bodies of men with the idea of the organization of the unskilled. They showed that the men had the grit to stand up against the worst sort of treatment and that they could preserve an organization in face of the most terrible odds.

With the close of the San Diego free speech campaign that particular phase of the organization activity ceased in California. Organization on the job succeeded and henceforward the organizers made every effort to get unity of action and co-operation in the actual course of employment. This was by no means an easy task, for the elements which were brought together in this fight were not accustomed to united action. To convert the migratory laborer into a fighting unit was and still is a most arduous undertaking.

But the inside history of the last year or two shows that many of these migratory laborers had taken the lessons of organization to heart and were putting them into effect. Little groups of two and three organized for better conditions on the individual ranches. They began to complain of the food, to resent the uncleanness of their surroundings; and in a multitude of ways they let it be known that they were engaged in improving their conditions. This action was by no means without its effects, which soon began to be manifest throughout the agricultural districts.

The first bold attempt, however, to come into actual economic conflict was at the Big Creek, where one of the largest electric

power plants in the West was being installed. The strike was not well timed, being in the winter, and was lost after a struggle. It resulted, however, in considerable improvement in the camps of the Stone and Webster Company, the employing firm. This strike is notable from the fact that this was the first time the migratory laborers formulated their demands for a change in camp conditions. These demands were as follows:

- (1) Reinstatement without discrimination of all men discharged for partaking in expelling the cook from Camp No. 3.
- (2) Abolishment of employment office on works, men to have the right to rustle their own job in any camp they may desire.
- (3) Strictly an eight hour day for all tunnel work, no overtime.
- (4) Wash houses with bath included, supplied with hot and cold water, night and day.
- (5) Improvement of conditions of bunk houses, such as lights in front of each, and no overcrowding.
- (6) Blacksmiths and helpers can go home at eight hours, provided they sharpen all steel used on shift. Helpers to have 25 cents raise, from \$2.75 to \$3 per day.
- (7) Reading rooms furnished with light and heat.
- (8) Change of cooks to be made when the majority of men so request, five days' notice of such request to be given.
- (9) An increase of 25 cents a day for mule skimmers in the tunnels, from \$2.50 to \$2.75 a day, same as muckers.
- (10) Each individual to be supplied with his own rubber boots.
- (11) Strictly eight hours for all men working outside, no reduction in wages.
- (12) A general hospital at the Basin and a hospital at Camp No. 2. A doctor in attendance at each hospital.
- (13) No discrimination to be made against men presenting these requests.

From this time forward the campaign for better camp conditions has proceeded until at last the state authorities are awake to the importance of this movement. The Commission of Immigration and Housing has begun to issue its notices that the camps must be cleaned up.

Dr. Parker says in this respect:

The employers must be shown that it is essential that living conditions among their employees be improved not only in their fulfillment of their obligations to society in general, but also to protect and promote their own welfare.

And with respect to the employees he declares:

On the other hand the migratory laborers must be shown that revolts accompanied by force in scattered and isolated localities, not

only involve serious breaches of law and lead to crime, but that they accomplish no lasting constructive results in advancing their cause.

Considering the foregoing, it is not surprising that when the people on the Durst ranch found themselves confronted by the conditions which there existed they rose in revolt. These conditions were admittedly filthy in the extreme. There was an insufficiency of drinking water, the toilets were disgusting and few in number, dysentery had already made its appearance, and the menace of typhoid was in the background, for this latter disease afterwards manifested itself in the families which had been on the Durst ranch. Yet the strike was orderly. There was no violence until the first shot of the sheriff's posse precipitated trouble.

Therefore, if the organization of the unskilled and their steady propaganda on behalf of decent camp conditions was responsible for the rising, there is little doubt that their capacity for organization acquired through many painful experiences in the last three years was also the main reason for their admirable behavior and discipline.

## THE GREAT AMERICAN SCAPEGOAT

BY MAX EASTMAN

The present controversy concerning Rockefeller as a Christian recalls to my mind Frank Tanenbaum and his little morality play of last winter. How perfectly was the historic attitude of churchdom portrayed on that chilly day when a few hundreds of the weary and the heavy-laden came and asked the Church of Christ for bread, and the Church of Christ, in person of an irate prelate, sneaked out the vestry door and summoned the police! They asked, none too humbly, I hope, to be allowed to sleep on the pews,—those clean new plush and velvety cushions consecrated to the pious if somnolent bottoms of the lords of the land! Think of that. It was of course an outrage in face of which the Jesus pretense fell utterly down, an outrage against property. And there was unholy joy, I suppose, in some pagan hearts to see this proud meretrix of history, with all her sacred plumage and language of love, so backed up to the wall and compelled to show who is her master. It was a perfect incident, symbolic of an era.

Indeed, as I observe the doubts and divisions of churchdom in the present controversy, I am driven to think it was a little too perfect. The position of the church is not so unqualified as that. Institutions do not live up so beautifully to their "economic interpretation." Their ideologies are never quite broken through. For in-

stance, only five out of the eight churches in Trinidad are openly against the strikers, and one of these is still saying a little about justice and mercy. One of the national organs of the Episcopal church recently published an article explaining, if not indeed defending, the principle of sabotage. I am disposed to look, then, for some special reason, besides the economic one, why Tanenbaum's army created such a panic among the godly.

"You can *kill* me before I will let you desecrate this house!" was the shriek of two prelates, a Protestant and a Catholic, to that boy's unusually gentle and tentative request; and the shriek was re-echoed upon the editorial page of every capitalist newspaper in New York, and almost every one throughout the country. There was hate in the ink. Even the news-columns were venomous. The whole community seemed to be indulging in a debauch of devout indignation, and the crime of Tanenbaum's conviction was only an inevitable culmination of that.

Of course a rising of the unemployed, boiling up from the very bottom, is an exceptionally dire thing to the powers. The unemployed are hungry, and yet they are free. They have nothing to lose, not even their chains. Yet, even so, I suspect that the church would have carried forth her pretence of brotherdom, the press would have been more amused than angry, even the courts might have been content with ordinary injustice, had it not been that this rising occurred under the banner of the I. W. W. And the church, the press, the state, the host of the people in this country, hate the I. W. W., and they rejoice in every occasion when they can spit upon it. They hate it with a hatred beyond all proportion to its menace against privilege, or against property, or against law and order.

The agitators of the I. W. W. have conducted the two most peaceful big strikes that our industrial history remembers. While the I. W. W. was organizing non-resistance in Paterson, the United Mine Workers were waging armed war in West Virginia. The I. W. W. contained last fall only fourteen thousand paid-up members—less, after nine years of propaganda, than the payroll of some big industrial enterprises. The United Mine Workers has several hundred thousand paid-up members. The United Mine Workers is an industrial union, too, organizing the unskilled, and its members stand at the very source of machine power. And yet, when the Mine Workers extend their organization with the noise of arms into new territories, the national press—barring the newspapers of the immediate territory they invade—makes no outcry comparable in volume of indignation to what goes up at the first peep of an I. W. W. agitator in a new city.

There are, of course, many reasons for this. The I. W. W. is

overt and uncompromising in its revolutionary purpose. It talks aloud the class struggle, the one big union. It is an ideal, and also a fighting group, with immense power of stirring up the people. There can be no doubt of that. As an advertising agent of pure revolutionary ideas, the ideas of Marx and Engels, the I. W. W. bears the palm in this country. It is out in the forefront doing the work that nobody else will do. It is frankly disreputable, and thus it wins a measure of desirable antagonism from all respectable sources. But I think it wins more of this reward than its actual power and activity entitle it to. Without jealousy and with all praise for their magnificent trouble-making, we can say that those few thousand members of the I. W. W. are, as yet at least, by no means the substance of the menace against capital, nor the imminent army of overthrow they are pictured in the press, pulpits, and public forums of the American nation.

The truth is that all nations at all times have found indispensable to their spiritual ease and well-being a standard universal scapegoat, upon whom they could dump the sins and the dammed-up hatreds of the day, and go on their way rejoicing. And the incidents which give rise to the choice of that scapegoat are, as a matter of common custom, quite disproportionate to the burden of crime and odium which he carries away. Thus the I. W. W., besides heralding in so heroic a manner the civilization of the future, is performing this great service to the civilization of the present, giving it a daily vent and cathartic, with double doses on Sunday, for those repressed motives of wrath and murder which might otherwise make havoc in the unconscious mind of the people.

There has recently been published a sixth volume of "The Golden Bough" by J. G. Frazer, a book that is a fabulous treasury of myths and fairy stories and folk-customs, one of the great works of anthropology. And this sixth volume, called "The Scapegoat," is full and brimming over with what the author calls "an endless number of unamiable devices for palming off upon someone else the trouble which a man shrinks from bearing himself." I wish I could express in a few words the astounding quantity of such customs, and the massive impression of the infantile psychology of man, both savage and civilized, which they convey.

For while Frazer himself is content to regard these ceremonies in the manner of their narration, as an attempted "transference of evil," I think we are justified by the current tendencies of psychology in regarding them also as an actual transference of hate. It is not only the speculative relief from ill fortune, but a real relief from raging at ill-fortune that makes them so popular. And if in the progress of culture these baby rages have had to be more and more

repressed into the unconscious, more and more have they sought blindly for a vent that culture will allow.

Periodically, Mr. Frazer tells us, in spring or at the beginning of the calendar year—as a kind of public New Year's resolution—the powers of a community would single out some person, object, animal or spirit, symbolically load upon his sorry shoulders all the ills of the tribe, and then (not symbolically) beat him up, drown him, slide him down hill, run him over the border, or scatter his blood to the winds. And not only periodically but also upon special occasions of misfortune—the incidence of famine, plague, warfare, domestic trouble in the royal family, and so forth—the same happy purgative was resorted to.

"A lady of easy virtue" we are told in one of these stories of India, had lost the favor of the king, and as she walked in the park revolving her troubles in her mind, "she spied a devout ascetic named Kisavaccha. A thought struck her. 'Surely,' said she to herself, 'this must be Ill Luck. I will get rid of my sin on his person and then go and bathe.' No sooner said than done. Chewing her toothpick, she collected a large clot of spittle in her mouth with which she besmeared the matted locks of the venerable man, and having hurled her toothpick at his head into the bargain she departed with a mind at peace and bathed. The stratagem was entirely successful; for the king took her into his good graces again. Not long after it chanced that the king deposed his domestic chaplain from his office. Naturally chagrined at this loss of royal favor, the clergyman repaired to the king's light o' love and inquired how she had contrived to recapture the monarch's affection. She told him frankly how she had got rid of her sin and emerged without a stain on her character by simply spitting on the head of Ill Luck in the royal park. The chaplain took the hint, and hastening to the park bespattered in like manner the sacred locks of the holy man; and in consequence he was soon reinstated in office. It would have been well if the thing had stopped there, but unfortunately it did not. By and by it happened that there was a disturbance on the king's frontier, and the king put himself at the head of his army to go forth and fight. An unhappy idea occurred to his domestic chaplain. Elated by the success of the expedient which had restored him to royal favor, he asked the king, 'Sire, do you wish for victory or defeat?' 'Why for victory, of course,' replied the king. 'Then you take my advice,' said the chaplain; 'just go and spit on the head of Ill Luck, who dwells in the royal park; you will thus transfer all your sin to his person.' It seemed to the king a capital idea and he improved on it by proposing that the whole army should accompany him and get rid of their sins in like manner."

This, you will understand, was among the rather highly cultured and merciful forms of the scapegoat tradition. As practised by the Greeks of Asia Minor in the eighth century before our era, the custom was as follows:

"When a city suffered from plague, famine, or other public calamity, an ugly or deformed person was chosen to take upon himself all the evils which afflicted the community. He was brought to a suitable place, where dried figs, a barley loaf and cheese were put into his hand. These he ate. Then he was beaten seven times upon his genital organs with squills and branches of the wild fig and other wild trees, while the flutes played a particular tune. Afterward he was burned on a pyre built of the wood of forest trees; and his ashes were cast into the sea. . . . The Athenians regularly maintained a number of degraded and useless beings at the public expense; and when any calamity, such as plague, drought, or famine, befell the city, they sacrificed two of these outcasts as scapegoats. One of the victims was sacrificed for the men and the other for the women."

"Every year on the fourteenth of March, a man clad in skins was led in procession through the streets of Rome, beaten with long white rods, and driven out of the city."

The ancient Mexicans annually fattened a free citizen, dragged him up to the top of their pyramid temples, and there cutting open his breast plucked out his living heart, holding it up as a symbol of purification to the sun.

The Jews too, according to Mr. Frazer, had their ancient custom of hanging a man in character of a god, as a method of taking away their sins; and at the festival of Purim in historic times they still hanged an effigy of Haman.

By such beautifully cruel devices have all tribes and nations, even down to these years of our Lord, managed to suffer by proxy, and load off their sins upon a walking delegate. Even down to these years of our Lord, I say, because what is our Lord himself but a scapegoat for the sins of the world?

"Jesus died to save us."

"Jesus paid it all."

"I was washed in the blood of the Lamb."

All these old ritual sing-songs of kingdom-come, what are they but the same easy medicine of the savage, no whit cleaned or purified of murder by the metaphysical flim-flam of a "doctrine of vicarious atonement?" I wish you would observe some day a list of "favorite hymns"—they are frequently compiled by votes of church congregations—and see how far this torture-magic of savagery is

the emotional substance of the Christian religion. If I have quoted some bloody and disgusting recitals above, is there any one of them more abhorrent to the stomach and the sense of moral responsibility than this favorite of favorites at Sunday School:

"Just as I am without one plea,  
But that Thy blood was shed for me."

You will observe in some of the accounts quoted a tendency to dress and feed and tend up the scapegoat for a while, before his dispatch to the next country, or the next world. This has been almost universally a part of the ceremony, the victim frequently being deified, given the "freedom of the city," or robed and crowned as a king. And Mr. Frazer advances an interesting and not unconvincing hypothesis that the actual crucifixion of Jesus, the enrobing him and crowning him with a crown of thorns and hailing him with salaams as the "King of the Jews," was not mere ridicule, but was part of an established ceremonial of the scapegoat type. His hypothesis is, in brief, that it was a custom of the Jews at Purim, or perhaps at the Passover, to employ two prisoners to act the part of Haman and Mordecai. Both paraded as kings, but one was hanged and the other was set free. On this occasion Pilate tried to persuade the Jews to take Barabbas for hanging, and let Jesus go free. But the elders and the priests urged against it, and in the face of a ceremonial custom Pilate was powerless to resist. Jesus was crucified, and Barabbas was released.

If that hypothesis be true, we have found a surprising harmony of opinion as to his true function, in those who slew Jesus and those who have throughout the ages for their own spiritual comfort battered upon the fact that he was slain. Whether an object of anger or adoration, he was only a fattened scapegoat to them all.

It is not surprising, then, if in the passage of years his dependents have learned little of his own heroic morals. It is not surprising if his adorers are the most ready of all to crucify a scapegoat in their own times. When Frank Tanenbaum adopted the banner of the I. W. W. and came with his three hundred followers, like the "rabble" of old, to present himself at the church of Christ, it was quite to be expected that he should receive only scorn and a mock trial and a little crucifixion of his own. For in embracing those fatal letters he gave himself and all his army the brand of the great American scapegoat, upon which by common acceptance all those who suffer the ills of our peculiar civilization are entitled to spit daily and relieve themselves.

## A "SOCIALIST" ADVOCATE OF PLUTOCRACY

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

H. G. Wells' latest book is published under two titles. In America it is called "Social Forces in England and America," in Great Britain "An Englishman Looks at His World." The American title describes the subject; the English title, the point of view.

There is no other Englishman that could be so well trusted to give us an interpretation of English progressivism; for no one else holds the balance so even between Socialism and the New Liberalism. Wells still calls himself a Socialist, though in several passages he definitely takes his stand with the New Liberalism. As to both movements, he speaks at once as a sympathetic insider and as a thoroughly independent critic.

Bold but careful generalization—this is the quality that attracts so many serious readers to Wells. Some of the generalizations of the new book are to the highest degree stimulating and valuable. For example, it is generally agreed that one of the greatest curses of our times is over-specialization. Wells points out that, after all, our greatest achievements are not due to the mere specialist:

The trained man, the specialized man, is the most unfortunate of men; the world leaves him behind, and he has lost his power of overtaking it. Change of function, arrest of specialization by innovations in method and appliance, progress by the infringement of professional boundaries and the defiances of rule; these are the commonplaces of our time.

Ours is undoubtedly an age, Wells agrees, where everything makes for "wider and wider co-operation." This, however, does not mean that people are being more and more specialized to do one particular thing, but only that they must bring a highly developed intelligence to each special problem. The work must be specialized but not the person. The revolutionary effect of this principle on all our thinking and living can hardly be stated in a few words, and Wells, as usual, makes no attempt to give us its full significance, but leaves the fruitful suggestion to work itself out in other minds.

It seems that Wells is, in one sense, a thorough revolutionary. Inspired obviously by the big things that are done in our time, he believes that no social change that is physically practicable is too big for us to undertake. He regrets that "no community has ever



yet had the will and the imagination to recast and radically alter its social methods as a whole." For "some things there are that cannot be done by small adjustments. . . . You have to decide upon a certain course on such occasions and maintain a continuous movement."

The Revolution that Wells has in mind is not the Socialist Revolution, not the abolition of classes, but one that is to put society on a basis of maximum efficiency. We are to determine "under what conditions a *man works best, does most work, works more happily.*" (Italics mine.) No doubt this Revolution also would ultimately require the complete abolition of classes. But Wells gives us no reason why we should not work consciously towards this larger goal, at the same time that we are aiming at efficiency.

It is true that Wells attaches a certain importance to revolutionary movements in the ordinary sense of the term, that is, to movements from below, but he seems to give far greater weight to more or less philanthropic movements from above:

Contemporary events, the phenomena of recent strikes, the phenomena of sabotage carry out the suggestion that in a community where nearly everyone reads extensively, travels about, sees the charm and variety in the lives of prosperous and leisurely people, no class is going to submit permanently to modern labor conditions without extreme resistance, even after the most elaborate Labor Conciliation schemes and social minima are established. Things are altogether too stimulating to the imagination nowadays.

It is the better intellectual and physical communication of our time that is the basis of such faith as Wells has in the popular movement. The great levellers, as he points out, are newspapers and schools, and the fact that even the common laborer moves freely about the earth in these days.

Besides having a certain measure of faith in the people, Wells gives other evidences that he is no mere State Socialist. His future society, which he calls the Great State, "is indeed no state at all."

For the work of Utopia-building Wells has a natural predisposition, and it must be admitted that he starts out on this task in the right spirit, and at first gives every promise that he will reach big conclusions. For example, in writing of the future of the novel, he displays the very attitude of mind and spirit that is most essential in dealing with so vast a subject as Socialism. Of the future novelists he says, "We are going to write of wasted opportunities and latent beauties until a thousand new ways of living open to men and women. We are going to appeal to the

young and the hopeful and the curious, against the established, the dignified, and defensive." It is hard to see how one imbued with this spirit could fail to bring us back something of value from his imaginary incursions into the future.

Wells' conception of Sociology is equally inspired, and by sociology he really means the science of Socialism—in so far as Socialism can be made a science:

Sociology must be neither art simply, nor science in the narrow meaning of the word at all, but knowledge rendered imaginatively, and with an element of personality; that is to say, in the highest sense of the term, literature.

The writing of great history [or sociology] is entirely analogous to fine portraiture, in which fact is indeed material, but material entirely subordinate to vision. . . .

There is no such thing in sociology as dispassionately considering what *is*, without considering what is *intended to be*. In sociology, beyond any possibility of evasion, ideas are facts.

The last sentence does not seem accurately to express Wells' point. His use of the word "ideas" seems to carry us back to the pre-scientific "ideology"; but it is clear from the passage that what he means is that *intentions* are facts. Indeed he leaves no doubt as to this, when, a few lines below, he points out that the important thing is for us to systematize our intentions:

I think, in fact, that the creation of Utopias—and their exhaustive criticism—is the proper and distinctive method of sociology.

Equally valuable with Wells' constructive suggestions are his criticisms of English politics. Though long a member of the Fabian Society, he entirely disagrees with its passion for social reconstruction and "efficiency" without any adequate consideration of what kind of society is really most to be desired. His criticisms of Fabianism in "The New Machiavelli" and elsewhere are well known; his analysis in the new book is even more masterly, and it applies to Socialistic reformers all over the world:

One hears nowadays a vast amount of chatter about efficiency—that magic word—and social organization, and there is no doubt a huge expenditure of energy upon these things and a widespread desire to rush about and make showy and startling changes. But it does not follow that this involves progress if the enterprise itself is dully conceived, and most of it does seem to me to be dully conceived. In the absence of penetrating criticism, any impudent industrious person may set up as an "expert," organize and direct the confused good intentions at large, and muddle disastrously with the problem in hand. The "expert" quack and the bureaucratic intriguer increase and multiply in a dull-minded, uncritical,

strenuous period as disease germs multiply in darkness and heat.

Having annihilated the very foundations of Fabianism, Wells proceeds to an equally destructive criticism of its anti-revolutionary methods:

The Fabians, appalled at the obvious difficulties of honest confiscation and an open transfer from private to public hands, conceived the extraordinary idea of *filching* property for the state.

His illustrations are both apt and amusing:

What to do with the pariah dogs of Constantinople, what to do with the tramps who sleep in the London parks, how to organize a soup kitchen or a Bible coffee van, how to prevent ignorant people, who have nothing else to do, getting drunk in beer-houses, are no doubt serious questions for the practical administrator, questions of primary importance to the politician; but they have no more to do with sociology than the erection of a temporary hospital after the collision of two trains has to do with railway engineering.

As a further illustration of the Fabian methods, Wells points to their tactics on the question of Mother's Pensions or the Endowment of Motherhood. In the first place he accuses the Fabians of having failed to make any big imaginative appeal for this big idea, and of presenting it "with a sort of minimizing furtiveness as a mean little extension of outdoor relief." But worse still, the Fabians are even opposed, Wells points out, to this type of reform:

The Endowment of Motherhood does not attract the bureaucratic type of reformer because it offers a minimum chance of meddling interference with people's lives. There would be no chance of "seeking out" anybody and applying benevolent but grim compulsions on the strength of it.

Indeed it was largely because of Fabian opposition to this reform that Wells resigned from the society.

It may be seriously questioned, however, whether Wells himself is a Socialist. His attitude of sympathy for the New Liberalism is in itself comprehensible and rational, but he seems to carry it to a point of abandoning Socialism on the ground that it offers no practical policy for our time:

Liberalism—I do not, of course, refer in any way to the political party which makes this profession—is essentially anti-traditionalism; its tendency is to commit for trial any institution or belief that is brought before it. It is the accuser and antagonist of *all the fixed* and ancient values and imperatives and prohibitions. . . .

I have never believed that a Socialist Party could hope to form a government in this country in my lifetime; I believe it less now than ever I did. I don't know if any of my Fabian colleagues entertain so remarkable a hope. But if they do not, then they must contemplate a working political combination between the Socialist members in Parliament and just that non-capitalist sec-

tion of the Liberal Party for which Chesterton and Belloc speak. Perpetual opposition is a dishonorable aim in politics. . . .

Possibly the Socialists may not be able to form a government in Great Britain within the twenty years of active life that probably remain to Wells, but it does not follow that they may not be able to do a far more constructive and creative piece of work by remaining in opposition. What Wells does in this paragraph, is practically to abandon organized opposition to the present form of society, although he expresses a radical disbelief in it. Yet History is full of examples where a militant, yet intelligent and fair-minded opposition has accomplished far more than any participation in government could possibly have done.

Having abandoned the hope of effective political opposition, Wells proceeds to abandon other fundamental points of the Socialist position. If mere opposition is undesirable, then a class war is indeed "irreparable," and a revolution from below would mean "social destruction." So Wells concludes, and then proceeds to adopt the whole ruling-class view. He writes:

The workman of the new generation is full of distrust, the most demoralizing of social influences.

There is only one way in which our present drift toward revolution or revolutionary disorder can be arrested, and that is by restoring the confidence of these alienated millions, who visibly now are changing from *loyalty to the Crown*, from a *simple patriotism*, from *habitual industry*. (Italics mine.)

At this point we might be reading any Tory reactionary or Imperialist, though it is certain that Wells is neither the one nor the other.

Far from advocating a class struggle, Wells definitely places all his hopes in the ruling classes, and a large part of his hopes in its millionaire philanthropists:

What we prosperous people, who have nearly all the good things of life and most of the opportunity, have to do now is to justify ourselves.

Rulers and owners must be prepared to make themselves and display themselves wise, capable, and heroic—beyond any aristocratic precedent. The alternative, if it is an alternative, is resignation—to the Social Democracy.

Social Democracy is thus the last of all horrors.

"We" must put an end to any "social indiscipline," "we" must "restore class confidence." The new generation of workers must be taught to believe in "the ability and good faith of the property owning, ruling and directing class." The cry, he boldly states,

must be not so much "Wake up England," as "Wake up Gentlemen." Class consciousness of labor is a very bad thing, but "class consciousness of the aristocracy of wealth" is indispensable:

It is to the independent people of some leisure and resource in the community that one has at last to appeal for such large efforts and understandings as our present situation demands.

The most frightful alternative that Wells can think of, "the end of all things" to use an expression used by Lord Rosebery in the same connection, would be—Socialism:

If we, who have at least some experience of affairs, who own property, manage businesses, and discuss and influence public organization, if we are not prepared to undertake this work of discipline and adaptation for ourselves, then a time is not far distant when insurrectionary leaders, calling themselves Socialists or Syndicalists, or what not, men with none of our experience, little of our knowledge, and far less hope of success, will take the task out of our hands.

And in order to secure the benevolent intervention of the ruling classes, the labor thinker "has to realize rather more generously than he has done so far the enormous moral difficulty there is in bringing people who have been prosperous and at an advantage all their lives to the pitch of even contemplating a social reorganization that may minimize or destroy their precedence." An "enormous moral difficulty," indeed!

And when Wells speaks of ruling classes, he does not mean the professional middle classes, "the social service class," to use Ghent's phrase, from whom there may be much to hope, but the capitalists themselves, government officials, and actual rulers. He even places special confidence in the multi-millionaires: "A man may start to corner oil and end the father of a civilization." Now the Carnegies and Rockefellers are the real aristocrats. A few years ago, it will be recalled, Wells' chief hope for America lay in a benevolent plutocracy under Roosevelt. He says:

The more hopeful and probable line of development is one in which a conscious and powerful, if informal, aristocracy will play a large part. It may, indeed, never have any of the outward forms of aristocracy or any definite public recognition. The Americans are as chary of the coronet and the known aristocratic titles as the Romans were of the word King. Octavius, for that reason, never called himself king nor Italy a kingdom. He was just the Cæsar of the Republic, and the Empire had been established for many years before the Romans fully realized that they had returned to monarchy.

The common voter, the small individualist, has less constructive imagination—is more individualistic, that is, than the big individualist.

The universities of America are lauded because they are "making a constantly more solid basis of common understanding upon which the newer generation of plutocrats may meet." At the same time American Socialism is condemned as Anarchistic, because it has been "little more than a revolutionary movement of the wages-earning class against the property owner."

And finally Wells takes up that most reactionary of all reactionary positions, worse than the mere advocacy of aristocracy, the preaching of an aristocracy of blood. The trouble in America is that "only an extremely small proportion of its blood goes back now to those who fought for freedom in the days of George Washington."

"Against the assets of cities, railways, mines and industrial wealth won, the American tradition has to set the price of five-and-sixty million native citizens who never found time to get born, and whose place is now more or less filled by alien substitutes. Biologically speaking, this is not a triumph for the American tradition. It is, however, very clearly an outcome of the intense individualism of that tradition. Under the sway of that it has burnt its future in the furnace to keep up steam."

The famous "Socialist" litterateur does not hesitate to say that the falling birth-rate of the old American families means the falling birth-rate of "all the best elements in the state."

Thus Wells appears at last in his true colors. He wants a revolutionary reconstruction of society, he wants every social advance that can be imagined, provided it does not interfere with the prosperity and power of the plutocracy, the new hereditary aristocracy of industry.

"Socialism, if it comes in England," prophesied Hilare Belloc a few years ago, "will probably turn out to be nothing more nor less than another of the infinite and perpetually renewed dodges of the English aristocracy." Belloc made this statement in a debate with Bernard Shaw—whose "Socialism" it fits admirably. It applies with equal exactitude to the "Socialism" of H. G. Wells.

# A SOCIALIST DIGEST

## SOCIALISM VS. THE STATE

No, the above title was not concocted by what some Socialist Party leaders call an "Anarchist" member of the Party. It is the title of a remarkable lecture by the man occupying the highest official position in the international Socialist movement, and the best known leader of the *moderate* wing (with the sole exception of Jaurès). It is the title of a lecture given by the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the International Socialist Bureau, the leader of the moderate Socialist movement of Belgium, Emile Vandervelde.

Vandervelde begins by reviewing the past position of the movement and of its great spokesmen, which he summarizes as follows:

We see, with Guesde, as with Marx and Engels, that there is no confusion possible between Socialism and State ownership. They will have nothing to do with the capitalist State, except to fight it. If they wish to master it, it is only that they may abolish it. At most, they would use it during a transitory period of working-class dictatorship.

To the arguments of the founders Vandervelde adds his own, concluding that State Socialism, or government ownership under capitalism, is necessarily anti-proletarian. His chief argument is this:

The progress of State ownership would indirectly strengthen the enemy and weaken the working class by paralyzing its movements. Who is less free, in fact, than the State workman? He is refused the right to strike. He is humbugged with respect to his right to belong to a trade union. He is doubly enslaved inasmuch as the capitalist State holds him, not only by the stomach, but by the neck.

But Vandervelde is dealing with facts, not with theories, with the present movement, not with Marx's views or his own. He asks whether the Socialist Parties are not drifting into State Socialism in spite of its well-known anti-proletarian character:

But in democratic countries, at least, everyone knows that the Socialist Parties have discarded, or tend to discard, this extreme attitude. They admit, at the present time, the municipalization or the nationalization of certain industries. They advocate the State ownership of railways, mines and monopolized industries in general. They proceed by way of the extension of collectivism rather than by waiting for the Social Revolution to be accomplished first. This

being so, we have to ask ourselves not whether there can be now any question of Socialism versus State ownership, but, on the contrary, whether it is not necessary to admit that democratic Socialism is gliding down a dangerous slope, and risks degenerating into State Socialism.

He then summarizes the growth of capitalistic collectivism, independently of the Socialist Parties:

One of the characteristics of contemporary social evolution is the considerable increase of the functions and the property of the State. The old monopolies or fiscal domains which it was thought would disappear—the tobacco monopoly in France and the State lands of Germany—have not only been retained, but extended and developed. Crown forests are bought or created. Railways are taken over. Alcohol is monopolized, or proposals are made to monopolize it, as in Switzerland.

He attributes this largely to the desire of governments to use such enterprises to secure money for their vast and rapidly growing military expenditures:

To have recourse only to taxation in order to obtain these millions is disturbing. Fiscal monopolies are thought of. Those already in existence are developed. The outcome will be an extension of collective ownership and at the same time of the public debt; but we must recognize clearly that it is difficult to see in this phenomenon a triumph for Socialist ideas.

Of course, Socialists oppose government ownership for such purposes. But they go farther, they endorse to a large extent the prevailing criticism of the inefficiency and corruption of governmental enterprises—under capitalism:

Now we cannot distrust too much the exaggerations of those who have a direct interest in saying, or getting others to say, the worst that is possible about public enterprises.

Nevertheless, having discounted these exaggerations and falsehoods, it remain true, at least in the countries where public ownership is indistinct from government ownership, that the present methods of exploitation of the public services give rise to perfectly justifiable criticism.

Socialism means *social* ownership, says Vandervelde, but it does not mean *government* ownership. Even with social ownership, they would not approve of such a small unit as a Socialist nation owning its railways. These must be internationally owned—and, of course, this would be still more true of steamships.

Socialists are opposed to government ownership:

It is absolutely incorrect to say that Socialists wish to hand over to the Government the management of the chief industries. The function of a Government, in fact, is to govern, not to administer industrial enterprises; and to give economic duties to a Government is to give to the police the management of public lighting, and to the army the direction of the Post Office and the railways.

To-day, unfortunately, we proceed more or less on these lines. The State, as policeman and soldier, is not sufficiently distinct from the State as schoolmaster and organizer of industry. Their fundamental characters are the same. Their resources are insufficiently separated, and their managing officials are recruited according to the same rules.

When a managing director of a State railway is wanted, it is not a railway expert who is sought. A minister is chosen. The choice is made from among the influential politicians, from the conspicuous members of Parliament, or lawyers; and in a few days such a person becomes the responsible chief and director of the biggest industrial enterprise in the country! Is it to be wondered at, under these conditions, that the exploitation of the State railways should leave something to be desired?

Before Socialists would consent to nationalize industry, our governments must cease to be governments, and become mere administrations of industry:

Despite the advantages now presented by the management of the railways, there would be no question of an extension of the system to industry in general, to socialize the means of production and exchange, without first taking into account the two following conditions: (1) The transformation of the existing State, an instrument of the domination of one class over another class, into that which Menger calls the popular Labor State by the conquest by the working class of political power; (2) The separation of the State as an instrument of authority from the State as industrial director, or, in the Saint-Simonian phrase, the government of men from the management of things.

Of these two indispensable conditions, the first, after what has been said previously, needs no comment.

But, if the conquest of political power by the wage-earners is a condition for the socialization of the means of production and exchange, it is not the only one.

Even were the powers of Government in the hands of the working class, instead of in the hands of the capitalists, it would remain none the less a Government which would be able, in the same way as its predecessors, to abuse the authority and resources which the exploitation of its enormously-extended domain would give to it. This is why the other condition, the separation of the governing State from the industrial State, is a *sine qua non* for the collective appropriation of the means and instruments of labor.

The day when that separation is effected, and then only, will it become possible to extend the sphere of the State's activity as an instrument of management without by that fact increasing its powers as an instrument of authority. Rather will it become possible to restrain the authoritative powers of the State by extending its powers of management. And so, by the extension of these two tendencies—fundamental in the Socialist movement—to their final consequences, we can lead up to a social régime in which the authoritative functions of the State will be reduced to a minimum, while its managing powers will be increased to the maximum.

This does not mean that the Socialistic or industrial organization is remote and depends on a distant and doubtful revolution:

Already these functions tend to become differentiated, and in greater degree, as the monopolies of the State become more numerous, we are forced to increase their autonomy and to diminish their dependence on the Government as Government.

Vandervelde gives three directions in which the governmental administration of industry is already beginning to separate itself from the Government:

The first of these consequences is the establishment of a trading account for each of the industrial undertakings of the State. For example, in Switzerland all the establishments exploited by State administration—post, telegraphs, arms and powder factories—have special budgets in addition to the general budget.

Another and more radical consequence of the separation of the State as Government from the State as employer is administrative autonomy. We know, for instance, that in Germany the fiscal exploitation of the mines of the Saar, and, in the main, the administration of the railways, enjoy, as against the central authority, an autonomy which amounts almost to complete independence.

Finally, the third consequence of the separation between the State as Government and the State as employer is that the workmen and employees of the administrations cannot be considered as government officials and as agents of authority, and this is of great importance with respect to trade union activity and association.

For a long time, certainly, the middle-class State refused to make this distinction and to concede the right of association and *a fortiori* the right to strike to all its employees, whether they were officials with some degree of authority, or simply workmen performing similar tasks to those engaged in private employment.

To-day, however, in democratic countries this distinction is generally admitted; and if in Belgium the Government continues to dispute the right of its employees to engage in trade union activity, this freedom is complete in France, in England, above all, for the Post Office, and in Switzerland throughout all the administrations.

While it is certain, then, that "the nationalization of private industries by the middle class State has nothing to do with Socialism," another question arises:

Is it possible to see a commencement of Socialism in these administrations? Can we maintain that their development will facilitate the transformation of the present methods of production in the Socialist sense?

For labor control of government does not depend altogether on the coming revolution.

It is true, Vandervelde admits, that labor has at present no direct power in parliaments:

Yet it is precisely in those countries where the ancient régime has most completely disappeared, where democratic forms are most

completely realized, that the gravest doubts arise as to the efficiency of Parliamentary action and of the possibility of the wage-earner acquiring real power by this means. . . . One would indeed be simple to believe that the action of Parliament alone—the administrative council of middle-class affairs—would be sufficient to inaugurate that tremendous revolution—the expropriation of the capitalist class and the socialization of the means of production and exchange.

But the Socialists are preparing for the coming political and social revolution by building up a State within a State (but a new kind of State, of course—and no State at all in the old sense) :

It need cause no astonishment that the wage-earner, having shed some illusions, should more and more embrace the conviction that the only means of really conquering the State and political power is to create a State within the State by means of working-class organization in all its forms, which, gradually increasing in power, would burst the governmental walls of present society and substitute cooperative *management* for capitalist *domination*.

Vandervelde, however, strangely allows his proletariat, politically powerless and incapable of calling a revolutionary general strike, to force capitalism along by intimidation :

Trade union action furnishes the means for effective pressure on public authorities from without. As Ostrogorski has said: "The function of democratic masses is not to govern, but to intimidate the governors." The real question is to know whether they are capable of intimidating them, and in what measure. That the masses possess already in most democratic countries the capacity of seriously intimidating the governors is undoubted. It is due to this that real progress has been made. (Example: The miners' strike and the minimum wage in England.)

It is evident that the power to intimidate will become more effective as the fighting organizations of the working class are developed. And, above all, it is from the working class organizations that a new society will be formed which will elaborate a new law, when the wage-earners will prepare to substitute themselves one day for the administrators and managers of capitalist society.

While there can be no such menace of revolution now, according to Vandervelde's own statements, there might be in the near future—but for one factor which he entirely omits. Everywhere the aristocracy of labor, including the railway workers so necessary to a general strike, takes the side of capitalism against the revolutionary labor movement—as we see especially in Italy and Australasia. And the labor aristocracy has a sound, selfish, economic—and hence unanswerable—reason for doing this. The small capitalist democracy is willing to share its income and power in some degree with the labor aristocracy for equally selfish and economic reasons—especially fear of the political and economic power of the better-paid proletariat.

But, whatever we may think of Vandervelde's politics, his analysis of the Socialist attitude to State Socialism is of high value.

It is fairly certain that the old Socialist arguments according to which nationalization was actually reactionary have fallen away. The chief of these, according to Vandervelde, were that "the extension of public services strengthens the enemy by curtailing the freedom of the working class"—which Vandervelde answers as above, and the argument that "the more individuals the present State employs, the more individuals it attaches and interests in its own preservation." But it is already evident that State employees are divided into two groups, the upper group being favored and the lower group exploited, the former being affiliated with the employers, the latter with the laboring masses.

In his conclusion Vandervelde weighs carefully all the advantages and disadvantages of nationalization to the employees immediately concerned. While admitting fully the loss of freedom nationalization entails, he points out that Socialists (in democratic countries) nevertheless favor government ownership :

To explain this attitude we must not lose sight of the fact that if State employees are less free and also less independent in bearing than most of the employees engaged in private industry, it is much more on account of the nature of their work and of the services they render than because they are employed by the State instead of a private person.

In France, for instance, where the railway workmen enjoy the same advantages with respect to pensions and constancy of employment as the State employees, we do not observe that they assume a more independent attitude. Rather the reverse is true.

When it is a question of "public services," such as the Telegraph Service or the Railways, the middle-class State, even when it is not the employer, has recourse to the same measures against the employees of the companies as it uses against its own employees.

In France, pleading the necessities of the "public safety," M. Briand militarized and requisitioned the staff of both the Northern Railway Company and the Western State Railway without distinction.

With respect to disadvantages, it does not seem, therefore, that there would be any great difference between undertakings of the same nature whether they were exploited by the State or by a big capitalist company. On the other hand—in democratic countries—the State employees have means of action to improve their conditions of employment and existence which the workmen in private employment have not, or not to the same degree. Much more easily than the latter can they obtain by political action a minimum wage and better conditions of insurance, etc.

Vandervelde here reaches the crux of the whole government ownership problem as viewed from the Socialist standpoint. Undoubtedly government employees on the whole are better off. How

far does this detach them from the Socialists and unite them with the classes that control governments? But not all governmental employees enjoy the same advantages. What groups, then, are sufficiently favored to attach them to the governing classes? Vandervelde does not deal with these problems at all. But he is reliable as far as he goes, and clears the ground for their discussion.

---

### THE NEW TORY PARTY

With the disruption of the Republican Party in 1912, Big Business found itself without a serviceable organization in national politics. During that campaign Roosevelt attacked colossal fortunes, proposed to regulate trust prices, favored graduated income and inheritance taxes, and even flirted with governmental railways and the single tax as experiments—in Alaska. While Wilson attacked the money trust, and threatened to hang it “higher than Haman,” if it brought on a panic.

After the elections things seemed even worse for Big Business. Roosevelt, to be sure, took to the woods. But Wilson appointed Bryan to the Cabinet, made a deal with the American Federation of Labor, exposed the Manufacturers’ Association, championed the peon in Mexico, and even refused to give audiences to Vanderlip, Speyer and other representatives of Big Business (reserving himself—unnoticed by the public—for Cleveland Dodge and members of the firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., who had financed his election).

This situation remained practically unchanged—as far as the public knew—during the first half of 1914. To be sure, there were enough signs of an ominous change even at the end of 1913. Wilson yielded to the banks in the currency law, as he himself admits whenever he says the bankers are thoroughly satisfied at the result. But Bryan won at two points. The government, nominally at least, issues the currency and controls it through the Federal Reserve Board—provided the President appoints the right men to the board. Then the President yielded to the railroads in indicating that he thought they ought to have the rate increase demanded of the Commission; in favoring as an anti-Trust measure a law which, pretending to regulate the issue of railway securities, would practically mean a governmental guarantee of these securities and in establishing tolls on American coastwise shipping passing through the Panama Canal. And—most ominous of all—the President was opposed frequently in the Senate by radical members of his own Party, and in every case made good the loss by gaining the support of Republican Tories.

But the public did not pay much attention to all this. After a quarter century the tariff had finally been reduced through the President’s efforts. The public did not notice, at first, that nine-tenths of the reduction—slight as it was in most cases—applied only to the surplus tax above the protective point. It took time to see that the cost of living has not been lowered. Bryan was in the State Department, and had not yet been discredited by a Nicaragua treaty. Wilson was helping the Constitutionalists in Mexico, and the disclosures indicating that Guggenheim and the Standard Oil were doing the same thing were not yet published. The A. F. of L. programme was being pushed through Congress, and the working class does not yet understand that the rapidly spreading State constabulary system and the approaching compulsory investigation (and delay) of all really menacing strikes are as effective for suppressing revolts of the laboring masses as are injunctions or the Sherman law (though these latter forms of oppression, it is true, are more dangerous to craft unions).

So the first half of 1914 ended with Wilson at the climax of his popularity. Good times had begun to return. His anti-trust laws appealed to the middle classes. And he made another masterly attack on the lobby that was trying to interfere with them. The success of this stroke can be measured by the opposition it aroused in Wall Street. Even the *Globe*, and Wilson’s most valuable supporter in America, the *New York World*, read him lectures. The *World* demanded for business peace at any price:

The President is right when he declares that there seems to be an organized campaign to prevent further anti-trust legislation at this time; but the campaign is not necessarily inspired by dishonest or wicked motives.

What the country most needs at this time is industrial peace, and any political policy that immediately promotes such a peace is a wise policy, no matter what party platforms say.

Then—like a thunderbolt to radical Democrats—came out Wilson’s determination to make of the Democratic Party the Tory Party of the United States, his decision to form an “alliance” with Big Business, to quote a leading supporter both of Wilson and of Big Business, the *New York Evening Post*.

---

### “THE CONSTITUTION OF PEACE”

When this weird expression was first handed down to us by President Wilson it sounded to most persons as if it was deliberately intended to be a glittering generality. All conflicting economic interests were to be covered over by a phrase. But it now seems

that the President actually believed that he was about to put an end to our numerous class conflicts, and establish economic harmony and social peace.

The reason nobody believed the President meant it literally was because of his many denunciations of Big Business, not of all Big Business, but of very much of it. Especially he had attacked what he called the "money monopoly" which brought it about that "the growth of the nation and all of our activities are in the hands of a few men."

But it seems from his new utterances and actions either that the President supposes, or that he wants to deceive the nation into believing that he supposes, that in a few brief months, without serious opposition (and almost unknown to the public, we must add) all this mountain of Big Business evils has been done away with, or is about to be done away with. We are asked to believe that the currency law was the beginning of the end of the "bad" trusts and the anti-trust law will speedily finish the job.

"The vast majority of the men connected with what we have come to call big business," says the President, "are incorruptible." To show that he means it he risks his popularity for his Wall Street friends, Warburg and Jones, and after having semi-officially indicated that Big Business was not welcome at the White House, issues the statement that it is welcome, and begins a series of receptions with a strictly private interview with Mr. J. P. Morgan.

Wall Street organs having unanimously attacked the President because of his denunciation of the Big Business lobby only two weeks before, became his supporters from that hour. Big Business has had the most unexpected windfall in its history, the support of a national administration without cost—beyond what it is pleased to pay. Says the New York *Evening Post* (note especially our italics):

Big Business might be excused for falling into the hackneyed "This is so sudden," in presence of the amorous advances which President Wilson made to it yesterday. It is so long since anybody has thought of it as a beloved object! For years it has suffered not merely neglect but contumely.

In all seriousness, men of large affairs must have rubbed their eyes as they read President Wilson's statement of yesterday. Issued primarily in connection with the nominations of Messrs. Warburg and Jones as members of the Federal Reserve Board, it runs far beyond this immediate occasion. It points to an attitude on the part of the President which, if not new, he has not hitherto assumed, and to a party policy which, so far as he is able to dictate it, will be something like a radical change for the Democrats. After all the vehement denunciations of large business companies and their managers, we now have it, on the President's word, that

"the vast majority of the men connected with what we have come to call big business are honest, incorruptible, and patriotic." Can such things overcome the heads of corporations like a summer cloud without their special wonder? But more is to come. *The President distinctly speaks of an alliance.* Not only must the Democratic party be thought of as no enemy to business, big or little, but it is now the duty of statesmen to seek in every way to cooperate with business men of ability and character, with the aim to use "every force for the upbuilding of legitimate business." *If Big Business asks more than that, it must be hard to please.* As a matter of fact, the reception given to the President's words, both by public men in Washington and *by business men everywhere*, shows that, if Mr. Wilson's declaration is sincere, *it will not be with him a case of unrequited affection.*

Doubtless, Mr. Wilson's friends will protest that this means no real change in him. But it will be received by the country as a radical change. It will be thought of as an obvious political *coup*—fairly Rooseveltian—and the motives and effects of it will be everywhere talked about.

The *Post's* interpretation has a double weight. The *Post* is a friend of both parties to the "alliance." "The President's policy of seeking friendly relations with Big Business," it says, "is sound and right."

The Philadelphia *North American* represents the Western rather than the Roosevelt-Perkins type of Progressives. Its comments on Warburg fit the whole of the President's new Tory policy:

The campaign in behalf of Mr. Warburg has been exceptionally widespread and vigorous, and has been marked by significant agreement between Tory newspapers and administration organs. They have exhausted the vocabulary of adulation in describing the nominee's unequalled equipment and fitness for the post.

He has been called "a genius among bankers," "a scientific financier without a peer in this or any other country," "a perfect master of the theory and practice of banking."

All this may be true; doubtless is true. But no one has questioned Mr. Warburg's knowledge or ability; the objection to him is based upon his known views, his affiliations, the record of the firm of which he has been a controlling member.

The gushing praise of his expertness in the business of banking is beside the mark. The commanding genius in finance of the elder Morgan was generally recognized, but that fact would hardly have made his nomination to the board which will control the money and credit of the nation any more desirable than that of the gentleman under discussion.

The federal reserve board will be the most important governmental commission in this country, bar none. Upon its administration will depend the freedom and prosperity of business—the very life and death of countless enterprises. As Mr. Wilson solemnly said in his eloquent campaign addresses, "the tyrannies of business lie in the field of credit," and the safety of the public



demands that "control of the new system be vested in the government itself" and kept clear of banking domination.

In the face of these pledges the president put through and indorsed a currency bill which rivets upon business the rule of the banker; he has consummated the wrong by naming bankers and trust officials to constitute a majority of the board; the one member who he declares is his "personal choice" is a corporation attorney who is a defendant in a government suit for illegal practices, and he elects to make his strongest fight for a leading figure in the banking combination accurately defined as the "money trust."

No banking house has better credit or a higher reputation for soundness than has Mr. Warburg's firm; but it has participated in virtually every big deal conducted under the dangerous Morgan policy.

It appears in the records of the New Haven Railroad; its connection with the manipulation of the Chicago and Alton was characterized in an official report as "indefensible financiering," and it is expected to figure in revelations concerning the unfortunate Rock Island road. Mr. Warburg was active in the money combine when Mr. Morgan unloaded on the Baltimore and Ohio the \$50,000,000 indebtedness of the Cincinnati, Hamilton and Dayton company, and was also a director in the corporation that was forced to assume that outrageous burden.

A "scientific" banker he must be, indeed, and doubtless as estimable a gentleman personally as the Tory chorus would have the country believe. But, in view of his affiliations and his known views on finance, his nomination for the federal reserve board is about as rational and as beneficial to the public interest as would be the naming of . . . John D. Rockefeller as head of an interstate trade commission.

No wonder the Big Business delegation which came to see the President from Chicago said of the President's statement on behalf of Warburg that "no more helpful, hopeful words have ever come from the White House."

## WILSON, ROOSEVELT, AND THE TRUSTS

Now that Wilson has shown himself as close to Warburg as Roosevelt is to Perkins, the public will be perfectly prepared to find that their anti-trust policies are also similar. A careful comparison of the Wilson programme with the Roosevelt programme, as recently pronounced at Pittsburg, will show that there remains only one point of distinction.

Roosevelt demands three powers for the Interstate Trade Commission: the power of full investigation of monopolies, the power to prohibit unfair trade practices, and the power to "end the exclusive control of a factor necessary to production." Wilson's bills are rapidly evolving to cover the first two points. The third point

alone marks an advance for Wilson, but not for Roosevelt. For the Colonel it is a retrogression. No more is said about the control of all monopolies, not a word is heard of the regulation of prices and wages in monopolies generally. And the particular monopolies chosen to be "ended" are not those which control a product necessary to the ultimate consumers, but those which control a product necessary to producers, *i. e.*, to manufacturers and farmers. These are not to be regulated, but are to be "ended." Here at least is an advantage over Wilson, for Roosevelt makes it clear that competition is not to be restored.

Roosevelt demands for the new Commission:

The power to end the exclusive control of a factor necessary to production by an order adapted to the circumstances of the particular case. The order may involve changes in organization, in management, or in the conduct of the business. Where exclusive possession of a natural resource is the basis of the monopoly, it may be necessary to subject its possession to the obligation of public service, that is, the obligation to sell to others a reasonable amount at reasonable rates.

But now we have the President lending his ear to delegations of Big Business which demand this very thing—supported by a large part of the smaller business men. According to a news despatch:

Recently the Chamber of Commerce of the United States conducted a referendum upon the proposal among the bodies in membership. The result was favorable to the federal trade commission plan by a vote of 522 to 124, each vote representing an association of business men ranging in numbers from a few dozen to several hundred.

In some cities affected by the influence of New York the idea was either voted down or ignored. The chambers of commerce of New York, Philadelphia, Boston and other eastern communities voted no.

But this vote was taken before the President's recent declaration of friendship to Big Business. If the composition of the Interstate Trade Commission is to be anything like that of the Federal Banking Reserve Board the President has just appointed, it will meet the same chorus of Wall Street approval, and the Commission plan—putting an end to endless lawsuits—will be demanded by Wall Street itself.

Big Business will then be in control. But nothing will be easier than for the real progressives of the Stubbs, Johnson, Pinchot, La Follette school—as soon as they come into power—to "pack the court." The Commission can be enlarged to suit their purposes. And the way will be rapidly paved for government ownership—and later for Socialism.

Moreover, this progress of the Progressives in the radical direc-

tion will be greatly hastened and their policies and tactics will be greatly simplified, now that Wilson has definitely pre-empted the Tory course for the Democratic Party.

The voters, after all, are a factor, and the last election showed that they are overwhelmingly and bitterly against Big Business. Wilson has beaten Roosevelt to the Tory camp. There is nothing left the Colonel now but to throw aside his new-laid Tory plans and turn once more to "the people," that is to small business men and the middle classes who still decide all elections.

### ROOSEVELT, REACTIONARY

The Wilson policy is at present in every way more important than the Roosevelt policy. But one cannot be understood without the other.

Roosevelt has recently indicated his intention to turn in the reactionary direction by every means in his power. He wants to see the number of Republicans in Congress increased, we are told by those near him. In this way the Progressives may come to hold the balance of power, even if their numbers are not much augmented.

One of the organs nearest to Roosevelt in these days is *Collier's Weekly*. It shows how the only way the Progressives can beat the Democrats is by some kind of co-operation with the Republicans—and it frankly states that this means a Conservative Party:

All the talk of amalgamation in the past has been coming from leaders and candidates for office, from national leaders all the way down to precinct committee men—men who had something to gain by amalgamation, namely, office, money and power, and who were being kept out of these perquisites by continued division. . . . But now, it must be said, the voter is beginning to think about amalgamation. With a number of voters, which increases daily, the chief present political concern—more important than all other policies or personalities—is to get the Democratic Congress out of power.

The party that would be best adapted to secure the allegiance of the largest number of voters in opposition to the Democrats would be a conservative party—*sanely and honestly conservative*.

Roosevelt has done everything in his power to pave the way for the expected reaction:

(1) In supporting Perkins as national chairman of his Party, he has not only renewed his pledge to Wall Street and promised trust regulation by a body of men satisfactory to the trusts, but he has openly rebuffed all his radical followers in the West.

(2) In attacking Wilson's modest tariff reductions, he neces-

sarily favors an increase of the tariff. And this attack has even brought him into absurdities, as the *New York World* points out:

In one breath Mr. Roosevelt finds that "the cost of living has not been reduced," and in the next breath he finds that the employer has sometimes "been able to struggle along with loss of profits, sometimes he has had to close his shop" because he could not meet the cheaper prices of foreign competition. In other words, tariff reduction has lowered prices, but the lowering of prices has not reduced the cost of living.

(3) In attacking Wilson's Mexican policy, he appeals to the Huerta financiers, paves the way for intervention, and distracts attention from domestic issues.

So Roosevelt is ready for action. But the Progressive voters, apparently, are not. As Congressman Gardner, of Massachusetts, points out, they are not at all prepared for compromise. And in many Western States they distinctly prefer the Democrats to the Republicans. In Utah they have even allied themselves with the Democrats.

### CONGRESS OF GERMAN LABOR UNIONS

The 1914 Congress of the German Labor Unions brought forth discussion of two questions of general interest, the question of the possibility of labor legislation under the existing capitalist system and the question of industrial unionism.

The resolution on "social politics" or labor legislation, proposed by Robert Schmidt and unanimously adopted, is in part as follows:

The demand for social legislation will always meet strong resistance in States governed by capitalist interests. Led by a selfish, materialistic view of history, the capitalist class believes it sees in every restriction of its dominating position as against the workers an injury to its inviolable interests. . . . The general interest is not the capitalist interest. The health of the people and the economic well-being of the masses must stand above the demand for the heaping up of giant fortunes and the increase of the power of a comparatively small group of interested capitalists.

The chief labor legislation demanded by the unions, as in other countries, is that which increases their rights and powers, "freedom of movement and equality with opponents," as Schmidt expressed it.

In his speech, however, Schmidt not only acknowledged that there were a few men, like the economist Brentano, who were in favor of increasing the rights and powers of the unions in Germany, but he linked the Laborites and Liberals together in England and praised them both: "Especially in England, under the Liberal

government, a great deal has been accomplished," he says. And, after mentioning the sickness, accident and unemployment insurance, and the minimum wage laws as examples, he concludes that "all these advances have been reached through the excellent politics of the Labor Party and the Liberal government."

It is difficult to see how, in this case, the language of the resolution can be defended. Certainly the Liberal government represents capitalist and not labor interests, and certainly the Liberals and not the Laborites hold the balance of power and so are the sole directing power in the country. Yet Schmidt admits that the "health and economic well-being" of the masses are being advanced—to a certain degree, at least—by British legislation.

The question of the industrial form of organization was brought before the Congress by the "factory-workers'" union—one of the most extraordinary successes, especially in the matter of recent growth, among the German unions. It was supported by another rising and interesting organization, that of the "municipal workers." The executive committee's resolution on jurisdiction disputes contained the following sentence:

Labor union development is undeniably in the direction of the amalgamation of organizations into great and powerful unions, and technical evolution more than ever requires the entrance of helpers and the unskilled into the trade and industrial unions to which they are eligible.

To this the factory workers proposed that the following words should be added:

And also the entrance of skilled workers in the unions of the unskilled for which they are eligible.

The resolution was defeated and the executive committee's recommendation of an arbitration court was adopted. The factory workers thereupon made a statement reaffirming their claim to the skilled workers in establishments under their control and called the proposed court a "compulsory arbitration court."

While the factory workers were defeated by 2,210,000 to 309,000 votes, the transport workers also showed themselves decidedly oppositional. The unskilled opposition, however, is, for the most part, within the great German unions themselves. For there the Metal Workers, Wood Workers, Building Workers, etc., instead of being divided into a number of loosely federated unions are united into single groups. And since the skilled workers are largely organized and the unskilled largely unorganized, the latter are usually in a minority. Yet there has been a great deal of friction of late, especially in the greatest union of all, that of the Metal Workers, which has over half a million members.

## REVOLUTIONARY BERLIN

Once more the Greater Berlin organization has been captured by the revolutionaries and promises to lead a new effort to turn the German movement back into revolutionary channels. Against the opposition of Richard Fischer and other members of the dominant conservative faction, the following resolution was adopted by an almost unanimous vote:

The declaration of the Prussian police-minister in the Landtag on May 18th [when he stated that even the partial electoral reform hitherto promised would not be granted], as well as the whole progress of the campaign for electoral reform up to the present, has clearly shown that only the strongest pressure of the popular will, only the political general strike can break the way for equal suffrage in Prussia. The second stage of the electoral reform movement has now begun, and must be continued with increasing force in Berlin and all over the Empire. The meeting calls on the comrades to agitate with all their ability in every workshop and meeting place, so that the Prussian masses may be ready and willing as soon as possible to show all their power.

The resolution was proposed by Rosa Luxemburg and supported by Ledebour, Stadthagen and other radicals.

Eugen Ernst, though favoring the resolution, pointed to the chief difficulty in the way:

We are ready to wage war no matter what the consequences, as soon as we see that the masses are willing and ready for the necessary sacrifices. But can the general strike be called without the consent of the labor unions?

## RADICALS AND SOCIALISTS IN FRANCE

Viviani, the new French Premier, was formerly a Socialist. Despite the opinion of some papers he is no Socialist now, and his support of the three years' military service law, and of a loan instead of an increased income tax, has brought down upon him the deserved wrath not only of Socialists, but also of many Radicals. For the repeal of the three years' law and the income tax are prominent features of the Radical program.

But at some points Viviani is certainly a Radical. The *Nation* (London) reminds us that "he opposed the coercive repression of strikers, worked steadily on minor projects of industrial amelioration and even dared to vote against the three years' law."

The *Independent* (New York) begins a statement of his hostility to the Catholic Church with a quotation from a speech made a few years ago:

All together, first our fathers, then our elders, and now ourselves, we have set ourselves to the work of anti-Clericalism, of

irreligion; we have torn from the people's soul all belief in another life, in the deceiving and unreal visions of a heaven. To a man who stays his steps at set of sun, crushed beneath the labor of the day and weeping with want and wretchedness, we have said: "Behind these clouds at which you gaze so mournfully there are only vain dreams of heaven." With magnificent gesture we have quenched for him in the sky those lights which none shall ever kindle again.

The *Independent* writer continues:

I do not think that M. Viviani has ever officially recanted on that point; but he has this very year deemed it prudent not to repeat his confession of disbelief, and to come back to the much safer ground of anti-Clericalism on which all Republicans join hands. On the 24th of March, 1914, speaking in the Senate as Minister of Public Instruction of the Doumergue Cabinet, on a bill drafted to defend the public schools against the Clericals, he expressed his present attitude in a speech, which the Senate ordered to be posted all over the country, and of which the following is a characteristic expression of his views:

If the Church were only a faith, if it were satisfied to open its temples to the believers, to call them to prayer, to offer them peace, silence, resignation, blessing for the dead and consolation for the living, we would have nothing to object. Before these people we stand respectful and uncovered.

But you know well, gentlemen, that the Church is more than that; the Clerical Party doesn't allow it to be only that: it wishes to be a government; it wants to reconquer the privileges that the Revolution has wrested from it; it will not be satisfied with the place to which the modern world has restricted it. Hence, if there is a régime that should confront such a system, it is the Republican régime; not merely because the Republic is a government, but because it is a faith, because it must unfurl like a flag its ideal before all men and continue to raise souls toward freedom and justice.

The *Nation* shows that the Socialist immediate program is, after all, not far in advance of that of the Radicals:

In legislation the manifesto of the Parliamentary Socialist party has this week defined the minimum programme which would answer its claims. It impresses the English reader by its singular moderation. It lays special stress on the enactment of the "English week." By "la semaine anglaise," French workmen understand the concession of a Saturday half-holiday to complete their lately-won day of Sunday rest.

More vague, but more urgent, is the demand for housing legislation, which in the large towns is probably more necessary than in any other European country. Nowhere are rents so high for the working class, or accommodation so comfortless as in France, and nowhere else does the landlord deliberately penalize a couple which dares to bring into the world more than the tolerated maximum of two children. For the rest, this programme asks for an improvement in the system of State pensions and insurance, which is in France markedly below the British and the German standards, and

for a large development of educational facility. None of these modest reforms are contentious in principle. The difficulty is finance. Radicals and Socialists are united in demanding a graduated income-tax on the British model, and a levy on capital after the German system.

Apparently there is opposition in foreign policy. But there, too, the *Nation* believes, Viviani and Jaures will be forced to effect a compromise, so that it will be the Socialists who will save France from the present domination of the Czar and his French capitalist allies, and rescue Europe from the ever-present menace of war:

With hardly a disguise, it is a plan to make the Triple Entente formidable for aggression which governs the policy alike of official France and official Russia. It is this Chauvinist intention, even more than the added economic burden, which the Socialists opposed when they fought the return to Three Years' Service. The first item of their whole constructive policy outlined in this eminently realistic and statesmanlike manifesto is a *rapprochement* with Germany. For our part we question whether the sinister policy of the Balance of Power has ever more fatally involved European statesmanship than at this moment. The leadership is with Russia, but our complicity is evident, and the old policy of "isolating" Germany is once more revealed in the efforts to detach Italy from the Triplice. M. Viviani must needs make his choice. Modern Socialism is prepared to compromise here and to moderate its demands there. But for it the issue against militarism is central. The fortunes of M. Viviani depend ultimately on whether or not he will take the bold decision to defy M. Poincaré and that "new" French Nationalism which is at bottom nothing better than a reflected Russian Imperialism. The peace of Europe is to-day in Socialist keeping, and the center of its task lies in France.

## AN IRISH LABOR PARTY

Not only does the new party come at a time when Ireland is before the world, but it brings before the international labor movement an entirely new type of labor organization. It is unlike all other labor and Socialist parties in excluding all but labor unionists. It is unlike other ultra-laborite organizations, such as the syndicalistic bodies of France and Italy, in its advocacy of political action. We take the following from the *New Statesman's* Dublin correspondent:

The Irish Trade Union Congress which met at Whitsuntide was remarkable for the launching of a new variety of political organization for Labor. It is now two years since the Congress (at Clonmel, Whitsuntide, 1912) decided, in face of considerable opposition from the supporters of the older political parties, that, Home Rule or no Home Rule, the time had come for Irish Labor to organize a political party of its own. This year the constitution of the Irish Labor Party was definitely settled; and it is noteworthy, as a

sign of the advance made in two years, that the Congress (97 delegates, representing 80,000 Irish workers) no longer showed the slightest sign of division on the propriety of forming an Independent Labor Party. It is to be a purely Irish Labor Party, not affiliated or in any way organically connected with the British Labor Party. The British Labor Party desired that the Irish Party should be merely an affiliated branch, and several conferences were held on this point during the past year; but the Irish Executive decided, and were upheld by the Congress, that the new Irish Labor Party must have no connection with the British Party other than the friendly relations which it hopes to maintain with organized Labor throughout the world.

The most interesting thing about the new party is that it is to be a Trade Union party pure and simple—neither a Socialist party, as on the Continent of Europe, nor a combination of Socialist and Trade Union bodies as in Great Britain. It is, in fact, to be the Irish Trade Union Congress under a new name, functioning in a different way. The body which hitherto bore that name is henceforward to be called the "Irish Trade Union Congress and Labor Party"; it is to add the direction of Labor's political struggle to its previous work in the industrial field. A single unified body, with a single executive, will have the conduct of the Irish Labor fight in both spheres. . . . This unitary method is mainly due to the influence of Mr. Larkin, whose reiterated view is that Trade Unions should include everybody, and do everything for themselves. In the same spirit he urges the Trade Unions to take up and run the co-operative movement, and to form their own Citizen Army instead of joining the National Volunteers. It is to be noted, however, that Mr. Larkin is not "Syndicalist" in the sense of abjuring political action; he strongly supports political action, but it must be under the control of the Unions.

Mr. Larkin's presidency, and the manner in which his personality dominated the Congress, is specially significant when we remember that a few years ago he was a sort of outlaw and was not allowed to sit as a member of the Congress. It is the first time an unskilled worker has presided at the Congress. . . . His address was at once eloquent and practical, emphasizing the lessons of solidarity in the present and aspiring to the co-operative commonwealth of the future. Mr. Larkin, to those who watch him at close quarters, seems to have matured considerably during recent months. The raucous note which once habitually disfigured his utterances—the natural outlet for the feelings of a man who was regarded as, and felt himself to be, an Ishmael—has been greatly softened; without losing vigor, he has lost some bitterness. He is now the acknowledged leader of the Irish Labor movement, and is looked to for inspiration even outside of Ireland; and this assured and recognized position invests him with a new calmness and confidence. He has around him a number of able men—Messrs. Connolly, Johnson, O'Brien, and others—who, while lacking his extraordinary personal magnetism, are his superiors in matters of detail, and between whom and himself strong mutual confidence has been cemented by the great struggle they passed through together last

year. There is every prospect that the new Irish Labor Party will be a competent and active group in the Home Rule Parliament.

The dice have, of course, been loaded against it in advance by the Home Rule Bill. The Congress demanded that the Amending Bill should make provision for (1) increased urban representation, (2) proportional representation on the Single Transferable Vote system—a minority, including Mr. Larkin, favored the Alternative Vote—and (3) votes for women. It also protested, by a vote of 84 to 2, against any exclusion of Ulster, however partial or temporary, from the Home Rule Bill. Temporary exclusion, it was urged, would mean that the old party cries would still be used to keep the workers asunder; Nationalist workers would be exhorted to concentrate on winning Ulster back, and therefore not to press for any labor legislation that might frighten the Ulster capitalists; while Belfast Unionist workers would be similarly held in bondage to the idea of making the exclusion permanent. Noteworthy speeches were delivered on this motion by several Belfast delegates, who said that they believed they were voicing the opinions of their fellow-workers in Belfast in holding that, if Home Rule must come, it was better to sink or swim with the rest of Ireland.

The Congress, as a whole, gave an impression of an alert and capable Irish working-class, ably led, preparing to work out its own salvation without further regard to the shibboleths which have so long prevented development on democratic lines in Ireland. The great majority were, of course, Nationalists; but no single member of the Congress made any attempt to defend Mr. Redmond's party or policy, and Mr. Larkin's scathing condemnation of both was enthusiastically received.

## THE MARCH OF COLLECTIVISM

Collectivism is advancing steadily and rapidly, not only as a movement of progressive capitalist parties, but as an actual practice of capitalist governments. This spread of governmental services, industries and enterprises is well summarized by Emil Davies, in the *New Statesman*. He passes over the state or city "as landowner, builder of houses, supplier of transport, gas, light, and power," as being a familiar commonplace, and proceeds to list other activities:

While our Admiralty is talking of state oil-fields, countries like Austria, Hungary, and Argentina own and work large areas of oil-bearing land, and in Serbia petroleum is a state monopoly. In Java the Government owns various rubber plantations and has taken over part of the gutta-percha industry. In Scandinavia there are numerous state silver mines, while in the Dutch East Indies the Government mines produce tin of an average annual value of £300,000. The only silver mines in the Austro-Hungarian Empire are the state mines at Prebram, in Bohemia, producing silver and lead to the annual value of £200,000. The Hungarian Government goes in for silk production on a fairly large scale, whilst, of course, tobacco is

cultivated and sold by most governments, this being one of the commonest forms of state monopolies. The Hungarian Government in its state railway workshops goes in on a large scale for the manufacture of ploughs and other agricultural implements, which enjoy a big sale not only in that country, but also in the Balkan States and further afield. The Prussian and Austrian state domains have vineyards and bottle their own wines and run world-known spas, such as Bad Ems, on most up-to-date lines. In Russia most of the zemstvos (district councils) have their own stores, selling agricultural implements, roofing iron, sheet iron, etc., and in 1911 no less than 8.8 per cent. of Russia's total consumption of these articles was sold by these municipal stores, largely on credit. The Russian Government has throughout Siberia a number of general stores which sell to the community machinery, tools, grain, and timber. Between 1906 and 1910 the number of these stores increased from 48 to 118, and their turnover exceeded £2,300,000, of which over £1,000,000 of goods were sold on easy credit terms. The net profit on these stores during the five years mentioned amounted to £175,000.

When we come to municipal activities we find an even greater diversity. At least five Italian towns carry on as commercial concerns nurseries for the cultivation of trees, shrubs, roots, etc., which they sell to the public. Two Italian towns go in for fish-breeding on a commercial scale, whilst many cities on the Continent run their own restaurants, refreshment rooms, and wine cellars, these last named being usually the famous *Ratskeller*. The city of Budapest, not content with having the finest bakery in the world run entirely as a municipal institution, in 1911 laid out no less than £20,000 on a number of municipal shops for the sale of meat, poultry, eggs, and butter, whilst municipal drug stores are a common feature in Italy and Russia. Budapest also runs a number of hotels—real hotels and boarding houses, not merely lodging houses.

As soon as we come to sport, we find that England cannot keep out of the municipal craze, for Doncaster possesses its famous race-course and not long ago purchased the "Glasgow Paddock," where the sales of blood stock are held. The town makes a large profit from these undertakings as well as from its other large estates. In Spain and Portugal the bull fights are usually organized by the municipalities at their own bull rings, and—the connection is not so remote as may appear—they, like cities in many other countries, run the pawnshops. Frankfort-on-Main works its own forests, vineyard, and public halls. Bill-posting is a common municipal monopoly in Italy and in some German towns. Freiburg in Baden, the delightful capital of the Black Forest, besides running some few dozen municipal undertakings (including warehouses, savings bank, pawnbroking establishments, forests, theaters, orchestra, undertaking establishments, farms, and firewood factories), issues a daily newspaper—not an ordinary municipal gazette, but a real live daily newspaper which brings in a handsome profit to the city.

Mr. Davies then proceeds to an amusing summary of all the things some citizens can have their municipality do for them, from the cradle to the grave:

In most of the towns in Italy or in Budapest he can buy his bread from the municipal bakery, and in other countries he can get municipally killed meat from a municipal butchery, and flavor it with government salt, after having cooked it over a fire made with state-mined coal. Or he can partake of this meal in a municipal restaurant, drinking municipally brewed beer, wine from the state vineyards, or state spirits.

The whole article is filled with valuable information. It is well supplemented by a recent article from the *New York Call*, dealing with the new activities of Budapest in reducing the cost of living. It is claimed that, owing to these activities, the cost of living in Budapest has gone down 19 per cent., while that in Vienna has risen 14 per cent. If municipalization, indeed, reduces the cost of living one-third, or anything like this, it will surely become a world-wide movement of employers—who have always managed to secure a large part, at least, of such reductions in living cost by reducing wages.

The salient points of the *Call* article follow:

Budapest has suddenly changed itself from being Austria-Hungary's dearest city to the cheapest, writes Curtis Brown in the *Springfield Republican*. This is entirely the result of municipal trading.

At a municipal meeting last month Burgermeister Barny announced that the cost of food in the last four years has been reduced 19 per cent., whereas in Vienna in the same period, the average price of necessaries has gone up 14 per cent.

While Vienna is the dearest city in central Europe, and suffers from chronic high price riots, Budapest citizens are rejoicing in general cheapness.

Austria and Hungary have the same tariff system. The only difference is that in Vienna the storekeeper makes a big profit, whereas in Budapest you now buy your meat, eggs and vegetables in stores conducted by the city, which make no profit at all. "Our town," says Herr Barny, "is becoming a universal trader. That is the only way to fight high prices."

Budapest's initiative in starting municipal food stores is a result of the bread riots of four years ago.

Vienna clamored for relief, but the Government gave none. The municipality kept to the policy initiated by the late Burgermeister Lueger—"handsome Carl"—the policy of favoring at all costs the small storekeeper.

Budapest did the opposite. It resolved that as the Government would not cut down the tariff, it would cut down the storekeeper's profits, and ever since then it has been cutting them down.

First Budapest started as a butcher. It established in Buda, in Pest, and in the Altofen district, handsomely equipped municipal meat stalls. The stalls were intended for the poor. But as the meat was better and cheaper than in private stores, all classes

patronized them. Prices were about three-quarters of the private stores' prices.

Next Budapest attacked the private bakers. It established four public bakeries and reduced bread prices 7 per cent. The private bakers were obliged to cut down their prices. To-day in Buda and Pest 50,000 families, counting in all 250,000 persons, buy their bread from the city. Doctors say that Budapest's municipal bread is purer and more nutritious than the bread of other Austro-Hungarian cities.

Having established its position as retailer, Budapest challenged the producers and distributors. It was moved to this because the producers of meat, eggs, and milk in the country round have an agreement equivalent to a trust for keeping up prices. The municipality built additional slaughter houses and behind the trust farmers' backs began to import cattle, sheep and pigs from remote parts of Hungary.

The stock was bought on the spot at low prices, and by good organization was transported to the city at minimum rates. The city began selling its own meat, in its own stores. The farmers outside Budapest were angry but helpless, and they reduced prices.

The city next organized a big municipal general food store, to which it affiliated twenty-three branch stores in different wards. These stores sell practically all home-grown products. Their function is to frighten the private tradesmen and act as price regulators.

The town has lost no money. The initial financing of its enterprise was difficult. A capital of over \$1,000,000 had to be invested.

But the loss suffered in several municipal enterprises was covered by the profits in others. The municipality's principle, as far as possible, is to make no direct profit.

### BOOKS REVIEWED

The Income Tax: A Study of the History, Theory, and Practice of Income Taxation at Home and Abroad; 743 pp. By Edwin R. A. Seligman, Professor of Political Economy, Columbia University. The Macmillan Co., New York. \$3.00 net.

Syndicalism in France, with an Introduction by Professor Franklin H. Giddings; 229 pp. By Louis Levine, Ph.D. Longmans, Green & Co., New York. Paper, \$1.50 net.

Joseph Pulitzer: Reminiscences of a Secretary; 236 pp. By Alleyne Ireland. Mitchell Kennerley, New York. \$1.25 net.

The Carpenter and the Rich Man; 339 pp. By Bouck White. Doubleday, Page & Co., New York. \$1.25 net.

The Social Significance of the Modern Drama; 315 pp. By Emma Goldman. Richard G. Badger, Boston. \$1.00 net.

Socialism and Motherhood; 128 pp. By John Spargo. B. W. Huebsch, New York. 60 cents net.

Our Dishonest Constitution; 182 pp. By Allan L. Benson. B. W. Huebsch, New York. \$1.00 net.

Why the Capitalist? A Refutation of the Doctrines Prevailing in Conventional Political Economy; 277 pp. By Frederick Haller. The Author, 210 Pearl St., Buffalo, N. Y.

Love of One's Neighbor; 40 pp. By Leonid Andreyev. Authorized Translation by Thomas Seltzer. Albert and Charles Boni. New York. 40 cents net.

Mariana: A Drama in Three Acts and an Epilogue. By Jose Echegaray. Albert and Charles Boni, New York. 75 cents.

The Mexican Revolution, 1906-1914. By Theodore M. Gaitan. Joe Ray, Vancouver, B. C. 10 cents.

## THE NEW REVIEW

### BOARD OF EDITORS CONTENTS FOR SEPTEMBER, 1914

Frank Bohn			PAGE
William E. Bohn			
Floyd Dell			
W. E. B. Du Bois			
Max Eastman			
Louis C. Fraina			
Arturo Giovanitti			
Felix Grendon			
Isaac A. Hourwich			
Paul Kennaday			
Robert Rives La Monte			
Arthur Livingston			
Robert H. Lowie			
Helen Marot			
Herman Simpson			
Albert Sonnichsen			
Wm. English Walling			

The European Explosion..... 501

*Frank Bohn.*

British and American Socialists on the War ..... 512

*William English Walling.*

Anti-War Manifestoes ..... 519

The Approaching Elections..... 524

*Charles Edward Russell.*

Carnegie, Man of Peace..... 525

*Eugene V. Debs.*

The Police and the Unemployed..... 530

*Mary Heaton Vorse.*

The Revolt in Butte..... 538

*M. Rhea.*

Recent Expressions on Racial Inferiority. 542

*Robert H. Lowie.*

A SOCIALIST DIGEST..... 547

Belgian Socialists for War.

The Russian General Strike.

Servian Socialist Congress.

I. W. W. vs. A. F. of L. at Butte.

The Falling Birth-Rate.

The Right to Motherhood.

Suggestions for Educational Reform.

The Share of Labor.

### ADVISORY COUNCIL

Arthur Bullard  
George Allan England  
Charlotte Perkins Gilman  
Reginald Wright Kaufmann  
Harry W. Laidler  
Austin Lewis  
John Macy  
Gustavus Myers  
Mary White Ovington  
William J. Robinson  
Charles P. Steinmetz  
J. G. Phelps Stokes  
Horace Traubel  
John Kenneth Turner

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Alexander Fraser  
Jessie Ashley  
Louise W. Kneeland  
Caro Lloyd  
Gertrude U. Light  
Arthur Livingston  
Paul Wilson  
Max Heidelberg  
Louis C. Fraina

Published Monthly by the New Review Publishing Association  
80 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY.

ALEXANDER FRASER  
President

MAX HEIDELBERG  
Treasurer

LOUIS C. FRAINA  
Secretary

Subscription \$1.00 a year in United States and Mexico; six months, \$0.50. \$1.20 in Canada and \$1.50 in foreign countries. Single copies, 10 cents. In bundles of 5 or more, 6 cents a copy.

Entered at the New York post-office as second-class mail matter.

---

**At the present rate of progress—which will surely augment itself during the fall and winter months—it is demonstrably certain that the NEW REVIEW will be self-supporting within ten months.**

The war will be analyzed from month to month in the pages of the NEW REVIEW. The two brilliant articles by Frank Bohn and William English Walling in this month's issue are a brilliant augury of what is to come.

Since the NEW REVIEW was re-organized it has been making steady progress. Old readers who ceased reading the NEW REVIEW, upon receiving sample copies, have written us, saying: "We are surprised at the progress which has been made." The following figures show the progress made in the purely business income:

March.....	\$142.42
April.....	156.93
May.....	163.83
June.....	176.27
July.....	221.76

Subscriptions during July were double those of July last year, and considerably higher than any month this year. Bundle orders are increasing; and our friends are enthusiastic concerning the NEW REVIEW.

Geo. N. Falconer, of Denver, recently went on a literature tour of Colorado, selling the NEW REVIEW. He tried to speak in Oak Creek, the seat of one of the coal districts under martial law. Capt. Morgan in command forbade Falconer's speaking on the street; but our comrade held a big meeting in the miners' tent, with rousing success. Comrade Falconer is active in Local Denver, carrying on revolutionary propaganda.

While donations have increased we are still shy \$100 a month, which we ask our friends to supply by becoming Contributing Subscribers pledged to pay \$1 a month for one year.

**The great European War is creating havoc throughout the world. Conditions everywhere are in a state of crisis; money is tight. During this crisis the NEW REVIEW will need, more than ever the co-operation and aid of its friends.**

Louis C. Fraina,  
Business Manager.

---

# The New Review

Vol. II.

SEPTEMBER, 1914

No. 9

## THE EUROPEAN EXPLOSION

BY FRANK BOHN

The ease with which the ruling classes of Germany have placed the whole national life of the German people as a pawn in the game of war, cannot but astonish the world. How many times have not the Socialists been called "dangerous to civilization." They would overthrow "culture" and what not. Judging from the most reliable reports, the whole German nation, with the sole exception of the Socialists, is now willing that Germany shall be made a shambles, that its wealth and its art treasures, the homes of its people and the thousand places made sacred by the thoughts and deeds of Germans, shall all be overwhelmed and utterly ruined. Industrial society to-day cannot endure such havoc. The economics of its daily life is a too closely wrought texture to be slashed by the sword. Germany, attacked from every side, will, if the war continues through the winter, lose five from starvation for every one killed by the bullets of the enemy. The conditions of the Thirty Years' War will be repeated. And on what a scale! The schools closed. Industry paralyzed. Cities in ashes. Railroads blown up by dynamite. A thousand roadways clogged with fleeing, starving women and children. All this was brought upon the Fatherland by its arrogant Junkers and greedy capitalists, who were never tired of telling the world that Socialism was "a danger to the civilization of Germany."

There are to-day two unholy alliances in Europe. Each of them has been for a generation an insult to the intelligence of humanity and a danger to the peace of the world. The more wicked and more dangerous of these is the alliance between the German militarist aristocracy, with the Emperor at its head, and the German middle classes, from the capitalists to the intellectuals. Hardly less disgusting is the counter alliance between barbaric Russia on