



335.05
#47
v. 2
1914 repl. repl.

This reprint edition reproduces, in an unaltered form, the entire contents of the original publication, as far as it has been possible to determine.

Introduction

Copyright © 1968 by

GREENWOOD REPRINT CORPORATION

This work has been printed on long-life paper and conforms to the standards developed under the sponsorship of the Council on Library Resources.

Printed in the United States of America

July 2, 1968 SR

JANUARY 1914

Ten Cents

The **New Review**

A-MONTHLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

The President's Message . . . Democratic Imperialism These
Great Marx Killers *H. S.*

The British Labor Movement *Theodore Rothstein*

The Paterson Strike And After *Patrick L. Quinlan*

The Italian Elections *Richard Perin*

Class Government in Germany and England *J. B. Askew*

Story of the Putumayo Atrocities :
Conclusion *W. E. Hardenburg*

Fetichism *Harry Kemp*

The New Intellectuals *Robert Rives La Monte*

Syndicalism: A Reply *John Spargo*

La Trinidad: A Cry from Colorado *Ida Crouch-Haslett*

A Feminist Extravaganza *Felix Grendon*

The Test *Louise W. Kneeland*

Socialists on the Negro Question . . . *George Louis Arner, Theresa H. Russell*

150 Nassau Street

New York

The New Review

Published Monthly

by the

New Review Publishing Association
150 Nassau Street, New York City

Alexander Fraser, *President*
Bertha W. Howe, *Treasurer*
Richard P. Appleton, *Secretary*

Herman Simpson, *Editor*

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

One Year, . . . \$1.00 Six Months . . . \$.50
Canada 1.20 Foreign 1.50
Single Copies, 10 cents
In Bundles of 5 or more 6 cents per copy

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

EXCEPTIONAL OFFERS

	Regular Price	Our Price
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	\$2.00
The Larger Aspects of Socialism. By Wm. English Walling	1.50	
	\$2.50	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	\$2.40
Socialism As It Is. By Wm. English Walling	2.00	
	\$3.00	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	\$1.50
The Masses, 1 year	1.00	
	\$2.00	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	\$1.50
The Inter. Socialist Review 1 year	1.00	
	\$2.00	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	\$1.90
"Comrade Yetta." By Albert Edwards	1.35	
	\$2.25	

Send orders to

The NEW REVIEW
150 Nassau St. New York

Kindly Mention the NEW REVIEW When Writing to Advertisers.

A BOOK

No Serious Minded Socialist
Can Afford to Ignore

IMMIGRATION and LABOR

By ISAAC A. HOURWICH, Ph. D.

Is not only the foremost book on the problems of Immigration treated from the standpoint of Labor, but is also one of the best studies of present day economic conditions in the United States treated from the Socialist standpoint.

8vo. With numerous Diagrams \$2.50 net;
By mail \$2.70

Together with a year's subscription to the
NEW REVIEW, \$2.75
(Book by mail 20c. extra)

SEND ORDERS TO

The NEW REVIEW
150 NASSAU ST. NEW YORK

Frank Bohn

will start on a subscription lecture tour
of the United States, representing The
NEW REVIEW, in January 1914.

During January, February, March and
April he will speak in the Middle Western
States (from Ohio to Missouri and
Minnesota).

Local Secretaries and Labor Organ-
izations in the Middle West who are
interested will be furnished all particulars
by writing to Comrade Bohn's Manager

Godfred Ritterskamp

602 ST. CLAIR STREET
CHICAGO, ILL.

The New Review

Vol. II.

JANUARY, 1914

No. 1

The President's Message

The message read by the President at the opening of the regular session of the present Congress, on Dec. 2, indicates broadly but clearly the general outlines of the domestic policy of the Wilson-Bryan Administration. The Banking Reform bill now before Congress is, of course, to be enacted into law at an early date, so that credit may be freed "from arbitrary and artificial restraint" and mere millionaires may engage in extensive enterprises without being obliged to pay tribute to the billionaires or Money Trust. Additional legislation is to be enacted in the interest of the farmers. "The pending currency bill," according to the President, "does the farmers a great service. It puts them upon an equal footing with other business men and masters of enterprise . . . , and upon its passage they will find themselves quit of many of the difficulties which now hamper them in the field of credit." But the farmer needs more than this, says the President. The farmer is the servant of the seasons, and the processes of nature will not be hurried. Special credit facilities must therefore be created to correspond to the special needs of the farmer. In this respect "we lag behind many other great countries of the modern world." In European countries "systems of rural credit have been studied and developed while we left our farmers to shift for themselves in the ordinary money market." A special commission created by Congress has been studying the various systems of rural credit in the countries of Europe. This commission is now prepared to report, and the President hopes that "appropriate and adequate legislation" may soon be framed by Congress looking to the creation of a special system of rural credits.

The upper and lower strata of the middle class having been

strengthened by means of the new banking and credit systems, the President next intends "to prevent private monopoly more effectually than it has yet been prevented." The Sherman Anti-Trust law is to remain unaltered, "with its debatable ground about it," but "the area of that debatable ground" should be reduced "by further and more explicit legislation." In the belief of the President "the country" expects this matter of anti-trust legislation "to be the central subject of our deliberations during the present session," and he intends to address Congress upon it in a special message, but he assures the trusts that he really does not mean to do them any serious harm: "It is of capital importance that the business men of this country should be relieved of all uncertainties of law with regard to their enterprises and investments and a clear path indicated which they can travel without anxiety. It is as important that they should be relieved of embarrassment and set free to prosper as that private monopoly should be destroyed. The ways of action should be thrown wide open," so that men may grow rich as of yore. Thus the menacing mien of the Jacobin is replaced by the encouraging smile of a Guizot advising the French people to stop making revolutions and to get rich. The heaven-storming Bryan is mellowed, ripened and transformed into the suave Wilson with his *enriches vous!* When the promised special message comes, the trusts will of course howl as if they had been stabbed to the heart. But that also is part of the program. Meanwhile, however, the President has not a word to say about the indictment of labor union officials under the Sherman Anti-Trust law.

The great economic reforms having been thus outlined, the President broaches a great political reform: the selection by the various parties of nominees for the Presidency of the United States through primary elections, "without the intervention of nominating conventions." Party conventions may, indeed, be retained, "but only for the purpose of declaring and accepting the verdict of the primaries and formulating the platforms of the parties." The President makes the further suggestion "that these conventions should consist not of delegates chosen for this single purpose, but of the nominees for Congress, the nominees for vacant seats in the Senate of the United States, the Senators whose terms have not yet closed, the national committees, and the candidates for the Presidency themselves, in order that platforms may be framed by those responsible to the people for carrying them into effect."

The last suggestion sounds exceedingly novel, but it is not so novel as it looks. In the early history of the United States candidates for the Presidency were not nominated by conventions composed of specially chosen delegates, but by caucuses composed of Representatives and Senators. Mr. Wilson, who was an historian before he turned politician, wants to adapt the old practice, in a modified form, to a new purpose. The object of the entire proposal is obviously to weaken the hold of the machines and bosses upon the various parties. Mr. Wilson has not forgotten his trials and tribulations as governor of New Jersey and as a candidate before the Baltimore convention.

From matters of strictly domestic concern Mr. Wilson turns to the territories oversea. For the Porto Ricans he proposes nothing more than equal citizenship, but to the Filipinos he holds out the hope of ultimate self-government and even independence. Indeed, he tells us that he has already made a beginning in this direction "by appointing five instead of four native citizens to the membership of the commission"! This almost naive statement sums up quite correctly the whole difference between the Philippine policy of the Republicans and of the Democrats, for while the Republicans also promise ultimate independence in some remote future, the islands could never have been annexed without the votes of the Democratic Senators acting upon the advice and with the consent of Mr. Bryan.

For Alaska the President recommends the construction of a railroad system by the government, in violation of all Democratic traditions against the extension of the functions of government, and particularly of the federal government. Thus do the facts of life triumph over dead theories! And thus the President easily passes over to some recommendations affecting the conditions of special groups of wage-workers. The Bureau of Mines should be enabled to render more effectual service in "making the mines more economically productive as well as more safe." In view of the notorious fact that the American mines (*i. e.*, mine owners) are the most murderous in the world, a little more stress might have been laid on their safety, and a little less on their productivity. "In justice to the railway employees of the country," the President proposes an employers' liability act that "will be no less to the advantage of those who administer the railroads of the country than to the advantage of those whom they employ." Finally, a law is to be enacted for the "alleviation of the very unsafe, unjust, and burdensome conditions which now surround the employment of sailors."

Very likely, the La Follette bill, or some modification of it, will be enacted into law during the present session of Congress.

We now have a practically complete view of the Administration program. There is nothing very startling about it. Like the revision of the tariff and the Senate and income tax amendments, which were on their way even during the Taft administration, the recommendations now made by the President move in the groove laid out by the necessities of capitalist society without regard to the party in power at Washington. The Republican Senator Aldrich, who was one of the arch reactionaries of the Senate, had elaborated a banking reform project which differed only in detail from the bill fathered by the present Administration. How little the latter is likely to hurt the Money Power may be seen from the fact that, on the whole, it has received the enthusiastic endorsement of Mr. Jacob H. Schiff, and even Mr. Vanderlip, its severest critic among the big bankers, says that eighty per cent. of it is good. The first steps toward investigating the rural credit facilities of European countries were also taken during the administration of Mr. Taft, nor have we any reason to expect that these facilities will work greater wonders here than they have worked on the other side. They will undoubtedly redound to the benefit of the farmers, but they will not change the direction of social evolution. Other countries, too, have had restraints placed upon private monopoly, upon the issuance of securities, upon corporation management, and they have carried labor legislation far beyond anything yet proposed by Mr. Wilson or likely to be enacted here in the near future, but we have yet to learn that in those countries capitalist society has undergone any essential modification or that in them a basis has been laid for the cooperation of the wage-workers and the middle classes such as some of our Socialists look forward to in this country, some with hope and others with fear. On the contrary, whatever tendency there may be toward such cooperation in this country results from the comparative backwardness of both our working class and our middle class; it is due to our inferior economic development, and not to our alleged superior economic development. By all means, let the Wilsons and the Bryans, the La Follettes and the Roosevelts remove the ugliest excrescences of American capitalism, but the inherent economic tendencies of capitalism and the class struggles to which they inevitably give rise—these they cannot remove.

Democratic Imperialism

In his message to Congress the President vouchsafed but little if any information concerning the foreign policy of his Administration. We may be, as the President asserts, the friends and champions of constitutional government in America, but how is constitutional government to be established in Mexico, in Central America, and in the republics on the southern shore of the Caribbean Sea while most of the inhabitants of those republics are in a state of abject slavery? To talk of self-government to people who do not own even their bodies is nothing less than mockery. The first step to constitutional government in those republics must be the confiscation of the lands now owned by native oligarchies and foreign capitalists and the establishment upon them of a free peasantry. The United States might well take the lead in the accomplishment of a change so beneficent and so consonant with our own past history and traditions. But this can hardly be expected from an Administration dominated by Southern Bourbons.

Most likely the President felt that there was no need for setting forth the aims and purposes of his foreign policy before Congress, having done so about a month before, on Oct. 27, in an address delivered at Mobile before the Southern Commercial Congress and a great audience which, according to press reports, included a score of Latin-American diplomats.

Stripped of all unnecessary verbiage, the foreign policy of the Administration, as expounded in the Mobile address, consists in the virtual assertion of American suzerainty over all the Latin-American republics that are contiguous to the Panama Canal. The President foresees that, owing to the Canal, "some part at any rate of the centre of gravity of the world" will be shifted. The great tides of commerce "which have been running *along* parallels of latitude will now swing southward *athwart* parallels of latitude," and New York "will be nearer the western coast of South America than she is now to the eastern coast of South America," with the result that "the States lying to the south of us, which have always been our neighbors, will now be drawn closer to us by innumerable ties."

The President then pointed to what he regards as the principal drawback of these Latin-American States as compared with the United States. In the latter, he said, foreign capitalists

make *investments*, while in the former they are granted *concessions*. "What these States are going to seek, therefore, is an emancipation from the subordination which has been inevitable to foreign enterprise, . . . and we ought to be the first to take part in assisting in that emancipation. I think some of these gentlemen (referring to the Latin-American diplomats present) have already had occasion to bear witness that the Department of State in recent months has tried to serve them in that wise." And the President announced that the United States "will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest."

The latter announcement may be taken with a grain of salt. "Never" may mean no more than "hardly ever," as in the Gilbertian libretto, and territory may be acquired, by a country surrounded with weak neighbors, in other ways than by conquest. Texas was not acquired by conquest; the American colonists merely revolted from Mexico, whereupon they were admitted into the Union. The Panama Canal zone was not conquered from Colombia; the department of Panama merely revolted from Colombia, whereupon we just took what we needed. The President's declaration of self-abnegation, however sincerely meant, can be taken at no more than the face value of all similar platonic declarations in diplomacy, which is nil. On the other hand his declaration that the Monroe Doctrine is henceforth to be given a new and wider meaning, so as to exclude not only the political but also the economic domination of Europe from Latin-American republics, is one the significance of which cannot be exaggerated. And lest there be any doubt about the matter, we have the further statement of Ambassador Page, in a speech at the Savage Club in London, that "no sort of financial control can, with the consent of the United States, be obtained over these weaker nations which would, in effect, control their Government." The matter could not be stated with greater explicitness.

European capital at once took great alarm at these utterances of the President and his Ambassador to Great Britain. Within less than a month after the Mobile address, Lord Cowdray, the head of the great Pearson interests in Mexico, announced the withdrawal of his application for oil and other concessions in Colombia. Lord Cowdray denied that this action of his had any connection with the Mexican situation, but he blamed the American press for misrepresenting his purposes in Colombia and giving them an anti-Monroe Doctrine coloring.

Two weeks later the Congress of Costa Rica refused to ratify the oil contract negotiated by the Executive of that republic with the Pearson interests, and according to cabled report the successive failures of the Colombian and Costa Rican contracts moved the London *Daily Mail* to ask "whether an attempt will now be made by interested parties to upset Lord Murray's oil concession in Ecuador, *which gives his firm the right to exploit the whole country by sections*." Perhaps it is pertinent to add that, according to the latest dispatches, a violent revolutionary movement is now in progress in Ecuador.

The full meaning of the loss of these concessions to British interests will be made clear by the following considerations. A few months ago Mr. Winston Churchill, the First Lord of the Admiralty, stated that the British Empire was self-sufficient in regard to all metal and mineral products, excepting petroleum; that the latter was becoming more and more the fuel of battleships, and that therefore it was the policy of the British Government to establish British control over oil supplies sufficient to remove all anxiety about fuel for the navy in time of war. The demand for petroleum and its products is also increasing in other directions and the profits of oil companies have grown enormously in the last few years. Accordingly we find British interests obtaining control of oil companies in the Dutch East Indies, in California, in Mexico, and, as we have seen above, seeking to obtain a virtual monopoly of oil-bearing lands in the Caribbean republics. In Mexico these British interests collided with American interests, both Standard Oil and independent. The Standard Oil has been accused of financing the Madero revolution and of lending financial support to the rebels now in arms against Huerta, while the Pearson interests have been charged with rendering the same kind of service to Huerta. Thus the policy of President Wilson, which is aimed against usurpers in Latin-American republics, happens to coincide in Mexico with that of the Standard Oil, while the policy of the British Government to secure control of oil fields through British capital investments and concessions clashes with that of the American Government. But a further fact, pointed out by the *New York Times*, must be noted. The oil field concessions in Colombia involved, of course, the construction of railways and pipe lines for bringing the product to the coast, as well as of docks and harbor facilities. "It could not escape attention," says the *Times*, "that the seaport where the oil from the interior was to be delivered would be rather near the Panama

Canal. It is only natural that our Government and our people should have taken note of that fact. *An oil port will in the immediate future be the equivalent of a coaling station.*" Thus do the economic, political and strategic interests of the British capitalists and government come into conflict with those of the American capitalists and government throughout the entire basin of the American Mediterranean. And, of course, the interests of the leading capitalist countries of Europe, such as Germany and France, coincide in this matter with those of Great Britain.

Considered in the abstract, the policy proclaimed by President Wilson and his British Ambassador sounds eminently just. The Caribbean republics have been mercilessly exploited by European capitalists. To use the words of the President in his Mobile speech, "they have had harder bargains driven with them in the matter of loans than any other peoples in the world. Interest has been exacted of them that was not exacted of anybody else, because the risk was said to be greater, and then securities were taken that destroyed the risks. An admirable arrangement for those that were forcing the terms!" Many of the innumerable revolutions in those countries have been fomented and financed by European concession hunters. Next to the division of the large estates and the establishment of a free peasantry, emancipation from the clutch of foreign capital is the most indispensable condition for the normal development of those countries. But there is the dread certainty that the cancellation of European concessions will be followed by the transfer of these concessions to American capitalists, that the elimination of European financial control amounting to control of the governments will be succeeded by American financial control with augmented control of the governments.

Important steps in this direction were already made by Mr. Wilson's Republican and frankly imperialistic predecessors. The finances of Santo Domingo were placed under American control during the Roosevelt regime. Mr. Bryan now goes a step further and sends there American commissioners to supervise the elections. The present government in Nicaragua was set up during the Taft Administration and is now being maintained by force of American arms. A memorial recently presented to the foreign affairs committees of the House and Senate by the Salvadorean Committee of the National Central American Association roundly asserts that "the present Nicaraguan Government is but a satrapy of native hirelings, set up by the scandalous intrigues of the previous State Department, more for the

purpose of turning the country over to Wall Street than for gaining a bargain in the canal rights," and that Adolpho Diaz, the present President of Nicaragua, "before becoming a political tool, was bookkeeper" in mines "owned by the family of ex-Secretary Knox." And it is with this counterfeit government of mercenaries that New York bankers have negotiated loans, with the consent and approval of the State Department, and that Secretary Bryan has negotiated a treaty putting Nicaragua under an American protectorate similar to that established over Cuba and selling to the United States the canal route, the islands of Little Corn and Great Corn, and a point in the Gulf of Fonseca for a naval station, for \$3,000,000. The consummation of this treaty will frustrate forever the great ideal of the Central American patriots—a united and strong Central American republic.

But to make this ideal impossible of realization forever appears to be precisely what the Wilson Administration is aiming at, thus differing in no wise from its Republican predecessors. This policy has usually been spoken of as "dollar diplomacy." It certainly is that, but it is dollar diplomacy on a magnificent imperialistic scale. Its immediate aim is nothing less than the establishment of American supremacy over all the republics from the Rio Grande to the Panama Canal. But the cancellation of the Colombian oil concession mentioned above and the strategic reason therefor advanced by the *Times* point to an ultimate extension of the American protectorate south of the Canal, over Colombia and Ecuador.

In his message to Congress the President did not even allude to these weighty matters, but four days after the reading of the message dispatches from Washington reported that President Wilson had personally notified all the Senate members of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the Nicaragua treaty would be taken up as soon as the Mexican situation had cleared. The Administration, the dispatches added, was aware of the resentment already manifested in other Central American countries over the proposed protectorate, but it was prepared to meet the situation by extending the Nicaraguan protectorate over all Central America. Everyone familiar with the ways of the Washington press correspondents and their relations to the various departments of the government knows that such dispatches would not be sent out without the express authorization of the Department of State and possibly of the President himself.

The general outlines of the foreign policy of the present Administration are now clear. Imperialistic designs in China have been renounced and attempts are being made to placate the upper classes of the Filipinos, but the most ambitious schemes of the imperialists are to be pushed with the utmost vigor and to their ultimate conclusion in the countries bordering on the Caribbean. From the point of view of the imperialists themselves this is, without the slightest doubt, the wisest course. Imperialistic concentration upon one object and in nearby regions is far more likely to succeed than a scattering of energies in the Far East, where powerful rivals are already firmly established. Finally, this policy but carries forward the traditions of Democratic foreign policy from the days before the Civil War, when "manifest destiny" pointed not westward, beyond the Pacific, but southward, to the Caribbean and beyond.

These Great Marx Killers

A correspondent calls our attention to the following editorial article in *Harper's Weekly* of Nov. 29:

A QUESTION TO SOCIALISM

One of the most interesting books we know about Socialism is that of Professor Simkhovitch, "Marxism versus Socialism," published this year. In it he presents very effectively a group of facts making against the theory of increasing misery, on which Marx based his argument. Here is an example of the amount of consumption of various articles in England in 1840 and in 1881:

	1840	1881
Bacon and ham..... lbs.	0.01	13.93
Butter	1.05	6.36
Cheese	0.92	5.77
Currants and raisins..... "	1.45	4.34
Eggs	No. 3.63	21.65
Rice	lbs. 0.90	16.32
Cocoa	" 0.08	0.89
Corn, wheat and wheat flour..... "	42.47	216.92
Raw sugar	15.20	58.92
Refined sugar	" nil	8.44
Tea	" 1.22	4.58
Tobacco	" 0.86	1.41
Wine	gals. 0.25	0.45
Spirits	" 0.97	1.08
Malt	" 1.59	1.91

Similar figures are given about other countries, but these are enough to illustrate. We have not happened to see any effective Socialistic answer to such figures, and should be glad to know from some member of that party

what the best answer is. Socialism certainly stands on a different footing if it has to depend merely on the allegation that, although the world is improving with great speed now, Socialism could make it improve even more rapidly, than it would stand on if it could demonstrate that the misery of the laboring classes really has increased.

For charity's sake we supply the words "per capita" which the writer of the above forgot to insert after the words "amount of consumption."

Did the writer ask himself the question, What *did* the people of England eat in 1840? Potatoes, pork, beef, veal and vegetables aren't mentioned in the table, so of course they didn't eat them. Of bacon and ham they ate so infinitesimal an amount that it doesn't count. Of butter, cheese, eggs (less than 4 in a year!) and rice, practically nothing. Of bread (corn, wheat and wheat flour) a little over one-tenth of a pound a day, less than two ounces—they certainly couldn't afford to eat cake! What, then, did the English people live on in 1840?

The writer of the *Harper's Weekly* editorial appears to suffer from the same malady as most people. When he sees a row of figures he is awed, and when he sees two rows of figures—a statistical table—he loses his reason, falls down on his knees and worships the Inscrutable Power. Had he preserved his five senses he could not have perpetrated that magnificent statistical lie.

For, on looking up Professor Simkhovitch's book we find, on page 138, that the above table does not represent the amount of various articles consumed per capita, but "the quantities of the principal imported and excisable articles retained for home consumption per head of the total population of the United Kingdom." Thus spirits, malt, etc., are excisable articles, and the table shows the amount of them retained for home consumption, the remainder of the quantity produced having been exported. Rice, sugar, tea, etc., are all imported, and the table shows the amount of them retained for home consumption, the remainder of the total imports having been re-exported. The consumption of these and other tropical or colonial products has greatly increased, not only in England but throughout the Western world, owing to the development of world-commerce. There remain the homely food products, such as corn, wheat, bacon and ham, butter, cheese and eggs, which up to 1846, under the old Corn Laws, were subjected to a high import duty and were therefore imported only in small amounts. England in those days produced the bulk of her own food supply. But since the abolition of the Corn Laws these primary articles of

food have been regularly imported in large amounts, because free of duty, and England has become dependent upon foreign countries for her food supply.

Thus the above table has no bearing whatsoever upon the "theory of increasing misery." It proves nothing either for or against that theory. The only thing it proves, and beyond any possibility of doubt, is the shocking ignorance of a great editor and of a professor of economic history in a great American university.

H. S.

The British Labor Movement

By THEODORE ROTHSTEIN

Since 1910 the British working class has again taken a position in the front ranks of the labor movement of the world. The British workman is now a very much discussed person, and recent events in Ireland, with their repercussion on the struggle in England, have detracted nothing from the interest which he inspires alike in friend and foe. What in the world is he after? This seems to be the question anxiously asked by the capitalist as well as by his own brother in foreign countries. Is he just fooling, or does he really mean business? Is he merely revolting against temporary disadvantages, or is he bent upon doing permanent mischief? In short, what is the meaning of this unrest in the British labor world?

The question would never have been asked if the British workman had not been known for two generations as a person totally different from what he appears to-day. Was he not the best-behaved workman in the world? Read the numerous books in various languages that were written about him in the past: was he not always represented to be a paragon of virtue—an industrious, patient, level-headed, practical and responsible man of labor? And is this not borne out by statistics showing how seldom he quarrelled with his employers, how readily he negotiated with them for amicable agreements, how faithfully he observed the contracts, how promptly he accepted conciliation and arbitration, and how obediently he followed his chosen leaders? He was, indeed, the model workman of the world—the delight

of social reformers and the despair of the Socialists. Who does not remember his behavior at international congresses where he would smilingly watch the childish excitement of the foreign delegates and lecture them upon their lack of practical common sense? Alas, this type of workman has now disappeared! A younger generation has arisen which simply delights in picking quarrels with employers, and speaks in terms of "general" and "sympathetic" strikes. No wonder people are rubbing their eyes and asking in amazement: what has happened?

Something, indeed, has happened—a trifling thing, hardly worthy of mention. The cost of living has risen—nothing more. But this trifling circumstance has opened the eyes of the British workman—thence "all his qualities," as Tolstoy would say.

The type of British workman with which we were familiar until recently was formed during the counter-revolutionary era which followed the collapse of the Chartist movement. Politics and revolutionary methods of warfare were discredited, and a profound sense of disappointment and helplessness pervaded the ranks of the working class. What were the people to do? The more energetic among them fled the country and helped to swell the tide of emigration to the colonies and America. The others, with stupid resignation and despair, turned to their every-day tasks. "Suffer, such is thy lot"—this seemed to be their predominant feeling. But on the very day, April 10, 1848, which registered the collapse of the old hopes at Kennington Green, a group of "Christian Socialists" assembled in the house of F. Maurice and came to the conclusion that something more than military force was required to oppose the Chartist infatuation. About the same time the Earl of Shaftesbury, on the strength of his experience with the movement for the Ten Hours' day, advised the Prince Consort to put himself at the head of social reforms if he wished to kill the revolutionary spirit in the country. The mood and the behavior of the working class after the collapse of 1848 suggested to the reformers the lines on which they had to work. Emigration? Why, this is far from being a calamity! Emigration, Maurice declared, was the holiest thing that could be imagined. As for the tasks of everyday life, these are just the things which form the essence of "Christian" existence. And with the help of some of the mightiest in the land emigration funds were started, co-operative societies were formed, workingmen's colleges were established, and here and there even trade unions were called into life to assist the workman in his struggle for better conditions of labor. Down with

despair, was the watchword—down with despair over the collapse of utopian and un-Christian hopes! Let us work in the present and for the present! And simultaneously the capitalist classes were appealed to for generosity and justice, and Parliament was called upon to do its share of reform work.

Strange to say, the appeals succeeded. They coincided with the opening of that grand era of capitalist expansion which began after the abolition of the Corn Laws. England was rapidly becoming the workshop of the world, and immense wealth began to flow into the coffers of the English bourgeoisie. Not daring to rely too much on armed force which, in the absence of militarism, was inadequate, and reaping at the same time a fabulous harvest of profits in every part of the globe, the English capitalist classes saw the wisdom of responding to the appeals of the "social reformers" and adopted a conciliatory policy toward their "hands." While the most active elements among the latter were being rapidly shipped away to the Antipodes or California, the remaining toiling millions saw their earnings gradually rising, the state of employment improving, the hours of labor decreasing, their money going a longer way owing to the co-operative stores, and their leisure hours fruitfully employed in the class and lecture rooms of the numerous "Mechanics' Institutes." What had been formerly a despair now became a source of hope, and the details of every-day struggle now became the gospel of "small deeds."

This it was which created the type of British workman such as we knew him throughout the remainder of the last century. The capitalist was no longer his enemy. Why should he regard him as an enemy when he found him in most cases so conciliatory and attentive to "reasonable" demands? Of course, he had to fight him sometimes or defend himself against his aggression. But there were wicked men in every class, and did not even a husband and wife sometimes quarrel? The idea of harmony between capital and labor gradually took the place of the doctrine of class war which had been propagated by the Chartists. The rest came as a natural consequence. Trade unions were necessary because some of the capitalists were wicked, but as those wicked capitalists were rather the exception, trade union policy stood in no need of militancy. On the contrary, trade union policy was to be based on the recognition of the essential good will of employers, and its objective was to be conciliation and compromise. The results of this conception were threefold. First, diplomacy became the predominant method of dealing with

employers; this, in its turn, led to the moral aggrandizement of the leaders and the corresponding withdrawal of the masses, as an active factor, to the background. Secondly, it became more and more the fashion to fix the relationship between the employers and their workmen in definite treaties, discouraging all but diplomatic action, and eliminating any change of wages and hours of labor during a certain, more or less lengthy, period of time. Thirdly, the primary aim of trade unionism gradually underwent a change from that of protecting the interests of the members by supporting them in their struggles against the employing class to that of assisting them in cases of illness, death, unemployment, and so forth. Out of the first arose the corruption of the leaders, direct and indirect, since it was easy to become corrupted in the absence of all control and in the daily communion with the employers. The second was responsible for the formation of a series of obstacles to the free and immediately responsive action of the masses. The third loaded the trade union organizations with a weight of responsibilities, beyond which it became increasingly difficult for them to discharge any other. The consequence of all these developments was that in course of time, as the economic world-position of England changed and wealth no longer flowed with the same facility into the pockets of the English capitalist classes, the growing reluctance of the latter to yield more than could be extorted by the utmost pressure brought the process of improvement in the conditions of labor to a dead stop. The last twenty years and more of the last century saw practically no advance in the earnings and no reduction in the hours of labor of the working class in Great Britain. In fact, considering the ever increasing fluctuations in the state of employment, which mark the period of decline of the unchallenged supremacy of British trade and industry after the rise of Germany and the United States, it is questionable if there was not actually a retrogression in the earnings of the British working class.

There was, however, one feature in the situation of the last quarter of the nineteenth century which mitigated its gravity, namely, the falling prices of most of the necessaries of life. There can be no doubt that though the nominal earnings of British workmen remained stationary or even decreased, their *real* earnings increased owing to the reduction of the cost of living. It was this circumstance which kept the British working class quiet and helped to maintain, in altered conditions, the old view and the old policy of trade unionism. Now and then,

as in 1893, the miners of South Wales or as in 1897, the engineers, the working class would become conscious of the altered attitude of the employers and break out in revolt. But the situation as a whole was still tolerable, and the revolts would die away and produce no further consequences.

The rising cost of living, which may be roughly said to have commenced with the middle of the first decade of the present century, put an end to the long drawn-out idyll. The pressure of life became more and more unbearable, and then it was seen how inadequate the progress had been in the whole preceding period. The men began demanding higher wages and better conditions of labor, but instead of being met half-way, as they had expected from past experience, they found their path blocked by a colossal Frankenstein whom they themselves had reared. There were the contracts and agreements which tied them down to certain conditions and which the masters were cleverly manipulating so as to stifle all action. There were their own organizations which they had allowed to decay and to be weighted down by a vast number of obligations which had nothing to do with the fight against the employers. There were, lastly, their own leaders whom they had permitted to usurp all authority and who had grown fat and lazy in doing nothing for them and doing as much as they could for the masters. Again a feeling of despair settled upon the masses, but this time the despair spelt not inaction, but on the contrary an outburst of activity all along the line.

It would take us too far were we to describe this outburst in detail. It was introduced by a series of skirmishes in various industries, all bearing a distinctive character. In 1906 the South Wales miners were already busy carrying on a series of local strikes in order to force the non-unionists into the organizations. In 1907 it nearly came to a general strike on the railways. A year later we witness a seven weeks' strike in the cotton industry, where for fifteen years previously all disputes had been amicably arranged under the famous peace treaty known as the Brooklands Agreement. In 1909 the same industry sees the outbreak of another war over the grievance of one single man, and a very chaotic dispute takes place among the engineers of the Northeast coast against the wishes of the leaders, in consequence of which George Barnes was constrained to lay down his secretaryship. The year following sees the famous boiler-makers' strike, which must be regarded as the real beginning of the new era. What with its sectional spirit, its abhorrence of all

strikes and disputes, its well-filled quasi-war chest (almost entirely invested in railway and other securities so as to avoid all temptation!), and its exemplary secretaries who held shares in the masters' companies and accepted posts under the Government—the boiler-makers' organization had been the veritable model of a practical, level-headed British trade union. And then it suddenly broke out in revolt because the employers had not been quick enough to satisfy the grievances of a handful of its members, thus trampling under foot the most solemn agreements, repeatedly and defiantly disobeying the orders and ignoring the entreaties of the leaders, and after many months of privation and universal condemnation from all labor leaders, returning to work only after the employers had been humbled to the dust and had agreed to all their demands. In 1911 we have the remarkable tidal wave of strikes among the transport workers of all kinds in all places and the general strike of the railway men; then in 1912 the general miners' strike and lastly, this year, again strikes upon strikes of the transport and railway workers—strikes against immediate grievances, strikes for the sake of one man, strikes on account of one scab or one brutal foreman, strikes because others had struck, strikes for the sake of a principle, strikes without the consent of the leaders, strikes against the express orders of the leaders, strikes on account of "tainted" goods,—strikes without end on every imaginable occasion. It is as if the workers of Great Britain (or rather the United Kingdom, because Ireland has now been drawn into the vortex of the class war) had been bitten by some restless microbe and were impatient to make good at one blow what they had failed to achieve in the long years of their stagnation.

That they are in a great measure succeeding in this, admits of no doubt. Certainly in course of the last few years wages have risen and the general conditions of employment have improved as a direct result of the strikes and, still more perhaps, as their indirect effect. A wholesome fear has, no doubt, been planted in many an employer's breast and a good deal of improvement has been achieved without striking a single blow. Yet this gain—quite apart from its actual amount—must be considered as of but secondary moment. Much more important is the *indirect* result of the awakening of the British working class to the realities of the situation. The British workman has at last realized the fatuity of his former trade union policy, and his present revolt is as much a revolt against

this policy as against the employers. He no longer wants to be bound by treacherous agreements which prevent him from fighting the oppressors; he is no longer willing to surrender his rights unreservedly into the hands of his officials and other leaders, and he no longer appreciates the miraculous virtue of the diplomatic method in industrial warfare, which has reduced his militant organizations to the level of mere friendly societies. Accordingly we see how even the Brooklands Agreement is being thrown overboard by the cotton operatives who refuse to remain parties to it; how the leaders are everywhere being taken in hand and made to execute the precise instructions of the members; and how the recruiting of fresh members and the amalgamation of kindred trade unions are being pursued with a zest hitherto unknown. It is remarkable, too, as recent figures show, how less and less the workers are inclined to have outside agencies of conciliation and arbitration intervene in their disputes with the employers, preferring to have them settled by direct negotiation on their own direct responsibility. As a net result of this awakening and these practices, we have a most marvellous increase of activity among the masses and a growing sense of power such as they have not possessed since the great days of the Chartist struggle.

And already we see rising from this combination of material and moral factors a powerful sense of class consciousness finding its expression in numerous directions. The incessant conflicts on a vast scale are bringing face to face large masses of workmen and employers, which almost assume the character of classes. They also—just because they are so vast—serve to bring out the interdependence of various categories of workers not merely in the same branches of industry, but also beyond their limits. Lastly their vastness causes the hearts of all proletarians to beat in unison with those directly implicated in them and creates a bond of moral union and sympathy throughout the class. It is this new class feeling of solidarity, generated and strengthened by the struggle itself, which is responsible for the latest doctrine and practice of the sympathetic strike, of which we hear so much in these days. The sympathetic strike may be impractical; but just as little as Philip Snowden's condemnation of the strike-practice, does the condemnation of the sympathetic strike by the trade union leaders prevent the masses from doing what is dictated to them by the feeling of fellowship with the different sections of their class. It may be foolish for the railway workers to act upon the doctrine of

the sympathetic strike whenever their assistance is asked, because then the railwaymen would never come out of strikes; but when they refuse to handle goods supplied to them by black-leg labor from Dublin, where the workers are bludgeoned for maintaining their union, who but the callous or corrupt can help rejoicing at this exhibition of class solidarity and hastening to their assistance? And in the fire of this newly acquired class consciousness all the old divisions between the skilled and unskilled, between the aristocracy and democracy of labor, are being destroyed and the whole mass is being coalesced into one solid, fissureless block of a class. In the few years which have elapsed since the commencement of the present century the British working class has undergone a revolution which, taking all its aspects, material as well as moral, is nothing short of marvellous.

* * *

How does it stand in point of *politics*? This is a question which must rise to the mind of every Socialist, and which we must review if our subject is to be adequately dealt with.

The period of trade union decay was also the period of political decay of the British working class. The traditional view has always been that precisely because the British working class was infatuated with its trade unions it neglected the political weapon. This view, however, is only conditionally true. It is perfectly correct to say that trade unionism spread in England mainly as a reaction against the political movement of the Chartists, but we have seen how little vigor there was in its subsequent development. As a matter of fact, the same factor, the blunting of class consciousness in the British workman, which was responsible for the decay of his trade union action, was also responsible for his aversion to political action. It could not, indeed, have been otherwise. It was not trade unionism which prevented in England the rise of a political labor or Socialist movement, but it was the lack of class consciousness which acted detrimentally on both trade unionism and independent political action. We may go so far as to say that had the British working class carried on a militant policy on the economic field by means of its trade unions it would have soon found itself in the political field doing the same work by political means. The reason for this *a priori* assumption is obvious: a militant trade union policy presupposes as well as generates a class consciousness, a consciousness of the class antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and class

consciousness is *one and indivisible* and is bound to be introduced into all dealings of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie. As an *a posteriori* fact, whenever the British working class was driven to assume a more determined trade union policy by some provocation on the part of the capitalists it also raised the standard of political revolt. In the 'sixties, when the trade unions, goaded by the action of the authorities in applying to them the provisions of the criminal acts, became restless, they ended by joining the International and extorting a great extension of the franchise. Ten years later when they again grew more militant because the employers made them civilly liable for their actions, they once more rushed into the political field and brought out their first labor candidatures. In our own days, as we shall presently see, the same happened with the Labor party. In a word, the lack of political activity which marks the period following the collapse of Chartism has been due to the same causes as were responsible for the decay of trade union activity: it was the absence of class consciousness which operated in the one as in the other case.

The first years of the present century also saw the rise of the Labor party. Its formation dates back to the year 1899, when the Trade Union congress adopted a resolution in favor of the establishment of a joint trade union and Socialist committee to organize and to further direct labor representation in Parliament. It was in anticipation of the next general election which was due in 1901 that the resolution was brought in and adopted, and though the suggestion itself might have been due to the obvious collapse of the Liberal party after the abandonment of Home Rule and the death of Gladstone, its aim was merely the more systematic pursuit of the policy of sending workingmen to Parliament without any specific political distinction—in reality as Liberals—which had been carried on since 1875. In other words, neither the authors of the resolution nor the majority of its supporters had anything further in their minds than the establishment of a mechanism for the more systematic creation of "Lib-Labs." As such the committee had no historical reason for existence. The Social Democrats soon left it, and the Independent Labor party itself, opportunist as it was, would soon probably have found its position very equivocal and incompatible with its Socialist professions. As a matter of fact, the party conference of 1901 revealed unmistakable signs of premature decay, and a few years more would have seen the committee going the way of its

numerous predecessors. But just in 1901 a remarkable thing happened: the House of Lords, getting bold in face of the apparent lethargy of the trade unions, let fall the famous judgment in the Taff Vale affair, and immediately the entire situation changed. The trade unions began to flock in large numbers to the Labor Representation Committee, and the Labor party movement was saved. In 1903 the first electoral contests were fought and won, and the general elections in January, 1906, saw the triumphant return to the House of Commons of a solid and enthusiastic phalanx, twenty-nine strong.

Now, one thought, the British working class was at last on its legs. It is true the movement had no program, no definite objective, and even its formal independence was ill-defined in the rules. But the way in which it fought and won its battle for the reversal of the Taff Vale judgment in the very first session of Parliament was calculated to inspire enthusiasm in the most sceptical mind, and it was generally agreed that the Labor party was likely to prove better than its theorists and official leaders. The disappointment came sooner than was expected. The very next year revealed a certain slackness in the movement; in 1908 we witness the parliamentary Labor group sedulously cooperating with the government on the Licensing Bill, with unemployment raging outside; in 1909 it ranges itself definitely on the side of the government in the matter of Lloyd George's famous budget and the campaign against the House of Lords; in 1910 it returns from the two general elections still more chastened in mood and still more moderate in conduct; and since then it has not ventured on any single action of its own—much less on any of which the Liberal government disapproved, contenting itself with saying ditto to every government measure, including the Insurance Act, and following its direct supporters into the same lobby. Its independence has become a mere matter of form and the Liberals themselves treat it as a mere appendix to their party. Even in such situations of immediate concern as the great railway and miners' strikes it proved worse than a broken reed: it traduced the railway men and it helped to force a compromise upon the miners.

There can be no question as to the immediate responsibility of the leaders for this *debacle*. Opportunists for the most part, ignorant in some cases and positively corrupt in certain individual instances, these men came to Parliament with a very hazy notion as to what they were going to do there. Some may well

have thought that they had come there to fight the two bourgeois parties on behalf of the interests of the working class. But for one thing, they themselves knew little what role Parliament had to play in this fight and were inclined to exaggerate its importance as an instrument of reform, and then they soon succumbed to the superior intelligence of other men who, professing the "organic" theory of society, proved to them that from their own standpoint diplomacy, compromise and cooperation were much better than fighting. The result was the same as we saw in the trade union movement. The leaders having repudiated the militant policy and adopted the diplomatic method of warfare, the masses became superfluous and sank back into a state of inactivity and apathy, while the leaders acquired an exaggerated independence and became, by their own policy and through their constant and exclusive communion with the master class, politically corrupted. Hence, when it came to the renewal of the parliamentary mandates in the two elections of 1910, they found the masses so unresponsive that they only succeeded in retaining their seats with the help and the favor of the Liberals. This reacted on their subsequent position in Parliament and rendered them still tamer and more impotent. George Lansbury (who, by the way, deeply resented the critical remarks of the present writer in the *Call* at the time of the elections of 1910 on this very subject) was the first publicly to admit that the Labor party had by its tactics committed suicide, and now we have even Kair Hardie and Philip Snowden, openly lamenting the failure of their policy as having brought about the collapse of their hopes.*

To the leaders, then, with their repudiation of class antagonisms and the class war tactics, must be attributed in the first

* A propos of the well-known Leicester incident Mr. Snowden said: "If the Labor Party Executive had endorsed a second Labor candidate for Leicester, it would have jeopardised the seats of four-fifths of the present Labor members. It is no use putting forward every reason except the true one. The present labor representation in Parliament is there *mainly by the goodwill of the Liberals*, and it will *disappear* when that goodwill is turned into active resentment. . . . It is worth serious consideration whether it would not be for the ultimate good of Socialism that we should be without representatives in Parliament until we can place them there by our own votes in the constituencies, instead of returning them by Liberal votes; for under such conditions no Labor M. P., however honest he may be, *can exercise that independence* which the Labor party expects from him" ("Labour Leader," June 26, 1913). Writing on the same subject, Keir Hardie says: "We are already *heavily overweighed by the Labor Alliance*. We attract to our ranks the best of the active, rebellious spirits in the working class. These do not expect impossibilities, but they cannot brook being always called upon to defend and explain away the *action and inaction of the parliamentary party*" ("Labour Leader," July 10, 1913). The italics are in each case ours.

instance the *debacle* of the Labor party. It is obvious, however, that here, too, it is the lack of class consciousness among the masses which in the last resort is responsible for everything. Of course, it is the duty of the leaders to foster and to educate that class consciousness, and for this work no class-room or laboratory is better fitted than the Parliament. To have neglected this work and made use of Parliament for totally different purposes constitutes the unpardonable sin of the labor leaders. But from the larger, historical point of view the main cause of the evil, including the behavior and the false conceptions of the leaders themselves, will be found in the absence of class consciousness from which the workers of Great Britain have hitherto suffered. It was the masses themselves who from the very first, laboring under a very confused notion of what political independence meant, sent to Parliament as "independent" men of Labor representatives like Shackleton and Henderson and the whole crowd of trade union officials, Liberals to the core and bona-fide betrayers of the workers' cause in the field of economic warfare. It was also the masses themselves who permitted the fight to slacken immediately after the Taff Vale fight had been won, and looked on with indifference while their representatives were assuming the grand airs of profound statesmen and hobnobbing with the political enemies of the working class. It is, as we have said, the exact parallel to that which took place in the trade unions: the same causes, the same effects, and the same phenomena.

But the same historical analysis of the fundamental causes which are responsible for the singular fortunes of the Labor party, such as we know it to-day, allows us to make a more hopeful prognostication as to the future. Because the revival of the labor movement in the economic field has not as yet been accompanied by a similar revival in the political domain, so that the Labor party still stands where it was a few years ago, the home-baked English Syndicalists have concluded that one is the effect of the other, that is, that the British working class has taken up the trade union weapon because it has become disappointed with the effects of political action, and that it will henceforth move along trade union lines until such time as it overthrows the capitalist order of things. This notion is pure imagination. Apart from one or two "intellectuals" who have, indeed, passed through disappointment with the Labor party into Syndicalism, the masses know nothing, either in theory or in practice, of the Syndicalist doctrines, and their present ac-

tivity is due to the causes set forth above and to nothing else. By no manner of means can any Syndicalist tendencies be found in this activity. The strikes are in no way conceived by those who engage in them as the alternative to political action or as an exercise in revolutionary "gymnastics." Nor is the weapon of the sympathetic strike and the form of organization by industry rather than by craft advocated and indulged in for any objects beyond those immediately posited by the necessities of economic warfare. If there is among the masses of the working class in Great Britain a disappointment with the Labor party, it takes the form of a relapse into the old Liberal or Tory creeds, and whatever ulterior motives may be operative, for instance, in the case of sympathetic strikes is wholly confined to the domain of simple class solidarity. But while the Syndicalists (if such exist in England outside a handful of men, many of whom, moreover, are laboring under a misapprehension of their own professed doctrines) are wrong in the interpretation of recent events, they are nevertheless correct in the statement of the fact that the extent, the intensity, and the form which trade union activity has of late assumed stand in no relation to the political interest of the masses and the concrete expression of that interest, the Liberal-Labor party. While in the field of economic warfare the masses are performing a revolutionary work of first magnitude, they not only do nothing to reform the Labor party, but they exhibit as yet no sign which could lead one to assume that in any election which might take place at the present moment they would act otherwise than vote as heretofore in the ordinary Liberal or Tory fashion.

This phenomenon is, no doubt, very baffling, but it only shows that the necessary extension of class consciousness from the economic to the political field has not yet been accomplished by the masses. Superficially considered, such an extension may appear to require merely an intellectual effort, and in fact, one often comes across the opinion that it is "intelligence" which the British masses lack. But that is a wrong view of the situation. The extension of class consciousness in the British masses from the economic to the political field is obstructed by many influences. It is more easily generated on the economic field, where the conflict of classes is more immediate. Even so it required several years before it could free itself from the material and moral shackles which had been imposed upon it by the theory and practice of old trade unionism. It cannot be otherwise with the process of clearing away the obstacles in the political domain. The

duration of this process is simply a question of the growth of class consciousness in breadth and depth, which being, as I have said, one and indivisible, is bound at a given stage to overflow the ancient dams and force its way into the field of politics. Never at any given moment can it be said *a priori* that this stage has been reached. Experience alone can prove it. But a theoretical analysis of the forces which are now at play teaches us that that stage is inevitable and must, if the present conditions continue to obtain, come very soon—perhaps like a thief in the night.

I use intentionally the qualifying words: "If the present conditions continue to prevail." Bourgeois society—especially in England—is inexhaustible in expedients and, in England especially, it never lacks the courage to act. It is possible then—at least theoretically—that by some bold policy of concession the capitalist classes may succeed in bringing about a new reconciliation with the working class. In that case the newly acquired class consciousness may be blunted, and the whole revolutionary process, at present observable, may be stopped. The situation is too complicated to allow it to be definitely stated whether this theoretical possibility is likely or not to translate itself into practice. One feels naturally tempted to disallow such a possibility, and an attempt to set up a justification of such optimism may easily be vitiated by promptings of sympathy rather than of demonstrated fact. But on the other hand, a correct appreciation of the situation ought to lead the Socialist forces to do everything in their power to assist in the present revolutionary process by taking part in the strike movements, by endeavoring to draw into them ever larger masses, and by introducing into them as much as possible system and solidity, because only by such means can their effect upon the class consciousness be rendered more profound and rapid and its passage into the political field accelerated. That is why the proclaimed attitude of men like Snowden towards the present strikes is so wrong and so opposed to the correct policy of Socialism, and this is the reason why we regard as inadequate even that sympathy (without active cooperation) which is imposed upon its members by the British Socialist party. We regard the complete solidarity on the present occasion of the Socialist parties with the masses as their prime duty and their chief work. This is the more necessary as the time may come when the masses will revolt against their political leaders in the same way and for the same reasons as they have revolted against their trade union leaders, and the close intimacy of the

Social-Democrats with them will become a matter of great and immediate importance.

Let us conclude with this note of warning. The time is heavy with momentous issues, and we must prepare ourselves to deal adequately with them.

London, Oct, 19, 1913.

The Paterson Strike and After

By PATRICK L. QUINLAN

[Comrade Quinlan, a leader in the Paterson strike, is out on \$5,000 bail, pending an appeal from a sentence of seven years for inciting to riot.]

It is entirely natural that the general bourgeois public, including certain groups of radicals and intellectuals, should be unable to imagine the possibility of a great rebellion of the workers without a John Brown, a Mother Jones or a "Bill" Haywood leading and directing. For they seldom look below the surface. To them the leader is the movement, the rank and file his pawns. It is the dramatic side of these incidents of the class struggle that appeals to the general public, and the Haywoods are regarded as essential as the Prince of Denmark is to the play of "Hamlet."

But even for those whose chief interest in a great strike centers in its economic and political aspects, the heat of conflict and the glare of fiery headlines too often tend to throw into the shade the economic causes and the net results. Due to the almost inevitable persecution of leaders, personalities take on a fictitious value and shine for a moment in the light of publicity.

The effect of this is doubly unfortunate, for on the one hand it leads to hero worship, and on the other it creates a belief in the mind of any but a great leader of men that he himself is the most important element in the combat.

And for the same reasons it is often almost impossible to determine accurately the causes or to appraise justly the results of industrial conflicts until passions have subsided and personalities have lost their glamor. The lapse of time restores to events their true proportions.

To a certain extent the above holds true of the recent strike

of the silk workers of Paterson, although to a less degree than in the case of other struggles within the last year or so. For despite the newspaper froth and the magnification of the personalities of the so-called leaders, no one at all familiar with the facts could have maintained for a moment that any man or group of men were the essential factors. The economic causes were too apparent to allow any to be deceived save those who were unwilling to know the truth.

Of course the same general economic conditions that cause all big strikes were responsible for the Paterson conflict. Low wages and the high cost of living are the universal agents of industrial war. But nevertheless there were certain conditions peculiar to the silk industry and to Paterson in particular.

During the last twenty years the process of manufacturing silk has been revolutionized. New machinery has been invented that is so nearly automatic that it can be operated by youthful and entirely unskilled labor. While the productivity of the machines has increased tenfold the weaver's art has become unnecessary. In some branches of the trade the operation of the loom became so simple that the employers decided that the weavers, especially the broad silk weavers, could run four looms instead of two without an equivalent advance in compensation.

From the very beginning the silk weavers resisted this attempt of the manufacturers to double and quadruple production at the expense of the workers. They realized that it would result in a glut of the labor market of the trade and a consequent reduction of wages. For a time the resistance was partially successful; but as there was no concerted effort, each shop fighting only for its own interests, defeats became more frequent.

Another of the factors leading up to the general struggle, and to the silk workers the sorest and most aggravating of all, was the inhumanly long work-day demanded by the manufacturers. Some of the mills were operated on a ten-hour basis, others had an eleven-hour schedule, while in still others twelve hours of work were exacted.

The workers finally became so restless under these intolerable conditions that in November, 1912, four months before the general strike was declared, a league was formed to create a sentiment among the silk workers that would make possible a concerted movement for an eight-hour day. This may be regarded as the actual beginning of the subsequent general movement.

However, this preliminary agitation for the eight-hour day,

since it had no news value at the time nor presented any dramatic features, was entirely overlooked by those who later attempted to make the Paterson strike illustrate preconceived ideas, and the tendency was to blame the leaders of the I. W. W. for the unsuccessful struggle for an eight-hour day. But the movement had begun before they came upon the scene, and they were neither responsible for its initiation nor to blame for its failure.

The league conducted its propaganda by means of leaflets spread broadcast among the silk workers. The local Socialist paper lent its columns to those agitating the movement.

Finally, in order to concentrate energies and prevent confusion the Eight-Hour League was merged with the local section of the Industrial Workers of the World.

The seed which had been sown began to bear fruit. It was not long before large meetings were being held at which the speakers and orators centered their talks upon the advantages to the workers of an eight-hour day and upon denunciations of the four-loom system. This agitation grew in strength during November and December, the organization constantly gaining recruits as a result of it.

In the first week of 1913 the growing spirit of rebellion was aided by an unexpected event. The broad silk weavers of the Doherty mill declared a strike. These workers had been organized by and were at that time affiliated with the Detroit faction of the I. W. W. About nine months previously they had struck, had failed to win their demands, and had returned to work after a very brief struggle. But the four-loom system and other working conditions proved unendurable. These weavers, about 1,200 in all, broke from their former affiliations, joined the Chicago I. W. W. and declared a second strike.

The demand for the abolition of the four-loom system was made the centre of the fight, although the question of the eight-hour work day was by no means abandoned.

The method of fighting resembled guerilla warfare. The workers remained out for about a week, then returned for a few days and again refused to work. This continued until the end of the month.

In the early part of February the Doherty workers began to realize that their fight could not be won alone, and that, if they were to win, the strike must be made general throughout the trade. This met with the approval of Local No. 152 of the I. W. W. and an agitation for a general strike began, the ar-

gument advanced being that unless the Doherty workers should win their demands the four-loom system would be introduced in all the silk mills of Paterson.

The broad silk weavers as a whole were swept into line, and with them the workers in the ribbon mills and dye houses. A general strike was proclaimed on February 25th, and all the crafts of the silk industry responded to the call with the exception of the loom fixers, who were affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

The story of the general strike, at least the more dramatic events, is familiar to every one. The arrests of the outside agitators, the closing of the strikers' meeting halls, the cooperation of the Socialist party, the arrest of the editor of the Socialist organ and the confiscation of the *Passaic Issue*—all these are too recent occurrences to have been forgotten. The brutality of the authorities and police of Paterson has become a by-word, and their utter disregard of law and justice will not be forgotten for many years to come. Still fresher in the memory of the workers of the country are the later events, the sentencing of Alexander Scott to fifteen years' imprisonment for "inciting hostility to government" in the person of the brutal Bimson, the conviction of the present writer and his sentence to seven years in state's prison on the charge of inciting to riot.

The strikers held firmly to their demands in the face of hunger and brutal and unlawful persecution, and it was not until the early part of July that any signs of weakening were apparent. But then the relief store was obliged to close for lack of funds. Hundreds of the strikers were in jail, children were starving and general ruin threatened the city of Paterson.

The dyers were the first to break under the pressure. A week later they were followed by the broad silk weavers. The ribbon weavers held out for a week or so longer, trying to secure some sort of favorable terms. But the beginning of August saw the great majority back at work and the strike was officially declared off.

When the strike was over the Socialist papers of the country were inundated with a flood of discussion on the merits, demerits, methods and tactics of the I. W. W. But the greater part of it was far beside the mark. For nothing new in tactics or methods had been tried or discovered. Sabotage, advocated by one or two of the agitators, is by no means new, nor is mass picketing. The idea of paying no rent to the landlords during the strike, in an attempt to force them to side with the strikers, was advo-

cated by the writer, but was an imitation of the methods used by the Irish peasantry many years ago. Although a few agitators were brought into momentary prominence by the persecution to which they were subjected, no new leader was really produced by the struggle.

To be sure, the withholding of rent was the source of much trouble to the middle class and petty capitalists. They felt its effects worse than they did the direct results of the strike. Had they been at all capable of defending their own interests, it must have forced the owners of land and houses to exert pressure upon the governments of city and county, or perhaps the state might have felt impelled to force an investigation and settlement of the trouble. But although losing financially to a greater extent than any other class, the impotence of this house-owning section of the community was such that its members could do nothing but stand aside and whine over their losses. It gave no sign of energy or vitality and amply proved the Socialist contention that it has outlived its usefulness and is now in the parasitic stage.

In one respect the Paterson strike was an exception to the general rule in industrial struggles, namely, that defeat brings discouragement and demoralization. There may have been a little nervousness on the part of some, but as a whole the body of workers went back to the mills with courage unimpaired and with heads erect. As if claiming the major portion of the honors of war, the workers entered the mills without lamenting their losses and wailing over their past hardships, but swearing to renew the combat at the first opportunity.

That this was no vain threat is proved by the fact that since the ending of the general strike there have been seven or eight smaller struggles. These were caused as a rule by the retention or re-employment of workers who during the protracted fight had acted as strikebreakers or special police. In every instance that this was discovered, the weavers stopped work as one man. In some cases a few hours was sufficient to cause the removal of the objectionable individual, while in others a day or so of stoppage of work was required to convince the employers that the workers were in earnest. But in every case it was the workers who came out victorious.

In nine or ten mills the wages of the workers were increased, that of the weavers about ten per cent., in one mill twenty-five per cent. A gain is also to be recorded in the matter of working hours. The ten-hour system is now the rule, although there are

six or seven mills of fair size where the nine-hour day was won. But the feeling of strength and solidarity among the ribbon weavers is such that they are making preparations to insist upon the nine-hour day in all the mills of the city.

It is evident from the above that the end of the strike was by no means a rout for the workers, as has been claimed in some quarters, nor that the strike won no material benefits. What was won may not have been all that was demanded, but still it is a fact that since the strike the working conditions have been improved to a considerable extent and that the weavers, at least, have forced upon the employers in the shape of higher wages some of their immense losses incurred by the strike. And the feeling of solidarity and of combined strength gained in the long struggle is not at all a passing thing, it is as evident to-day as it was during the height of the strike.

A review of the results of the strike would be incomplete without some mention of its effect upon the political complexion of Paterson.

Before the strike the Socialist party received in the last presidential election a higher vote than it had ever before received in Paterson. The Socialist votes cast at that time totalled 1,650. At the municipal election last November the Socialist candidate for Mayor of Paterson polled 5,155 votes, running only 2,215 votes behind the successful nominee, the candidate of the fused Republicans and Progressives. And the adjoining boroughs showed a gain that was very nearly as surprising as that of the city of Paterson. Passaic, with no municipal ticket to elect, increased its Socialist vote by nearly 500. The Borough of Haledon was captured completely by the Socialists, and North Haledon elected three members of the working class to its borough council.

A careful analysis of the votes cast for the Socialist candidates shows plainly that their greatest support came from the workers in the silk industry. The brutality of the Republican Chief of Police and the callous indifference of the Democratic Mayor toward the lawless conduct of his subordinate had opened their eyes in a political sense. In addition the Socialist party was the only party that did not fear to espouse openly the cause of the strikers and to bankrupt itself in lending active support. This bore its natural fruit on election day. This action is made all the more striking by reason of the fact that the Socialist party's candidate for the mayoralty was a member of the American Federation of Labor, while the silk workers themselves are

affiliated with the I. W. W. There is but one conclusion to be drawn from this, and that is that the silk workers had learned the lesson of class solidarity and the necessity of carrying that solidarity into the political field.

But if the silk workers cast their votes almost solidly for the Socialist candidate, why was he not elected? He most certainly would have been elected mayor of Paterson had he been supported by the workers outside of the silk industry as well. Unpleasant as it is to record, the truth is that the workers affiliated with the American Federation of Labor refused to vote for one of their own members, although he represented the only working class ticket in the field, and divided their votes between the two capitalist parties. A strange spectacle indeed. Members of an organization professing syndicalist principles giving political support to a member of a rival labor organization, and the members of that other organization ignoring their own class interests and knifing politically their own representative.

The I. W. W.ites, so heartily despised by some of the ignorant, and in some quarters blamed for the universal slump in the Socialist membership and vote, taught a sharp lesson of class solidarity to the members of the older and conservative unions. They showed that the latter's lack of class spirit was alone responsible for the failure of the workers to win control of the city government. It is improbable that anything but dense ignorance was responsible for the craft unionists' throwing away of their votes, for after the event many of them expressed regret at their failure to vote the Socialist ticket, saying: "We had no idea that the Socialists could poll so many votes." To be sure, several hundred workers voted the Democratic ticket because the President of the A. F. of L. Trades Council, a brewery worker, had been nominated on that ticket as a candidate for the assembly. Others voted for the Republican candidates, a number of whom were prominent in the same Trades Council. That these men were placed on the Republican and Democratic tickets was, of course, no accident. They were there for the sole purpose of attracting the votes of the members of the A. F. of L. but the plan would have failed miserably had not these members been too ignorant to understand this old political trick. Unless they plead guilty to ignorance, they stand self-convicted of betrayal of their own class in the hour of its need. For it was they who lost the election to the working class of Paterson.

Others who must share a certain portion of the blame for the loss of the election are the members of the Socialist party of both the city and the state. Their fault was lack of faith. They failed to grasp the splendid opportunity, and at the moment when the entire resources of the state organization should have been thrown into the Paterson fight they stood apathetically on one side and left it to the silk workers to demonstrate their fine class solidarity and intelligence.

Nevertheless the failure to capture the municipal government of Paterson cannot be regarded as a calamity, for the reason that the lesson taught by the result to the ignorant and half-hearted is certain to be of lasting benefit. Never again can any member of the working class of that city, whatever may be his union affiliation, excuse himself for not having voted the working class ticket because he did not believe that victory was possible, did not want to throw away his vote. The worker at Paterson who at the next election fails to vote the Socialist ticket deserves to live forever under the yoke of the capitalist.

The Italian Elections

By RICHARD PERIN

The result of the recent general elections in Italy, the first since the extension of the suffrage to embrace about 8,000,000 instead of 3,000,000 electors, has been widely heralded by the bourgeois press as a ministerial victory. But can that be called a victory which robs the alleged victor of a large part of his strength and which broke the government's strangle hold on the Southern Provinces? The representation of the Liberals, the government party, fell off from 372 in the old Chamber to 305 in the new, and of these many belong to the opposition. To be sure, the ministry still has an apparently safe majority. But the Left has made very important gains, the Socialist representation alone having increased from 40 to 78. And the number of the Catholic deputies is now 34, as against 21 in the old Chamber. Add to this the fact that many of the minis-

terial deputies owe their elections to Catholic votes and pledged themselves in writing to support certain of the Church's political demands, and it will readily be seen that circumstances may arise under which the ministry's support will melt away to a threatening degree.

For instance, should the ministry attempt to curry favor with the extreme Conservatives, it would immediately lose the support of the Radicals, who now number 68. Should Premier Giolitti incline toward the Left, he would at once discover how many of his Liberal supporters have pledged themselves to the Catholics (*L'Osservatore Romano*, the organ of the Vatican, claims 228). It would be especially unsafe for him to introduce or to support a bill providing for a more liberal divorce law or to oppose a Catholic proposal to reintroduce religious instruction into the schools, for a promise of support on these questions was the price paid for their election by a large percentage of the ministerial candidates. The prospect before Giolitti is by no means rosy, nor will his probable successor find the problem of leadership with such a Chamber an easy one.

Before the elections, the bourgeois press ridiculed the Socialists on the score of inconsistency, alleging that they feared the results to their party of the extension of the suffrage to the more illiterate portion of the population. After the results of the elections became known, the same press attempted to account for the tremendous increase in the Socialist vote by attributing it to the admission to the suffrage of the ignorant masses.

Unfortunately for the bourgeoisie, the facts do not bear out this inconsistent explanation, but actually refute it. If we were to take the map of Italy and were to indicate in red the former and present strength of the Socialists, it would be found that the former red spots had merely become larger, but had not shifted their position. And the largest blotches of scarlet would be found, as before, in the northern provinces. In the North, as is well known, illiteracy is far less prevalent than in the South. It was in those very districts and municipalities where intelligence is high and education more general that the Socialists made their greatest gains, and this in spite of the fact that the new law increased the electorate in these localities by a far lower percentage than in Southern Italy. The gains made by the Socialists are apparently the fruit of long continued and intensive propaganda, and it is probable that their representation would have been nearly as large had the elections been

conducted under the restricted suffrage of the old law. The reaction probably gained as many recruits among the new voters as did the Socialist party.

As conclusive proof of how little the extension of the suffrage was feared by the Socialist party, it may be well to quote a statement made on October 15th last by Mussolini, the manager of the Socialist daily *Avanti*. He said: "We now have 24 Deputies who are members of the party. We count on electing at least 50. At the last elections we received 350,000 votes. This time we hope to reach the million mark."

With 53 Revolutionary Socialists elected and in addition 25 Socialists of other colors, with a total of more than a million votes cast for Socialist candidates, it would seem that the "fears" of the Socialist party were well grounded.

But jubilant as the Socialists of Italy, indeed of the whole world, may be over the tremendous advance made by their party, it cannot be denied that the most portentous result of the elections was the rebuff that the government experienced in Southern Italy. To be sure, Socialists of all shades, revolutionary, reformist and syndicalistic, received almost a quarter of all the votes cast, but startling as that may seem, Southern Italy's revolt against the government is even more significant.

Since the unification of the Italian States, the southern provinces have been the milch cow of the government. They have borne the major part of the burdens of centralized government and have received almost none of the benefits. Corruption and oppression have ever been their portion. The Neapolitan and Sicilian have hitherto regarded the Camorra as complacently as the average New Yorker regards Tammany Hall. And the two exercise very nearly the same functions.

Giolitti, no less than his predecessors, was the beneficiary of this corrupt system, which was indirectly under the protection of the monarchy. Hoping to perpetuate it, hoping to gain additional support for the already tottering monarchy, he forced an extension of the suffrage upon a reluctant parliament.

The result? He himself, and through him the monarchy, received a slap in the face. The people of Southern Italy, weary of oppression, weary of ministerial and local corruption, yearning for a taste of political freedom, turned on him and delivered the blow that may ultimately force him into seclusion. They have signified in the most emphatic manner, these ignorant illiterates of the South upon whom Giolitti placed his firmest reliance, their repugnance to the monarchy, their disapproval of

the Lybian enterprise, their opposition to imperialism and militarism and all that these imply.

The ministerial candidates in these provinces suffered crushing defeats, and the opposition parties received the major portion of the votes.

One more error of ignorance (or deliberate misrepresentation) of the capitalist press remains to be contradicted. Even the usually honest New York *Evening Post* is guilty of one or the other. In its issue of November 28th its special correspondent, "L. V.," states that "there is still a great deal of indifference to politics in the masses, and in fact, under the new law only about 15 per cent. of the registered electors actually voted." How does the *Evening Post* reconcile this with the fact that nearly 4,500,000 votes were cast out of the 8,000,000 qualified under the new law to exercise the suffrage? Had it considered only the votes cast for the several shades of Socialists, over one million in all, it must have seen its error or have hesitated at such gross misrepresentation. The truth is that over 50 per cent. of those entitled to vote took advantage of their privilege, and that over 12½ per cent. of those entitled to vote took advantage of this privilege to signify their adherence to the principles of Socialism. Does that look like indifference when viewed in the light of the usual voting percentage in the United States?

The working class of Italy is fully awake, and great things may be expected of it in the near future. A firm foundation for progress was laid at the last elections.

Class Government in Germany and England

By J. B. ASKEW (Berlin)

It is certainly no mere coincidence that at a time when public opinion in England has been outraged by a glaring example of class justice the Prussian government should have afforded a like notorious case. It may not be unknown in America that Ramsay MacDonald, the theoretical authority and guide of the English labor party, maintains in common with his bourgeois admirers that class war and class justice are terms only suitable to Prussia, and ought presumably, like all imported goods, to be branded with the words "Made in Germany" as a warning to all true sons of Britain to have nothing to do with them.

It must have been a double sorrow to our friend when the government of his dear Liberal allies gave the clearest proof that the class war and class justice were not German monopolies.

To observant men and women, not obsessed by biological analogies or confused by ethical phrases, it has long been clear that England is a class state in the basest sense of the word. Even if class justice does not take on so open a form as in other countries, it is largely because English justice, by reason of the heavy expenses involved on those who call on it, has long been a preserve for the rich. English justice proclaims the equality of rich and poor before the law and takes at the same time every precaution that the poor be kept away. But now we may thank the Liberal government for destroying what little ground there was for believing in the impartiality of English justice or its independence of class considerations. Compare the treatment meted out to Sir Edward Carson and Lord Londonderry, who have been allowed for more than a year to organize in Ulster an armed rising against the government without any steps being taken to check or prosecute them, with that accorded James Larkin, the trade union official, who on the strength of a single speech in which he had said not a hundredth part of what Carson has said daily, was condemned to several weeks' imprisonment. When we consider that the law by which Larkin was convicted is between two and three hundred years old, and that the fact that he spoke disrespectfully of the king was among the points of the indictment, it is fair enough to speak of the whole proceeding as farcical. But it must further be said that not even in Prussia, the classic land of prosecutions for *lese majeste*, would it have been possible to convict a man on the strength of such words as Larkin was accused of using. Many a comic paper in Germany could have been convicted over and over again, had a similar rule prevailed. It is easy to see why the English government has no need to pass an anti-Socialist law, since she may revive obsolete laws from previous centuries. Fortunately the mighty protest of the British workers compelled Larkin's release.

Another case of class justice in England was that of Sir Rufus Isaacs, who instigated certain colleagues to a transaction somewhat similar to that of the Krupp case in Germany, and was then made Lord Chief Justice of England. In this capacity he sits in judgment upon men guilty in many cases of crimes less serious than his own.

How the courts under the feudal capitalism of Prussia mete

out justice is shown in the Krupp case. It is important to bear in mind that here the government was tackling the most powerful of German capitalist firms, in fact, it might almost be said that the Krupps, with their allied banks, embodied German capitalism, and to indict a member of that firm was, in a sense, to indict German capitalism, militarism and imperialism. How unwillingly the government disturbed such a hornet's nest was shown by the careful manner in which the public prosecutor—usually so keen when after an ordinary criminal—this time ignored the most important and manifest points, and forgot to ask the most obvious questions. Explanations were gravely accepted which under ordinary circumstances would have aroused only laughter. When certain witnesses were at a loss to explain their conduct, the courteous presiding judge was good enough to suggest an explanation for them. They were acquitted of a charge of treason and found guilty of bribery. But it is certain that many a poor devil of a spy has been given a long sentence on evidence far less damaging. When an attempt was made to defend the accused on the ground that bribery was probably a necessary feature of capitalism, the government and the capitalist classes soon saw that such a defence might do for the Krupps, but it would give the case against capitalism entirely away.

The fact that Krupp was known to have offered guns to the French government just before the outbreak of the Franco-German war has not been allowed to disturb the reputation of the firm as a model of German patriotism, any more than the fact that they supplied armor plate to the American government at about half the price demanded from their own. An agreement which Krupp entered into with other gunmakers provided that they should not compete against each other in their own countries. Thus were monopoly prices assured in their home land, while in countries like the United States the advantage of competition was enjoyed. It was naively explained by one of the directors that the Krupps, in trying to buy state secrets, were actuated not merely by a desire for profits but were thinking how to find employment for their workmen—those workers, whose interests they had previously guarded so anxiously against the insidious wiles of Socialist agitators and trade union organizers! Yes, indeed, the Krupps were proven to be not only patriots, but philanthropists as well.

In the Fatherland the German official has always been held to be a model of incorruptibility. How awkward the situation

is at present may be imagined when it is considered that the Krupp board of directors consists largely of ex-ministers and other high state officials, who have exchanged the dignity of state offices for a directorship. That such directors would have access to ministers and even higher powers, and thereby be in a position to render peculiar services, the Krupps well knew.

That so much of the facts in regard to this case ever reached the public was due to the Socialist press in Germany. The extent of the bourgeois government's fear of certain Socialists may be gathered from their clumsy and of course unsuccessful attempt to dictate to our parliamentary representatives what members should be excluded from the committee to investigate the armor contracts. By their objection to Karl Liebknecht the government has deprived this inquiry of any value it might have had in the eyes of the public, who now conceive it to be a mere whitewashing effort.

Corruption and its twin brother, class justice, are the two prevailing characteristics of capitalism equally in Liberal England and Conservative Germany.

Story of the Putumayo Atrocities

By W. E. HARDENBURG

VII.

Conclusion

On June 10, 1913, the report of the Select Committee of the British House of Commons was made public. The Committee found that the British directors of the Peruvian Amazon Company had been guilty of culpable negligence, but placed the responsibility for the atrocities upon Arana. The report was received generally as a fair and well-considered finding, and the comments of the press upon the responsible individuals was extremely severe.

In regard to Arana, the Committee finds as follows:

"As a Peruvian citizen, Senor Arana is doubtless not responsible to British courts for acts done by him in the Putumayo. The Committee had before them at the outset, a despatch of Sir Edward Grey's of Jan. 20th, 1911, in which, referring to the Putumayo, he speaks of the 'present state of affairs, which

dates from a period before the concern became a British company, and for which it is clear that the Arana Brothers are responsible.' Sir Roger Casement definitely expressed in his evidence before the Committee the view that 'the partners in the firm of Arana Brothers are criminally responsible.' Mr. Barnes, who went to the Putumayo as a member of the Company's commission of enquiry, in answer to a question whether he thought that Senor Arana was the 'organizer of the criminal system.' replied, 'I think he certainly was.' During the sittings of the Committee a petition of certain shareholders was heard in the High Court for the compulsory winding-up of the Company. Mr. Justice Swinfen Eady in his judgment referred to Senor Arana's position in these terms:

"Senor Arana, with his three partners, were jointly concerned in selling a business that had for years before the sale been concerned in collecting rubber in the atrocious manner disclosed in the Report, . . . and it was the profits arising from that business and in part from the rubber so collected that were set out in the prospectus. In my opinion it is quite impossible to acquit all the members of the firm of knowledge of the way in which the rubber was collected. Certainly the atrocities must have been brought home to Pablo Zumaeta long before the time of the Company's Commission, and if Arana personally were unaware of the extent to which these atrocities were being committed, he ought to have known and he ought to have ascertained. In my opinion, having regard to his connection with the Company, and his business in the district and his position as vendor, he is the last person who ought to be in any way connected with the winding up of the Company.'

"After carefully weighing all the evidence placed before them your Committee is convinced that Senor Arana, together with other partners in the vendor firm, had knowledge of and was responsible for the atrocities perpetrated by his agents and employes in the Putumayo. . . ."

With reference to the British directors of the Company, the report proceeds:

"Your Committee finds no evidence that the British directors made themselves individually parties to any overt act which would expose them to a charge under the Slave Trade Acts. But they cannot absolve them from the charge of culpable negligence as to the labor conditions that prevailed under their Company. They had inherited a system of doing business, of the real nature of which they were confessedly ignorant. It

was worked by agents of whom they knew nothing. They wrote to the Foreign Office that 'the Board have taken and will continue to take all the steps open to them to ensure that the Company's business in the Putumayo district shall be carried on in a proper manner, and with all possible consideration towards the natives.' And Senor Arana in a letter to the shareholders, sent by the Company to the Foreign Office, declared that 'the greatest care is taken in the selection of the agents and employes of the Company in these remote regions.' No care at all was taken, and the employes were, in fact, a gang of ruffians and murderers who shot apparently from sheer lust of blood, or burnt, tortured, and violated in a spirit of wanton devilry."

The attitude of these directors, their insolent disregard for the condition of the workers who showered them with blood-stained gold, their total lack of thought for everything but unearned profits, is well illustrated by the following passage:

"A photograph of the wild, naked forest Indians whom they employed hung on the walls of their Board room, and there was a list hanging in the room of the Indians working in the sections. But no discussion ever took place at Board meetings about the labor question or the treatment of labor. Mr. Read (one of the directors) stated that 'it never crossed his mind to inquire into the treatment of the Indians at all.' Asked if he had satisfied himself that the average price was being paid to natives that was paid in other parts of the world, he replied: 'It never occurred to me to ask at all. I suppose they knew their own business and ways, and they tried to get the thing done as cheaply as possible.'"

Although the Committee thus finds the British directors guilty of culpable negligence, it seems very doubtful if they will ever undergo any punishment. Under British law, Arana, if he were under the jurisdiction of the courts as a British subject, could be indicted for a variety of grave offences, such as the common-law crimes of murder, maim, etc., and the statutory offences of slave-trading and holding persons as slaves in foreign countries. But the British directors have succeeded in showing that it would not be possible to prove that they had such knowledge as Arana had. The law is clear that British subjects actually committing such offences abroad, either personally or as accessories, could be prosecuted in the British courts. But a man cannot be an accessory without having knowledge. It is on this ground alone that the British directors escape all but

moral censure. As the Committee points out, their lack of knowledge might have been dispelled by inquiry, but they did not choose to inquire. Before the Committee, all the British directors took the position that they had no duty of inquiring about the labor conditions. No matter what horrors accompanied the production of the rubber, the directors were under no responsibility, so long as they allowed themselves to be persuaded by Arana instead of making their own inquiries!

"Behind the question of the individual responsibility of the British directors," continues the report, "lies the wider problem raised by the second half of the terms of reference in this inquiry. . . . The case of the Peruvian Amazon Company is one in which a composite board of directors drawn from three nations, sitting in London, nominally professed to direct the operations of rubber production by wild Indians thousands of miles away in the depths of the Amazon forest. We now know what has been possible under the negligent ignorance of one section of the directors and under the callous indifference and guilty knowledge of another section of the Board. The public spirit of a chance traveller and an English journal was in this instance able to present a strong *prima facie* case for inquiry. Thanks to the initiative of the Foreign Office, and the remarkable work of Sir Roger Casement, the truth has been established, the worst infamies have been terminated, and it may be hoped (though with no great assurance)* that a lasting improvement in the conditions of this particular district may be secured.

"But in the course of the inquiry your Committee have been impressed with the fact that ill-treatment of the Indians is not confined to the Putumayo. It appears rather, that the Putumayo case is but a shockingly bad instance of conditions of treatment that are liable to be found over a wide area in South America. No doubt there are special features peculiar to the Putumayo problem, such as the dispute over the territorial sovereignty, which would not occur elsewhere. But the spirit of the '*conquistador*' appears to be at work on other rivers. The real difficulty is the existence of a low standard of treatment towards these unfortunate Indians, though it is recognized that the best elements in Peru and elsewhere are working for improvement.

* While this article was being written (August, 1913), the author received a communication from South America stating "that the Indians are treated most shamefully by Arana." Details of a specific outrage were given and it was stated that "much more evidence could be obtained."

It would be going beyond the scope of the Inquiry to attempt to indicate localities where . . . the conditions are not yet brought up to a proper standard. It is, however, a very material point in the Inquiry whether the Putumayo case is to be regarded as due to an isolated gang of exceptional criminals. The Committee have had to face the question whether they were dealing merely with a single and local outbreak of crime or whether they were in presence of a more widespread malady. The outrages on the Putumayo were carried to an inhuman extreme, which, if it had not been proved up to the hilt, would have seemed incredible. It may be hoped that these depths of brutality are unparalleled elsewhere. But your Committee regret that they are unable to regard the ill-treatment of the Indians, of which the Putumayo case is an abominable instance, as an isolated phenomenon."

The soundness of this opinion is self-evident to anyone who knows Peru. In the whole Eastern half of the country, peonage of the most brutal character reigns supreme. Under it, tribe after tribe of the forest Indians have disappeared within the last two decades. Indeed, Eberhardt, a former American Consul at Iquitos, estimates the decrease of the Indians at five per cent. per annum. Before the rifle, whiskey and syphilis of Peruvian "civilization," the primitive tribes of the Upper Amazon wither, decay and disappear. Twenty or thirty years more, and they will have vanished from the soil.

"Moreover," continues the report, "there is an increasing tendency for tropical regions to be developed by absentee and international capital through the use of colored or native labor. There have been sufficient instances in different quarters of the world to show that under such circumstances abuses are liable to occur. Away from the influence of civilized opinion men revert and throw back to lower standards that have been left behind elsewhere. It is one disquieting feature of the Peruvian Amazon Company that symptoms appear in practice of acquiescence in, or assimilation to, conceptions and practices which cannot be defended. The economic waste of ill-treating, and perhaps exterminating, the native labor by which alone such regions can be developed, is, from the commercial standpoint, shortsighted enough. But that consideration by itself cannot, it appears, be relied on to provide the remedy, and it would seem that your Committee have been directed to consider whether any strengthening of the law is required to provide additional safeguards in view of the facts and tendencies above referred to."

The final conclusion of the Committee is that so far as British companies are concerned the present law is adequate. It recommends, however, the consolidation and extension of the existing law as to slave-dealing by British subjects and using persons as slaves in foreign countries.

This, it may be said, at best facilitates the punishment of crime after it has been detected. What is wanted most is a means of preventing it and of bringing it to light. With this in mind, the Committee recommends "that British companies employing colored labor in foreign countries should notify the Commercial Department of the Foreign Office and the Consul in whose territory they propose to operate that such labor is employed by them and any prospectus issued by them should be similarly forwarded."

These recommendations are excellent. The Committee went as far as it had power to, and there is no doubt that its recommendations, if enacted into law, will do much to deter similar profit-seekers from totally ignoring the conditions of their colored workers in foreign countries.

But the recommendations of the Committee can carry weight only where British companies or British subjects are concerned. The acts of a Peruvian or other foreign firm are, of course, not subject to British law. Hence, associations of capitalist adventurers can still continue flogging, torturing and mutilating helpless natives, so long as they form themselves into other than British companies.

Fetichism

By Harry Kemp

A chair, some rusty relics,
 An old discolored book—
 A great man lived there once, they say:
 So men go in and look!

The New Intellectuals

By ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE

"The style is the man." Who was it said it? It matters not, for whoever said it, it is not true. Were it true, Walter Lippmann would be our foremost sociological thinker, and this he most surely is not. In spite of the brilliancy of the style, and what I am tempted to call the efficiency of the sparkling epigrams in his book* there appears to be but little depth or consistency of thought. But there is, on the other hand, a fascinating openness of mind, a delightfully receptive attitude toward truth, no matter whence it comes or what its garb.

I am inclined to rate this breadth of vision, this openness of mind, this intellectual and moral receptivity as the finest trait of the New Intellectuals who have been entering the Socialist movement during the last decade and more especially during the past four years. The names of Max Eastman and Walter Lippmann will at once suggest themselves to the mind of the reader. And indeed they are a fine type of the category I have in mind. How widely they differ from the intellectuals (pitiably few) who came to Socialism in the last decade of the last century! In those days we had only two types of intellectuals: the eager, youthful American, convinced that Marx was outgrown, avid for the creation of a New American Socialism; and the equally eager, usually foreign, young student of Marx, whose culture was narrow and more or less barren, because he was as truly a one-book man as was the Seventeenth Century Puritan of Cromwell's army. Both types were ineffective. The former failed because of his contemptuous attitude toward "Marxian dogma," as he sneeringly styled the doctrines of Scientific Socialism. The latter failed because he spoke a language not "understood by the common people," in the words of the Prayer Book, and equally because his intensity of concentration upon Marx deprived him of that broad general culture without which it is impossible to use the Marxian viewpoint and method fruitfully. The more thorough the Marxian scholarship, the more it needs

* A Preface to Politics, by Walter Lippmann. New York, 1913, Mitchell Kennerley. 318 pp. \$1.50 net.

a background of broad and liberal culture. Without the latter, its perspective will be utterly distorted, and its attempts to face twentieth century facts grotesque and pitiful as well as futile and impotent.

It would be very easy to point to illustrations of both the above types, but it would be ungracious and needless. Suffice it to say that some of those of both types so ineffective in 1900 had overcome their handicaps and abundantly "made good" by 1910

But one of the most cheering signs of the day is the emergence of the new type of intellectual with its appealing openness of mind. These new intellectuals are far removed from the Puritan-like narrowness of the Marxian student of 1890-1900. They are steeped in the culture of the day and generation. It may be that the culture is a superficial one, but such as it is these young men have it for a background for their sociological theories.

Their open-mindedness is so broad that they do not banish Marx as obsolete or obsolescent as did the young American intellectual of 1900. They are graciously willing to accept and appropriate any crumbs of truth that poor Marx, with the terrible handicap of his "Hegelian incubus," may have stumbled upon, provided only they can glean these truths without reading Marx. For it appears to be one of the hidden secrets revealed by pragmatism that the best way to learn a thinkers' thoughts is steadfastly to refuse to read his books. "For the study of politics," Lippmann tells us,* "I should say unhesitatingly that it is more important to know what Socialist leaders, stump speakers, pamphleteers think Marx meant, than to know what he said. For then you are dealing with living ideas: to search his text has its uses, but compared with the actual tradition of Marx it is the work of pedantry." Lippmann has evidently had the courage of his pragmatism, and has apparently depended entirely (pp. 303 and 316) on Spargo for his knowledge of what Marx thought. It matters not that the editor of the *NEW REVIEW*, in a memorable review in the *Call*, proved conclusively the utter unreliability of Spargo's "Life of Marx." Pragmatism tells us it is far more important to know what Spargo thought Marx thought than it is to know what Marx really thought and wrote.

The charming and winsome open-mindedness of these young men at times leads them to accept "truths" that are mutually

* P. 237; see also p. 214.

destructive. Thus on page 93 Lippmann sets down this truth: "It is not the business of the politician to preserve an olympian indifference to what stupid people call 'popular whim.' Being lofty about the 'passing fad' and the ephemeral outcry is all very well in the biographies of dead men, but rank nonsense in the rulers of real ones." While on page 303 he welcomes with equal warmth this truth from Spargo's "Marx": "He (Marx) admired most of all, perhaps, that fine devotion to truth as he understood it, and disregard for popularity which marked Owen's life. *Contempt for popular opinion was one of his most strongly developed characteristics.* (Italics mine.) He was fond, says Liebknecht, of quoting as his motto the defiant line of Dante, with which he afterwards concluded his preface to *Das Kapital*: '*Sequi il tuo corso e lascia dir le genti.*'"

It will be obvious that open-mindedness, with all its lure and charm, has its disadvantages. But the lure is very real. Few more readable books on sociological questions than this of Lippmann's have ever been written. The pages fairly bristle with epigrams that not only sparkle, but also penetrate deep behind appearances to vital realities.

Here are a few examples: " * * * much of what is called 'corruption' is the odor of a decaying political system done to death by an economic growth." "Violent revolutions may be charged up to the unreadiness of statesmen." "It is perfectly true that government is best which governs least. It is equally true that that government is best which provides most." A hundred more equally striking could easily be quoted, but we leave our readers to mine for these nuggets for themselves.

Beneath the surface brilliance what are the essential theses running through this book? There appear to be two.

First, that the world is fore-ordained to be saved by the "state-craft" of congenial leaders. "Some people are predominantly eager and willful. The world does not huddle and bend them to a task. They are not, as we say, creations of environment, but creators of it. [How much does the influence of the "pragmatist," Nietzsche, count for in all this?] Of other people's environment they become the most active part—the part which sets the fashion. What they initiate, others imitate. Their's is a kind of intrinsic prestige. These are the natural leaders of men, whether it be as head of the gang or as founder of a religion" (page 12).

And, second, that this "state-craft must make human nature its basis" (page 86).

We might add as a sort of corollary to Proposition I, that Roosevelt is the finest type yet evolved of the Superman or Congenital Leader.

The stress upon "state-craft," "statesmanship" and the heroic role of the "statesman" or "leader" is so insistent that it must bore even the most patient and appreciative of readers. Whence springs this idea? We suspect chiefly from the "human nature" of Walter Lippmann. He cannot but be conscious that his "human nature" is the "human nature" of a broadly cultivated man, whose superior culture enables him to see far more clearly than can the ignorant masses what the said masses really need and how they should be governed for their souls' good. His signal modesty cannot hide from his penetrating eyes that he is a creator of environment, a natural leader of men. Hence, naturally enough his firm faith in "leadership."

No doubt this super-stress upon leadership is also in part a natural reaction from that grotesque Fetish of Democracy which has so often emasculated Socialist organizations. Lippmann is scarcely beyond the mark when he writes: "It is an article of faith among orthodox Socialists that personalities do not count, and I sincerely believe I am not exaggerating the case when I say that their ideal of government is like Gordon Craig's ideal of the theatre—the acting is to be done by a row of supermarionettes." True and amusing as this is, is it not equally grotesque to hold up as the ideal of government the rule of "natural leaders"?

There can be but little doubt that the personality of leaders is, as Lippmann contends, a far more potent factor in the evolution of the Socialist movement than most Socialists are willing to admit. But to use Lippmannesque language, if we keep clear our vision of the future and cherish in our hearts the needs of dear old "human nature," where is there need now of placing the accent? On Democracy? Or on Leadership?

The role of the leader has always been large. It looms large still to-day in the Socialist movement and even larger in the Syndicalist movement. Hero worship has more lives than any cat. We may be a little saner than our ancestors were in the days of Napoleon and the Iron Duke. I believe we are. But the star still holds far more than his just share of the stage. It is the task and mission of Democracy and *a fortiori* of Socialism and Syndicalism to minimise the role of the "leader," and to exalt the role of each and every private in the ranks of the army of progress. It is by its effect on the development of

individual initiative and self-reliance that every proposed tactic should be judged. We still need leaders. Were we so far developed that we did not need them there would be no need of a Socialist movement. We would be already far advanced along the road to Free Communism. But so long as Haywood looms bigger than Syndicalism in the eyes of the average American revolutionist there is surely no need to harp on the necessity of leadership, but rather every reason to urge upon the rank and file to respect their own brains, do their own thinking, and actually be themselves, their own leaders. This is, as I understand it, the teaching of the orthodox Socialists, and I cannot but think it a healthy teaching. Lippmann's doctrine of the necessity of leadership is true, but as a doctor would say it is not the medicine indicated by the symptoms of the patient.

I remember when Matthew Arnold was taken to task for his extreme laudation of the highly centralized educational system of France, his reply was that he was writing for Englishmen, not Frenchmen. Englishmen needed to recognize the value of organization and centralization. It well might be that Frenchmen stood more in need of seeing their defects.

In the same way I think the need to-day is to place the accent, not on Leadership, but on Democracy. But if I am wrong, will Lippmann kindly give us some infallible sign or badge by which we can recognize these "natural leaders of men"? Lacking this, we may perchance follow mere impostors and, invoking Section 6, Article II, expel the "natural leaders."

Frankly, I for one would prefer to see the Socialist army occasionally march in the wrong direction on the initiative of the rank and file than to see it march always right in supine and abject dependence on leaders. The former course would tend to exercise and develop self-reliance; the latter would cause it to atrophy.

With Lippmann's apotheosis of Roosevelt I feel little inclination to quarrel. Accepting Lippmann's concept of leadership, and the belief of the so-called "constructive Socialists" that passing Old Age Pensions and Workingmen's Compensation Acts is building the Co-operative Commonwealth a brick at a time, the figure of Theodore Roosevelt appears to me admirably adapted to arouse the enthusiasm of those people whom Lippmann quotes H. G. Wells as describing as "rushing about the country shouting: 'For Gawd's sake, let's *do* something *now!*'" With such a conception of Socialist "statesmanship" it would appear to me more logical to support Roosevelt than Hillquit or

Berger or Spargo, for surely Roosevelt is far more likely to get it done "*now*." Woodrow Wilson appears to have an even greater faculty of getting things done now, so it might be still more logical for the "constructive Socialists" to support him, were it not for his obstinate persistence in believing in the possibility of "unscrambling scrambled eggs." As it is, Roosevelt is the logical "natural leader" of the Constructive Socialists, and, if the fusion dreamt of by the astute editor of the *Metropolitan* magazine comes off, in 1916 we may hear the welkin ring with cries of "Vote for Roosevelt and Berger!"

Beyond doubt, the fundamental thesis of Lippmann's book is that "state-craft must make human nature its basis." Lippmann's philosophy, like Walling's in his "Larger Aspects of Socialism," is anthropocentric. "While the routineers," he writes (p. 9), "see machinery and precedents revolving with mankind as puppets, he [Lippmann's ideal "statesman"] puts the deliberate, conscious, willing individual at the center of his philosophy." Again he says: "The desire for human politics is all about us" (p. 89). This is the note that both he and Walling sound again and again.

On a first reading it is but natural to take them literally and conclude that this is a curious case of mental atavism or reversion to the standpoint of the uncritical, pre-Marxian Socialists, who were forever trying to evolve from their inner consciousness that set of institutions which would best fit "human nature." In large part, they disregarded history and existing economic conditions, and based their reasoning, their very Socialism, on the naive assumption that human nature was uniform, fixed and unvarying, a known quantity, a given absolute. This is why we still smile at them as "Utopians." After Marx, Engels and Plechanoff pointed out that human nature was ever-changing and multiform, and that the "human nature" to which the Utopians were striving to adapt social institutions was simply their own nature, that is to say, the nature of a Nineteenth Century, educated, middle class continental gentleman, serious thinkers and writers ceased for half a century to prate of "human nature." But now once more the industry of manufacturing institutions to fit "human nature" is enjoying a boom. Again there has been opened a special custom tailor shop where institutions will be designed to order to fit "human nature."

They are far less utopian than their great Nineteenth Century predecessors, Owen, St. Simon and Fourier. But the same

fallacy, to the extent to which they have assumed it, has led them into much the same errors. I have ventured to suggest that it was the contemplation of the particular highly differentiated "human nature" of one Walter Lippmann which led Lippmann to place such emphasis on leadership and statesmanship or state-craft.

Seriously, how is it possible to found a real science of sociology on the traits of "human nature"? What can be predicated of "human nature" in general save the disposition to pursue pleasure and shun pain? And these are characteristic of all sentient life. This anthropocentrism, taken literally, leaves us absolutely without definite guide-posts, fixed criteria or standards of judgment. If we are to organize even the Socialist party so as to best suit "human nature," whose "human nature" shall we take as our standard—the human nature of Lippmann or of Gustavus Myers, of Haywood or of Hillquit, of Geo. D. Herron or of Jimmie Higgins?

Anthropocentrism sounds well but analyzed is meaningless.

This deification of "human nature" leads Lippmann to speak of the human "will" as though it were some force or source of power extraneous to the Cosmos. Socialism for example is not to be explained by a study of human and especially industrial history, but is a product of this extra-terrestrial "will." "In the language of philosophers, Socialism as a living force is a product of the will—a will to beauty, order, neighborliness, not infrequently a will to health" (p. 215). This can only be accepted as an explanation on the assumption that the "will" originates in some spirit cloud-land outside the cosmos made known to us by our humble senses. The "monism" of the Socialist tanner Dietzgen and the historical materialism of Marx both teach us that this "will" is part and parcel of the cosmos, and that that social "science" which balks at investigating its genesis is no science, but a delusion and a sham.

Surely it should be possible to be ready to accept a new vision, to keep our eyes and minds open to new truths without thereby necessarily closing our eyes and minds to the still living and pregnant truths of half a century ago.

But I am inclined to believe that the minds of Lippmann and others of the New Intellectuals are far less utopian than their language; that their utopianism, for the most part, is only skin deep.

When they talk about adapting our philosophy and politics to the needs of "human nature," I take it that what they really

mean is that we should not blindly borrow dogmas and formulas made in Germany or elsewhere and attempt to force them upon the American people without first having made a careful study of American economic and historical conditions and of the "nature" of the American people *as determined or modified by those conditions*, and thus having made sure that the imported formulas fit. This, though no doubt I have badly expressed it, I take to be the real essence of their "anthropocentrism," and with this every Marxist will agree. In the Letters to Sorge Marx himself insisted on this same point.

I have tried to hint that the open-mindedness of the new intellectuals at times betrays them by leading them to accept hypotheses that are mutually incompatible. But after all this is an amiable weakness. How much better and more generous it is to accept some things that in time prove to be untenable, than to keep one's mind hermetically sealed against the unanticipated!

I have never beheld anything more tragic than the attitude of the great majority of the Socialists of England to the great awakening and uprising of unskilled labor of 1911 and 1912. At the very time when day after day the Conservative *Morning Post* was warning the fashionable world of its dread portentousness, veteran Socialists were daily assuring me that it had no significance. Here was the very uprising of the lower strata of the proletariat so long foretold by themselves, but because it created its own forms instead of meekly flowing into the molds prepared by them (the "natural leaders") it "possessed no significance"!

Could bigotry further go? And this blindness to current economic phenomena is characteristic of many of the official leaders and spokesmen of Socialism all over the world.

It is to the credit and glory of Lippmann and the new intellectuals that they wear no blinders, that their eyes are as wide open to see the significance of a strike in London or Milan or Lawrence or Paterson, as of a victory at the polls in Milwaukee or Butte.

Long after Lippmann's utopianism has been forgotten he can look back with justifiable pride to having written in 1913: "What we loosely call 'syndicalism' is a tendency that no statesman can overlook to-day without earning the jeers of his children" (p. 29). "Syndicalism is shot through with the assertion that an imposed drudgery is intolerable—that labor at a sub-

sistence wage as a cog in a meaningless machine is no condition upon which to found civilization" (pp. 288-89).

Hail to the New Intellectuals! May they increase and flourish! Shall I add: May they think more and write less!?

Syndicalism: A Reply

By JOHN SPARGO

Dr. Louis Levine, author of a valuable treatise on The Labor Movement of France, to the merits of which I have repeatedly called attention, has done me the honor of publishing in the NEW REVIEW his estimate of my book entitled "Syndicalism, Industrialism and Socialism."

Long experience has taught me that as a rule, the author is well advised to ignore the criticisms of his reviewers. After all, the verdict that counts is passed by the average of his readers. Only in exceptional cases, therefore, do I reply to reviews, no matter how foolish or misleading or unjust they may be.

For what seem to me good and adequate reasons, I propose to make an exception of Dr. Levine's criticisms and to reply to them, or to such of them as seem to me to merit so much attention. I do not propose to reply to his criticism of the literary style of the book, nor to apologize for the fact that it "conveys the impression of a lightness of touch . . . intended for the mental ease and comfort of an evening audience, but which is somewhat disappointing to a serious reader." To be quite frank about it, I rather glory in the achievement. Usually the "serious reader" who is disappointed by a literary "lightness of touch" is a good deal of a prig anyway. Of course, I might have written, or compiled, a heavy, soporific treatise and addressed myself to a very small circle of "serious readers." I might even have published such a treatise in the publications of a dignified academic institution. I chose to do otherwise. That is all.

Dr. Levine charges that I have misstated the Syndicalist position in some important particulars. To such specific charges as he makes I propose to reply. I quote the first specific charge:

"Spargo assures us that the Syndicalists' ideal is a society in which the unions and not the community will own the means of production, and that in this respect Syndicalism is but a revival of Owenism. Where Spargo obtained his information on this

point (sic!) no one can see. At least he does not tell us. To prove his erroneous assertion he first quotes Tom Mann to the effect that Robert Owen had advocated long ago industrial organization; on the basis of this quotation he makes the unwarranted conclusion that the *aims* of Owen were similar to those of the Syndicalists; then he quotes Mr. and Mrs. Webb on Robert Owen's ideas of the Socialist society in which the unions will own the instruments of production. *Nowhere* does Spargo quote verbatim any Syndicalist writer who says that the unions and not the community should own the means of production. No wonder; he could not, if he wanted to."

To make my reply quite explicit. I will take the *two points*—not one as my precise critic states—separately. I have used the word "own" in two places in the connection which Dr. Levine disputes, notably on page 41, where I attempt to summarize my description of Syndicalism. Dr. Levine says that the Syndicalists do not want to *own* the instruments of production, but to *control* them. If that is true, there is an error in my description, of how much importance can only be determined after we have ascertained the relation of the degree of "control" to be exercised to anything that can be called "ownership." Dr. Levine says that the Unions are to determine the "conditions under which work should be carried on (i. e., hours, methods, division of labor, etc.)" Really, the "ownership" that remains after these powers have been abstracted from it is a fitting topic for a Gilbert and Sullivan comic opera! Take the illustration offered on page 191 of my book, the transport service: if the workers in that service are to have exclusive control of it, determining how often trains shall run, and where, the multitude of practical details affecting the service, it is not less than a quibble to say that they do not "own" the service. I hold, to quote from my book, that "The citizens as a whole have vastly important interests at stake, interests which cannot be safeguarded except by the representation of the community as such in the management." The fact is that the exclusive control aimed at by the Syndicalist constitutes the real ownership. Outside of and apart from it "ownership" is a farce—a myth.

So much even Dr. Levine shows against his own labored brief. Mind you, I do not admit that the average Syndicalist renounces ownership in the strict sense of the word, Dr. Levine to the contrary notwithstanding. I could fill a small volume with quotations to prove that my statement was literally correct. For example, again and again, I have heard William Dudley Hay-

wood say that the unions are to "take possession" of the means of production, to "seize" the factories, tools, and so on. But perhaps Dr. Levine does not consider Haywood "a thoughtful Syndicalist." Rarely have I spoken on the topic anywhere but that some Syndicalist or Industrial Unionist has raised the point that the State cannot "take over" the means of production; that for that purpose an economic organization is necessary. Here again, these voices of the rank and file may be disregarded by Dr. Levine.

When Dr. Levine says that I have not quoted *verbatim* from any Syndicalist writer on the point he tells just enough of the truth to mislead the reader and misrepresent my position. I do quote verbatim the resolution offered at Basle in 1869 on this point, and refer to the most convenient and accessible source book. Of that resolution Yvetot, Pouget and Berth have written and spoken their approval. I do quote Pouget and Labriola, and refer to special writings of Sorel and Berth in which they set forth their view of the union as the unit of social organization. And that view is that the unions will exclusively and completely "organize production and regulate consumption and administer the general social interests." What is contemplated in this view is the essence of ownership.

Concerning the second point, the statement that in the foregoing respect, as well as some others, Syndicalism is a revival of Owenism: In the discussion of this I state that Tom Mann, in an article which I specify, made the specific claim that Syndicalism is but a revival of the Owen agitation. For obvious reasons, I did not and could not quote the entire article. My statement, which is absolutely correct, and readily verifiable, was in the nature of a summary of that part of Mann's article. I then proceed to quote an interesting amplification from the remainder of the article. I wrote that Mann "specifically claims" so much for Syndicalism, supposing that the language was plain enough to convey to the mind of ordinary receptivity and intelligence the information that at least one "thoughtful Syndicalist" regarded modern Syndicalism as a revival of Owenism in some important particulars, at least.

The next specific "inaccuracy" which Dr. Levine charges is that I divide the French unions into "yellow" or "conservative" and "red" or "revolutionary." This, says Dr. Levine, is erroneous because the term yellow is in France applied to unions which are "regarded mainly as tools in the hands of the capitalists and as strikebreaking agencies." Methinks I have heard that charged

likewise against very important unions in our American Federation of Labor! Now, what I really say is that the terms "red" and "yellow" are *sometimes* applied to the revolutionary and conservative unions, respectively. And that is the fact, as Dr. Levine knows full well. Ambiguous the phrase may be: *inaccurate* it most certainly is not. As a matter of fact, I could easily cite hundreds of instances in which the conservative unions in the *Confédération Generale du Travail* have been referred to by the radicals in their press as "yellow."

Again, for saying that "Direct Action" is a phrase which was long used by the Anarchists to cover the "propaganda of the deed," and that the term "historically is identified with insurrection and with terrorism generally, including assassination," Dr. Levine chides me. Further than that, he declares that I have been once more guilty of misstatement. The term did not come into use, he affirms, until used by Pelloutier. It is rather monotonous work traversing Dr. Levine's reckless statements and stupid blunders. M. Pelloutier was active in the early "nineties" (I am writing in my hotel, on the road, away from my library, or would give exact dates), and at that time "Direct Action" was an old and well defined term. Even Dr. Levine, notwithstanding that he later on says it was *coined* by Pelloutier, admits that it was used by the Bakuninists at the time of the International. But he says the use was occasional and vague. Even so, my statement would stand as correct and Dr. Levine's criticism be as impudent as it is stupid. As a matter of fact, the term was, at one stage of the Marx-Bakunin conflict, as commonly used and as well understood as to-day. Nay, the understanding was more definite than now—for our Syndicalist friends have caused confusion by using the old term in a new sense. Dr. Levine could easily collect hundreds of cases in which the term was used from the files of such papers as the *International Herald*, and that organ Pelloutier never knew. I have Marx letters and manuscripts in Marx's own handwriting in which the phrase occurs and these date from 1871. Here as elsewhere, Dr. Levine is entirely at sea. What I object to most, however, is the fact that Dr. Levine raises this cloud of dust to hide the fact that the statement he so recklessly assails was part of a careful attempt to do justice to the Syndicalist, to make clear that he does not necessarily or usually mean by "Direct Action" terroristic action. From a precise critic recognition of that fact might have been expected. But Dr. Levine is hardly *precise*, as I have shown above. And I recall that in his own work on the French movement he coolly lumps

Socialism and Anarchism together and treats them as one movement!

Because arrangements are under way to publish in this country an authorized English translation of M. Sorel's *Reflexions sur la Violence*, and only for that reason, I notice here the charge that I have been guilty of error in saying that Sorel's works contain the best theoretical statement of Syndicalism, "and are circulated by Syndicalists as such."

To my opinion of Sorel's works I adhere. That he has ceased to be a Syndicalist does not alter the weight of the arguments he made for Syndicalism while he believed in it. Dr. Levine says that Sorel's works were never "much circulated among Syndicalists" and that "during the last few years they have been withdrawn entirely from circulation among workers, by the active men in the Syndicalist movement." Now, I never bothered to measure the volume of the circulation of Sorel's works. I have frankly expressed the opinion that his influence upon the rank and file must have been rather small. I regarded his works as important chiefly because they interpreted Syndicalist action rather than inspired it. But that his works are even now circulated exactly as I state in my book, and for exactly the reason given, are facts, Dr. Levine to the contrary notwithstanding. In the summer of 1912 I received from at least half a dozen leading Syndicalists of France the advice that the best statements of their *philosophy* were those of Sorel. Some of these letters came from men who had vigorously opposed Sorel. Moreover, the publication of the work of Sorel above named in English quite lately was due to the activity of Syndicalist followers of his.

But the acme of absurdity is reached by Dr. Levine when he complains that I quote from individuals; that I sometimes deal with organizations; at other times quote individuals who have nothing to do with the representative organizations; choose the man to be quoted to suit my purpose. "There are such things as platforms, programs, convention reports, etc., why not use them?" demands my critic.

First, of all, I have used them quite freely and extensively. Had I confined myself to these sources, however, my book would not have the "interesting and exact information" which Dr. Levine so grudgingly concedes to it. For example, I quote from and refer to the report of the Toulouse Congress of the *Confédération Generale du Travail* on the question of sabotage. But that report does not define Sabotage comprehensively, does not describe its many forms. Am I not morally bound to supple-

ment that report by adequate illustration? If Haywood describes one form of sabotage and Pouget another and Ford another, must I reject all three or reject Pouget and Ford, having chosen to quote Haywood? And does the fact that I have quoted what Haywood says in its favor debar me from setting forth the fact that not all Syndicalists agree, that some have vigorously opposed it?

How utterly childish and silly is the criticism is best revealed by imagining the fix Dr. Levine would be in if he tried to write for a foreign audience an account, descriptive and critical, of our American Socialist Party. Confined to "platforms, programmes and convention reports," he could not quote from, say, the *New Review*, William English Walling, Robert Rives La Monte, Louis B. Boudin, Herman Simpson, and scores of others, their most significant criticisms. The attitude of the party expressed in concrete terms in resolutions and platforms is only one side of the picture. The actual state of the party mind and temper, and especially its tendencies, can be gathered only from the books, pamphlets, articles and speeches of the exponents of different theories and tactics. The logic of Dr. Levine's objection would lead to a description of the Socialist Party utterly one-sided and misleading. Dr. Levine is indignant because I have not applied that method to Syndicalism. But, then, to mislead was not my purpose, Dr. Levine!

Really, one is rather ashamed of paying serious attention to the sort of piffle which my pretentious and sadly ill-informed critic indulges in! My only justification is that perhaps it may save some other self-appointed critics from similar exhibitions of immaturity. That my "interpretation" of Syndicalism does not satisfy Dr. Levine is not a fact I can regret. On the contrary, I am glad it is so. I should be sorry to satisfy Dr. Levine by my interpretation of any movement of the masses, for reasons which ought to be obvious to any intelligent reader of this article.

But perhaps when next I write I will try to still further simplify my style, so that it may be adapted to "the mental ease and comfort" of Dr. Levine and others like him, who, seemingly, cannot grasp statements which "an evening audience" usually finds easy enough.

La Trinidad

A Cry From Colorado

By Ida Crouch-Hazlett

Beautiful land of the Titan, where Nature in passion majestic
Hath built her impregnable fortress in battlements cleaving
the sky;
Whose towers are scaled by the whirlwinds and crowned with
the suns of the ages,
Flaunting through centuries' sieges their evergreen standards
on high.

Land of the lights that no artist hath ever yet caught on his
canvas—
Gold of the late-delayed day-dawns and purples and pinks of
the eve,
Haloes around grey-capped summits and silver-robed crests of
the midnight—
Shimmering dream-worlds of color their magical mysteries
weave.

Down through thy granite lined gorges the wild waters dash o'er
the rapids,
Breaking in thunderous music and maddening whirlpools of
spray;
Leaping in frantic abandon the foaming cascades, to the levels
Where deep in the womb of the cañon they pant to be born to
the day.

Beauty of Nature and bounty of gifts for the god-man, our
brother,
Flame in the heart of the mountains to warm the soul-flame in
his breast;
Crawling in underground dungeons, soot-begrimed, whipped and
spurred by his hunger;
The merciless masters behind him; before him the demon Unrest.

"Break we these gyves of the minions! we suffer, we starve and
we perish.
Our children, the cubs of the jungle, weave garlands of jewels
for thine.
We starve that your sons may be joyous; your maidens be fairer
than lilies.
You snatch from our blood-dripping fingers the prizes we snatch
from the mine."

Strike! Strike! See the banners unfolded! The blood-crimsoned banners of freedom.
 For Justice! What! Justice for hirelings? For answer the Masters train forth
 The gleaming battalions, the lightning that leaps to the heart of the striker.
 Nor pity, nor law shall protect him, nor hope from the south or the north.

And down through the trail of the ages the same solemn sorrow is moaning.
 And shall it endure forever, and darken the joy of the sun?
 Ah, no—unto nation from nation Revolt is advancing its legions.
 The toil-cursed embrace Revolution. To-morrow their freedom is won.

A Feminist Extravaganza

By FELIX GRENDON

The race is not to the swift but to the good-humored. Philistinism made this discovery early in the nineteenth century, and so got the start of the pedagogs and idealists on the one hand, and the heretics and Socialists on the other, by a full seventy-five years. What is the result? Our schoolmasters still teach us that the truth is pedantic, solemn-visaged, stuffy, austere; our radicals and revolutionists, that it is angry, belligerent, rebellious, iconclastic, terrible to behold. It has remained for Shaw to teach us that the most serious truth is full of fun. This is a lesson to which American Socialists do not take kindly. We know that a raging sea of truth has dashed for a century against the Capitalist rock, and that the rock has weathered the onset with great good humor and complacency. Do we turn our experience to useful account? Not we. We lash the truth to renewed fury, instead of borrowing a weapon from the enemy's camp and applying the very simple maxim that a drop of smiling persistence will wear away a stone.

All this is apropos of an American edition of "Press Cuttings"* just issued. It is really no fun to be reviewing a play written years ago, while the enlightened nations of Europe, Asia, Africa and Australia are reviewing "Catherine the Great"

* Press Cuttings. By George Bernard Shaw. Brentano's. New York, 1913.

and "Pygmalion," written by the same hand only yesterday. But that is the penalty imposed on critics who commit the artistic solecism of living in the United States. And in view of the enormity of this offence, I dare say the punishment might well be much severer. Fairness obliges me to add that a few copies of the English edition of "Press Cuttings" were surreptitiously put on sale at Brentano's in 1911 or so, and were promptly snatched up by the choicest spirits in Manhattan, readers all, I am assured, of the NEW REVIEW. This being the case, it will be enough to give a mere reminder of the theme: the conversion of the English government to votes for women. This conversion takes place when the government, driven to the direst straits by the guerilla warfare of the militant suffragets, enlists the aid of the women opposed to suffrage. But the new friends prove greater tartars than the old foes. The shameless and unscrupulous behavior of the leading Antis throws such consternation into the government camp that the Prime Minister determines to break the intolerable alliance and yield to every suffraget demand.

The victorious good-nature of this play, cutting clean through the pretensions of the anti-suffragets and their leaders, has in all probability won more converts to the cause of suffrage than countless realms of solemn facts. It has been said that the action abounds in the wildest caricature and the most extravagant situations. The same might be said of any good farce. What is more to the point, the characters are as inimitably real and striking as any in Dickens, and, as they have not been sprinkled with Dickensian holy water, they are immeasurably truer. Indeed, much of what we dub caricature in modern creative fiction appears as such through our inveterate habit of observing life through the spectacles of our favorite dead authors and using these second-hand impressions as yardsticks to measure new authors by. Thus, in "Press Cuttings," the argumentative Orderly, the easily rattled General, and the shrinking Prime Minister who leads his government from behind, betray the characteristic weaknesses of the rank and file in our civil and military institutions. Yet, to Dickensians, these weaknesses are the typically feminine weaknesses. In the same way, the brutal resourcefulness of Mrs. Banger, the conceited cleverness of Lady Corinthia, and the hard-headed sensibleness of the Charwoman are qualities that women constantly exhibit in modern public and business life. Yet, to Dickensians, these qualities are the typically masculine qualities.

Under the stress of the women's movement, this unscientific grouping is fast becoming obsolete. And so are the writers who classify human qualities as male or female, and build their plays upon this classification. But it must not be supposed that Shaw's ironic inversion of such romantic labelling is the essence of his lightest vein. Even in a topical sketch, genius delves deeper than that. Well-meaning conventional people tilting in all good faith against the irresistible, innovating forces of society, or fearless, innovating people tilting against the ponderous conventional forces of society—there you have the raw materials of a Shavian extravaganza, worked up in the first case into "Press Cuttings," and in the second, into "How He Lied to Her Husband." Not every bird that warbles is a thrush, however. Compare "Press Cuttings" in which the fun springs straight from the heart of reality, with the "Importance of Being Earnest" in which the fun springs from ingenious make-believe, and the difference between art as a gay expression of conviction, and art as a fantastic parlor pastime strikes you with projectile force. All the wit, imagination, and grace that Wilde lavishes upon the dialogue are unavailing to the characters that never rise above the level of automatons, although they are as diabolically clever as Hoffman's dancing Olympia. Observe, in contrast, how the master hand of Shaw reaches down into the complex of human existence, and out of the substance and adventure, struggle and inertia, sweat and aroma of the life there, fashions characters that can be put through the maddest paces without belying the reality of their flesh and blood. The result is that you can read Shaw's farce over and over again with fresh enjoyment every time, whereas you can't read Wilde's farce twice, without feeling that his epigrammatic popguns are only popguns, and not anvil strokes from a Promethean forge.

Somewhere or other Shaw has stated that he tells the most absolute truth in a mood of the most absolute levity. This is the paradox of invincibility. And the paradox is justified not only by the man of genius, but by the fanatic who cheerfully dies for his convictions, and by the man who has nothing to lose but his chains. It is only your serious, scientific, American Socialist who cannot for the life of him see what a huge joke reality is. Him, accordingly, I implore to read "Press Cuttings," in the hope that from its truthful fantasy he may glimpse the strength of good humor as a controversial weapon. I particularly recommend the play to those who do not understand that a spur in the head is worth two in the heel, and that the world is his who has the wit to see through its pretensions.

The Test

By Louise W. Kneeland.

He knows, indeed, of love, who, from a blossoming hedge
Bestows a flower,
But he who for love's sake applies the knife's keen edge
Fathoms its power.

Socialists on the Negro Question

To the Editor of the NEW REVIEW:

Your invitation to a discussion of the Negro problem and Socialism moves me to express a few ideas which have been in my mind for some time. I agree thoroughly with Comrade Raymond, and feel that it is of the greatest importance that a little knowledge of Southern social conditions should be acquired by every comrade who attempts to do propaganda work in the South. I am a Northern man, but I have lived in the South, and know something about conditions there, and while I am as anxious to see the coming of the Brotherhood of Man as my more doctrinaire comrades, I know it to be a fact that social equality is out of the question in the South, and that any advocacy of social equality by Socialists not only makes no impression on the Southern mind, but it completely closes his mind to the economic truths of Socialism.

The Negro has made remarkable progress since 1863, but on the average he is still centuries behind the white man in the process of Social Evolution. The Negro is not a white man with a dark skin, he is a different being with a different type of mind, except where education and environment, together with a liberal intermixture of white blood have developed his mentality. It is true that many individuals are above the average even of the white race, but so long as the average of the race is lower than the average of the whites, the superior race will instinctively seek to protect its higher standard by social isolation, and any argument to the contrary is wasted breath.

I venture to say further that there is hardly a doctrinaire in the Socialist party who would not have been riding with the Ku Klux Klan if he had lived in the South during the reconstruction period. The enfranchisement of the Negro after the Civil War was a great mistake, and the South could not do otherwise than to nullify the Fifteenth Amendment. Suppose the school children of Chicago below the grade of High School should be given full suffrage without preparation, everyone else in the city disfranchised, with the exception of Bath-house John and his associates, and the full membership of the Tammany Society imported and made the legal guardians of the enfranchised children, then you would have a situation parallel to that which the South had to face after the War. Ignorant Negroes were herded to the polls by unscrupulous Northern carpet-baggers, and every intelligent white man in the South was disfranchised for rebellion. The Southern whites soon put an end to the loot after the Northern troops were withdrawn, and you and I would have been with them.

Under these circumstances it is always a surprise to me to find any Negroes voting in the South, but they do vote in increasing numbers, and with the consent of the whites, and I believe that they will gradually regain

the right to vote as they become qualified. In one Southern town where I lived for five months four Negroes were allowed to vote, and I do not remember many others who were above the mental standard of a white boy of twelve, whom we do not allow the right to vote.

I do not thoroughly approve of the Southern attitude toward the Negro. There is too much assertion of superiority, too much charity and not enough justice, but the true Southerner never hates a Negro. It is the Northern man in the South who is the nigger-hater. The Southern attitude is the result of the conditions that they have had to meet, and we would feel the same in a similar position.

Then let us educate, agitate and organize in the Southland among both races, but for the sake of those whom we would uplift let us leave Southern prejudices severely alone, and organize and help support Negro locals and White locals separately in this relatively backward section of the country.

Jefferson, Ohio.

Yours fraternally,
GEORGE LOUIS ARNER.

To the Editor of the NEW REVIEW:

I am interested in the extraordinary letter of "A Southern Socialist on the Negro Question" in the December NEW REVIEW and am glad that you have invited comment upon it.

This is not the place, I take it, to go into a long discussion of the subject of race prejudice itself. In the same number of the NEW REVIEW are two articles which alone should be sufficient to prove to any fair and open mind the senselessness of this survival of barbarism. Robert H. Lowie conclusively establishes the fact that from an anthropological standpoint there is no basis but self-conceit for the Caucasian's claim of race superiority. While the Story of the Putumayo Atrocities and an endless chapter of like horrors (which we need not go further than the details of a typical Southern lynching to find) would tend to prove, I think, that whatever the alleged "outrages perpetrated by the Negroes against the whites," these have usually been exceeded in unspeakable, inhuman, wanton cruelty by the outrages of the whites against the Negroes.

Our ancestors dragged their ancestors from Africa in chains, and we have resented ever since the fact of their existence among us. We despise these dark-skinned Americans because they are "inferior," and when in spite of appalling obstacles they manage to educate and advance themselves to a position of unquestionable mental, physical and moral equality (or superiority) we hate them because they refuse to "know their place" and "presume to step outside of that line." With a rare exhibition of consistency, as Bernard Shaw points out, we condemn them to black our boots and clean our cuspidors and then despise them because they black our boots and clean our cuspidors. Or we lynch them for their "arrogance" when they venture to begin to protest against serving exclusively in these exalted capacities.

In this country to-day there are approximately one million pure blacks and nine million mulattoes, quadroons, octoroons, etc. To the Southern gentlemen that shudder with disgust at the suggestion of complete and unrestricted amalgamation as the only possible solution of the Race Problem and that are largely concerned with public utterances on the subject of the necessity of preserving "the God-given Purity of the White Race" I should like to put just one question. Where did these nine millions come from?

I had not intended to go into even this much of a discussion in beginning this letter, but to Ida M. Raymond, who signs the letter of a "Southern Socialist," and to all "Socialists" that share her point of view, I make this fraternal suggestion. There is plenty of room in the organizations of the Democratic, Republican or Progressive parties for any one concerned as she is with the education of the whites and the blacks "to the point where both will recognize the position that each must occupy in the economic and social distribution of the classes." But so long as Socialism is understood to signify a fundamental conviction for Equality, Democracy and Human Brotherhood, how can anyone holding these contrary convictions conscientiously remain in the ranks of the Socialist Party?

Washington, D. C.

Yours fraternally,
THERESA H. RUSSELL.

The New Review

A-MONTHLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

The Industrial Crisis	H. S.
The Middle Class and Progressivism	Frank Bohn
The Patron Saint of the Progressives	Rose Strunsky
Legislation by Exhaustion	Julian Pierce
Academic Slavery	Arthur Wallace Calhoun
Peace in the Balkans	Michael Pavlovitch
The Gift	Louise W. Kneeland
Poems	Harry Kemp
The Scarecrow Woman	
Monotheism	
Ah, Sweet the Birds	
This Paltry I	
Alter Ego	
The Tiger or the System?	Felix Grendon
Syndicalism As It Is	Robert Rives La Monte
Book Reviews	L. C. Fraina, Louise W. Kneeland
A Socialist Digest	William English Walling
Larkin and Governmental Interference in Strikes	Brilliant Socialist
Victory in Bulgaria	The Socialist Defeat in Baden
Strike in Switzerland	General Strike Against the Church
Government Ownership Without Profits	A Historical Book

150 Nassau Street

New York