

# THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VIII

JANUARY, 1908

NO. 7

## Socialism and Art.

WHEN I was asked to speak about "Socialism and Art" involuntarily my mind turned to the days, when, with other thoughtless boys, instead of going to school I preferred to ride to Pompeii and stroll around the ruins, or peep in to the different museums at the silks, gold rings, masks, cameos, columns, mosaics and thousands of other things.

It was there that for the first time I happened to run across a bit of marble inscription in Latin, where it could yet be easily read: Art in Vita et Vita in Arte. Art in Life and Life in Art.

Man in all ages has liked to see his own ideas take form in the material in which he worked. In fact the very rudest races made images of fishes, birds and other simple forms in pottery, long before the art of drawing was developed. The craftsman of the middle ages, who wrought beautiful things in leather, metal and stone was merely engaged in transforming his ideas, his dreams, into a material form. His work was the expression of what he saw, of what he felt.

Man's desire to create cannot be better illustrated than in the play of a child. He is happy building with his blocks or piling the sand and we are led to believe that the desire to make, to create is one of the instincts inborn in man.

In a book entitled "The Physiology of the Brain," Jacques Loeb, Ph. D., formerly of the University of Chicago, says:

"Human happiness is based upon the possibility of a natural and harmonious satisfaction of the instincts. One of the most important instincts is usually not even recognized as such; namely the instinct of workmanship. Lawyers, criminologists and philosophers frequently imagine that only wants make men work.

This is an erroneous view. We are forced to be active in the same way as ants or bees. The instinct of workmanship would be the greatest source of happiness if it were not for the fact that our present social and economic organization only allows a few to gratify this instinct."

It is upon this physiological basis that William Morris founded his claim on behalf of Labor, which, as he says, "No thinking man can deny is reasonable, that"

"It is right and necessary that all men should have work to do which shall be worth doing and be of itself pleasant to do; and which should be done under such conditions as would make it neither over wearisome nor over anxious."

No other man but an artist and socialist like Morris could conceive such a correlation. First, productive work; second, beautiful forms; third, pleasurable exercise. There we have the *workshop* the *studio* and the *playroom* in one and the same place.

But let us return to the short Latin phrase: Art in Life and Life in Art.

The average man and woman associate "Art" with large halls having wide floors swept and polished spotlessly clean, walls covered with paintings; palms and ferns banked here and there at various turns; electric lights and a few statues supposed to be *ancient productions*. This is their conception of Art.

Webster defines Art as "acquired skill, dexterity, aptitude; method of doing well some special work; the application of knowledge to practical purpose."

John Ruskin, who, with William Morris, gave a real new impulse to Art, defines it, I think, in the true sense. He says:

"Art is man's expression of his joy in labor."

Here he correlates art with the whole of life. These words in their deepest sense mean, man's effort to create his ideal, to decorate with beauty his home, his city, his spirit; to dignify and enrich his sensibilities; to elevate his moral qualities. In a word, it is the unity of parts to the whole.

Whether we speak of Art in this broad sense or in a narrower meaning, the divorce is almost complete.

Note the finish of each piece of handicraft around your home; go into your streets, your theatres, parks and cemeteries. Look about you and you will get a fair idea of the miserable life forced upon the great mass of the people by the Competitive System of Capitalistic Production.

I have said by the Competitive System of Capitalistic Production and I repeat it, because the Philosophy of Economic Determinism shows that class ownership of the means of life is the root of all social evils. The basis of our social structure is the production of "goods." How much pleasure is the portion of our producing men and women? How many do really wish

to perform the essential labor in the present society? Count them on your fingers. We are all trying to avoid this necessary labor; and why? Because there is no pleasure in it. As Comrade Simons, of Chicago, said:

"The production of goods has become an evil. Here we find the fundamental cause of the whole 'inartistic' and hence painful character of our present society."

We often hear that this or that artist is doing his work mechanically, that he is putting no feeling and very little beauty into it. Our own age must be a part of the "period of decadence" of which the Europeans speak.

It seems sometimes that the wares exhibited for sale in our stores must have been purposely made in ugly and shabby designs when we understand the pleasure and interest the maker might have found in their execution. Take the familiar art of bric-a-brac, pottery or plaster statuary of which we all have small pieces in our homes. If these small statues were given into the hands of the retoucher the result might be that they would rival some of the terra cotta statuettes found in Greece and well known under the name of Tanagras. But this would add a few pennies to the cost of production, and the manufacturer does not want to add the "unnecessary expense."

This is true in the other branches of art. Some mild after-noon take a walk in any of your cemeteries. You will pass rows of monuments arranged in haphazard fashion, without individuality or character, with shabby traceries, and letters and carving wrought with a careless hand. All are executed without thought and in a hasty manner that bears the impress of Commercialism.

From the Monumental News published in Chicago, I clipped this. It was under the heading: "Simplicity in Monumental Design."

"As a rule the manufacturers of monuments are making monuments, like the manufacturers of barrels or boxes, having as a sole object the desire to get all they can out of it without regard to the question of Art in the design."

And I think that if the present system of production for profit lasts fifty years longer instead of cemeteries in America, we shall have a good many stone yards of dilapidated and indistinct markers to be measured by the perch and the cord. On every hand we have what Morris would call the "Pretence of Art." You may find exceptions but they are in spite of, not on account of it. And the working people have no opportunity to enjoy it.

Construction and Decoration should go hand in hand. Utility and Beauty must be indissolubly united. To test this assertion, let us examine the houses of the middle class as well as

the homes of the laborers. We find long monotonous rows of brick flats, ugly, shoddy and gloomy outside as well as in, and two story frame shacks that degrade the name of house. The builder has been commanded to decorate them. A few strips of fluted plank are nailed on the outside, with crude gew-gaws meant to be bas-relief pasted on in so careless a fashion that after the strain of the first winter you may pick them up from the ground and cast them into the ash barrel.

The editor of *Country Life in America*, a non-socialist publication, attributes it to the following cause:

"Much of the architectural degradation in America is due to the New World Commercialism and should consequently be considered prayerfully and with humility. There is nothing quite so hideous as an entire street lined with houses all alike with the possible exception of a few superficial details. No aisle of elms or maples will ever serve to relieve such a street of its bourgeois hideousness. It ought to be possible to secure an injunction restraining real estate companies from perpetrating such crimes against good taste."

All this Architectural degradation the editor of *Country Life in America* says is due to Commercialism. This is another way of saying the Capitalist System of Production.

No man could speak like this at the time of Greece and Rome, or in the dear old days of Michel Angelo. In the former case the architects and sculptors of the Parthenon knew well that all they created was for all the citizens of the Republic. The slave could enjoy the beauties of the Coliseum as well as the patrician. Both could intelligently understand what Art is.

Art was popular in those days. It was not a fad for the parasitic few.

The same can be said of the Middle Ages. The four preceding centuries of popular Art laid the foundation of the great Italian Renaissance. I will try to tell you about this large army of craftsmen, who have left us the Vatican and Notre Dame with their beautiful traceries and original carvings, full of dignity and character.

The oppressive Baron was on their backs and a pretty rigid line separated the serf from his Feudal Lord. You must remember that this was arbitrary.

The crafts divided into Guilds were strictly watched at the door of each Craft. But the production of wares was for domestic use and only the very little surplus of what was needed at home went into the market. There was not yet the division of labor which has taken away the joy in work.

A boy accepted as an apprentice would learn his craft from beginning to end. For illustration take the marble worker.

Accepted as an apprentice he learned to polish. As soon as he had mastered the first step he was given a chisel and practiced squaring a simple slab. He spent two or three hours daily training hand and brain in elementary geometry and architectural drawings. Ere long he was attempting small free-hand drawings or modeling at odd moments and by and by he carved in marble the roses he had already modeled. He never stopped, was always working, striving and progressing. He became more or less master of his trade but this did not satisfy him. He continued to try bigger designs, to "better himself" as they say. There was always something new to be conquered. The combination of many different colored marbles made beautiful interlaced patterns for altars and pulpits. He made new designs and used them and became a skillful mosaic worker. The master demanded only that the work be thoughtfully and well done. The workman was not used like a slave. There was no foreman to rush about at his heels demanding that everything be accomplished with his eternal "RUSH" and "Hurry." Men were allowed to execute their work leisurely, with thought pleasure.

And at this point I wish to lay all possible emphasis on the fact that it is during the leisure time that the mind of man turns to higher things. It is leisure that enables a true appreciation of Art to take root in the masses.

The cry we hear nowadays of indifference to Art is due to lack of education in taste, as well as to a lack of leisure. This cannot be otherwise under the present system. The mass of the people have little or no leisure in which to divert their minds collectively or individually from the more sordid necessities of life. Under a better and happier system of society when the essential class, who perform the useful work of society, have more leisure they will soon learn to recognize, to love and understand Art in all its forms and manifestations.

During the Renaissance the workman's hand and brain had an opportunity to develop according to his capacity because one man could design and supervise the work as well as carve the statuary and fresco the walls not only of the Vatican but of the other public buildings as well.

It is true Michael Angelo did not work alone. Other artists worked under his direction, with him. It was a co-operative labor of both hands and brains. Each did his best, subordinate to the whole. No one lost his individuality.

Competition was unknown. Waste and destruction, the main features of the present system of society, were impossible. It was unnecessary to cut another man's throat in order to protect your own. Your gain was not another's loss. The motto

of those days was not "Each man for himself and the Devil take the Hindmost." To quote Morris again,

"It was this system which had not learned the lesson that man was made for commerce but supposed in its simplicity that commerce was made for man."

Love for the beautiful was the only incentive to these artists and craftsmen. To them beauty of form was more than a pleasure to the mind and eye. It means education in the loftiest sense and refinement of soul. Beauty was to them a religion.

But the world is always evolving. Toward the beginning of the 17th century, as competitive commerce began to develop, the glorious Renaissance faded rapidly into oblivion. At the end of this century we still possess these arts and crafts, but their vitality, the Soul is dead!

As the master craftsman became a small capitalist, the free craftsman of former days became a journeyman. Here we have the workshop. Man's ingenuity invents the machine so that the unit of manufacture is no longer a man. He is become but a fragment of it.

New markets are opening. Commerce demands continually larger and more expansive factories where the workmen collected are helpless without the body of officials over them known as foremen. The laborer may have nothing to do from the beginning of one year to another but feed a machine; he may merely lift a lever at monotonous intervals. The foreman, clerk, draftsman, manager, drummer, and the capitalist are all over him, each deemed more important than he who does the work.

Here he is only a part of the machine, performing the same tasks year after year. He works automatically and the faster he works the greater are the profits accruing to the masters.

All through the 18th century old machines were being discarded or perfected and new ones invented so rapidly that it is with difficulty that we keep pace with the changing order.

The automatic machine appeared toward the end of this century and has transformed the workman into a tender or operator. His brain is useless in the work he is now called to perform. He has become mere hands. In fact the capitalists' advertisements read, "Hands Wanted." And the laborer applying at the factory gates asks "A'nt you employing any 'hands' to-day?"

In the 20th century the pace is accelerated until every year or two brings complete and marvelous changes in the wonderful tools of production. Now we see in every large factory a few experts directing each department and a multitude of untrained men, women and children operating an infinity of machines.

And still the cry of our manufacturers to-day is, "More

machinery! Labor-saving machinery!" Machinery to save the cost, not the pain, of Labor. It is in saving the cost of labor that profits are increased. This is all the capitalist desires. For this reason he embarked in business. Profits! More Profits! Larger dividends! What does he care about Art?

It was John Ruskin who said: "Life without industry is guilt and industry without art is brutality."

I am sure he referred to modern industry which has robbed work of all joy and pleasure. I still see the bit of marble slab in the National Museum of Naples. Though I was unable to understand the sentence then, I have never forgotten the words,

Art in Life and Life in Art."

The present society has ruined art and thus destroyed the pleasure of life. And life without joy, life without pleasure, life without art is brutality!

Is there anything more brutal than the Greed of Capitalism! The Greed that has bowels for profit only! That buys and sells miserable young artists, seeing nothing but Dividends!

All through Europe the shops and studios are filled with young men and young women of talent who are striving, suffering year after year to see realized their sacred ideals. They live unknown and despised in an environment where Greed, Lying, Cheating, Humbug, Bigotry, and Hypocrisy reign supreme, where the only ideal is Profit!

But in spite of the brutality which surrounds us, Art is not dead. We know that Art is vital to humanity, but what is our hope for a full revival of it? How can the world become art-loving! Revolution is the price to be paid for making the world happy!

The best artists in Europe are turning to the Socialist movement because it is the only revolutionary party. When the people will rebel in a body and throw Capitalism in the same grave with Chattel Slavery, Serfdom and Feudalism, then shall Art revive in all its glory.

It will be then that my children can be educated, each according to his capacity instead of according to the amount of money I have. It will be then only that Humanity will enjoy that Art that is the

*"Expression of Man's joy in production."*

GIOVANNI B. CIVALE.

## The Element of Faith in Marxian Socialism.

ONE of the main postulates of any really modern view of the world is the entire relativity of all knowledge, whether it call itself scientific or religious, historical or exact. At times this may have a distinctly depressing effect upon any thoughtful man or woman. In the search for truth, or in our efforts after an ideal society, in our longing for the satisfactions of our higher life; we are constantly confronted with the admitted possibility of entire mistake and utter failure.

It is at this point that the individual is sustained by the Social hope, and the sense that at the worst his efforts if honest will by their very wreckage, perhaps, warn others from the rocks. This fundamental faith in the "worth" or "value" of life devoted to knowing and being is ultimately, un-analysable. We may speak of it as the product of all evolution—as it doubtless is—but that does not prove that it is rational. It is open to any one to maintain the contrary without any intellectual suicide (Schopenhauer—Buddha).

Again the modern religious teacher is constantly distinguishing between the ultimate religious elements in any view of life, and the dogmatic forms under which these elements seek to express themselves, though often losing themselves in so doing. And one of the chief causes of the failure of middle-class Protestantism to-day is its identification of worn-out and false dogmatic formulae with the essential message which gave it organizing value as a factor in the world's renaissance. Many things are true as long as they are the simple expression of life's experience, and the formulation for practical purposes of what we know, as far as we can know anything, and of what we feel with every heartbeat of our body. And these same things cease to be true when hardened into dogmas and made the "rule for every rational being" like a maxim of Kant.

Surely we who acknowledge with humble thankfulness our indebtedness to Karl Marx will best repay that indebtedness by seeing to it that his high scientific faith and his tentative philosophic formulae do not harden into dogmas in just the way the sayings of Jesus and Paul, of Luther and Wesley have been hardened into the bondage that make the relative social fruitlessness of their followers an historic tragedy.

Laws in any realm are only tentative hypotheses. The "law" of gravitation is simply our formulation of our limited experience of earth and stars. Our faith, however, is that it will



serve our purpose until a still wider generalization takes its place. This fundamental faith is "religious" in the highest sense. It is the resting upon an assumed order in the universe, an order we cannot prove, but which underlies all our trying to understand.

Exactly the same religious element underlies the philosophy of Karl Marx. Amidst poverty and neglect, persecution and scorn, his faith in an underlying order in men's affairs working itself out in economic laws, kept him true to himself, and led him to fearlessly stake not only his own seeming welfare, but what was far greater heroism, the welfare of wife and children upon the issue.

The three generalizations which rudely express that faith all represent various aspects of life actively. The economic interpretation of history is socialism interpreted principally as a philosophy of life. The theory of surplus value is socialism mainly thought of as an economic theory and a really scientific political economy. The class struggle is socialism mainly treated as a political tactic for the consummation of proletarian hopes. Into each of them there enters at the very beginning elements of really quite sublime faith. The successful comfortable middle-class thinker can with sneer and scoff most easily resist the impact of the new conceptions involved. But denial of them all involves even intellectually no necessary mental suicide. It is easy to say the class struggle will be no more successful now than in Babylon, Egypt, Rome or all down the century, and no demonstration of new industrial conditions or of seeming tendencies can be really conclusive, for after all we have no experience that shuts off the possibility of the hopeless bankruptcy of the existing social order, and the establishment, say, of a new chattel slavery.

We who have faith, see that this cannot be the case. We see the facts whose interpretation in the light of Marx and Darwin, of Kant and LaPlace make us joyfully certain of the outcome. But without this faith a contented bourgeoisie or even a discontented proletariat may blindly stagger on in the bogs of social selfishness and industrial individualism. Faith is not believing without evidence, but without initial faith in an ultimate order, giving content and meaning to life's struggle the rational thing is to selfishly seek the greatest amount of such values as remain, and say "*après moi le deluge!*"

The writer is personally particularly interested in the formula of the economic interpretation of history. The danger that it harden into a barren and utterly unscientific fatalism lies easily at hand. The historic analogy of the history of theological determinism suggests both the danger and the rem-

edy. To a small persecuted group of un-influential protestants against the social order there was, no doubt, tremendous strength in the sense that success was foreordained, and that God was sovereign. They had no such generalization of history as might entitle them to say, as we say, that the economic outcome is assured on the basis of economic law. Theirs was a strictly religious faith in a magic setting, and as such gave to them as to Paul and Augustine a wonderful source of power and influence. But when in the seventeenth century this faith hardened into a dogma of divine decrees, separated from all real social hope and enthusiasm and ministering only to the selfish individual wish to escape hell and gain heaven, it became a horrible lie, a misinterpretation of life and an insult to God.

In exactly the same way we may absolutely misunderstand our world, by teaching it as a non-psychic mechanism. Any thorough-going view of the world assumes throughout orderly sequence and unbroken law. The laws, however, are in the highest sense psychological and ethical as well as mechanical and historical. Psychic and ethical factors are as much part of the economic web as climate and geography. It is no "explanation" of ethics to say that they are the "product" of social mechanism, any more than it is true to say that social mechanism is the "product" of ethics. To raise this question of priority in time is to confuse issues that should never be confounded.

There are no single causes, there are no single effects. We move in a complex of conditions, and it is impossible to alter one condition without at once changing the whole complex. The doctrine of causation has proved useful, indeed so useful that it is doubtful whether we now could ever, save in theory, rid ourselves of it. But the classification of causes and effects in priority of time save for practical purposes is child's play to be relegated to scholasticism.

For practical purposes we call human purpose an efficient cause, and must treat it as such, however much we may in the study reduce it to an effect or complex of effects. We must act as though we were free, and appeal to men as though they could act freely, and our appeals become "causes." In the law courts, political assemblies, in business relations, in the class room we deal with psychic factors in a web of causes and effects, whose relations to the non-psychic factors remind us of all knowledge moving in the subject-object relationship. To attempt to escape from the inherent limitations of the thinking process may be natural, but has been so far most distinctly marked by failure. And to separate out one set of factors and call them "causes" and another set "effects" is both childish and un-scientific.

What then is the social usefulness of the Marxian formulae? Much every way. It expresses to the struggling, hoping minority our firm faith that the whole universe is with us, that the whole warp and woof of conditioned life insures ultimate victory. We may seem helpless and can only protest, but economic causes are fighting, like the stars in their courses, for economic justice and the final consummation of a classless industrial brotherhood. This faith becomes itself a tremendously efficient cause, and even a grain of it can move mountains. It is not as a dogma, but as a philosophic faith that the doctrine has value. And it loses that value when reduced to the almost childish absurd medievalism of a Loria. Surely the function of a really intelligent modern socialist review is to sometimes save socialism from its friends.

THOMAS C. HALL.

## Bernard Shaw.

THE time has come to put in a word for the man who laughs. We have had too many tomes written on behalf of the man of silence—as if negation were a virtue; too many tomes for the sincere man—as if Stonehenge were anything better than some good building material gone to waste. Irreverence is the mainspring of progress, and irreverence is only a vulgar name for the scientific method. At the bottom of the scientific method is a well-defined sense of humor; from which it is to be gathered that the man who would keep abreast of the times and their tendencies, must be born with, acquire or have thrust upon him the capacity to discern between the sublime and the ridiculous.

This attribute is also essential to enable one to perceive the eternal fitness of things, to mark their relative importance and proportion, and to feel certain of the psychological moment to aim a straight jab for the solar plexus or manipulate a coup d'etat. Ingersoll's is a sterling tribute to Abe Lincoln, only because Ingersoll was possessed of and could therefore appreciate in Lincoln the sense of humor. By just the amount that Lincoln towered above his self-sufficient contemporaries, does Ingersoll's tribute excel the mass of lip worship that all but smothers the memory of Abe Lincoln.

The sense of humor is a faculty that Marx had developed to an inordinate degree. Even when his theory of value becomes a household maxim, and the language of the "Manifesto" is common parlance—even then will Marx be read and enjoyed for his magnificent wit. Proudhon's solitary claim for recognition on the part of history rests in the fact that he inspired the "Poverty of Philosophy." The puncturing of the Senior Last Hour bubble is only a pin thrust; the monumental nature of Marx's wit is grasped when we consider how his interpretation of history makes of private property a mere bird of passage, already on the wing before the blasts of the Social Revolution. Had Marx taken the capitalist regime without a grain of salt—which too many Socialists are prone to do—instead of overtoppling the prevailing scheme of thought, and devoting his energies to the organization of the militant proletariat, Marx (with Proudhon) might have terminated his career of usefulness an honored and respected member of the Society for the Mitigation of Unseemly Conduct among Urchins.

There must be some reason for it when men of mediocre capacities are kept guessing—as they are about Bernard Shaw. “Is he serious; or, is he jester plenipotentiary to the universe?” To be sure, what Bernard Shaw says has an element of truth in it, “grossly exaggerated” though it be. Possibly, in the course of several generations, will our so-called critics (penny-a-line space spoilers), “light-hearted paragraphists who gather their ideas by listening to one another’s braying,” learn that it is not a question of *how* Shaw says it, but *what* he says.

Shaw was once a very young man and, like a great many of us, the exuberance of youth ran away with him. Having a *normal* vision, he saw that the times were out of joint, and he elected himself born to set them right. Hence his work in the “Fabian Essays.” Having tried in vain to revolutionize John Bull’s mental attitude over night, he sat down to the task of smuggling his thoughts in by the slower process of suggestion. For some years he foisted good Socialist doctrine upon an unsuspecting, conservative reading public, in the supposition that it was dramatic criticism. Growing impatient, however, with the denseness of his subject (John Bull, of course), he changed his field of operation to the world of the stage. As a consequence, no less than two American actors (really Americanized Britishers) can talk sense upon the stage without acting as if they were cramped for room.

It will not be amiss here to give a taste of Shaw’s quality, along about the time he was a journeyman in dramatic criticism. The excerpts are taken from his weekly contributions, now collected in “Dramatic Opinions and Essays.”

“It is an instinct with me personally to attack every idea which has been full grown for ten years, especially if it claims to be the foundation of all human society.”—Vol. I., p. 313.

“The truce with Shakespeare is over. It was only possible whilst ‘Hamlet’ was on the stage. ‘Hamlet’ is the tragedy of private life—nay, of individual bachelor poet life. It belongs to a detached residence, a select library, an exclusive circle, to no occupation, to fat homeless boredom, to impenitent mugwumpism, to the illusion that the futility of these things is the futility of existence, and its contemplation philosophy: in short, to the dream-fed gentlemanism of the stage which Shakespeare inaugurated in English literature: the age, that is, of the rising middle class bringing into power the ideas taught it by its servants in the kitchen, and its fathers in the shop—ideas now happily passing away as the onslaught of modern democracy offers to the kitchen taught and home-bred the alternative of achieving a real superiority or going ignominiously under in the class-conflict.”—Vol. II., p. 398.

From the above it can be gathered that Shaw is aware of the transient nature of the present disorder. The all-absorbing question as to whether or not Shaw's Socialism is sound, will therefore be waived. Such Socialists as are incapable of recognizing the simon pure article when not labeled "class-conscious, uncompromising, militant, revolutionary, Marxian" are herewith invited to exasperate themselves to their heart's content over it and hide their heads for shame between the covers of "On Going to Church."

It is well to remember (strange it would be if he did not profit by his experience with the reading public) that Shaw had to accept the material at hand. What's the use of reiterating sixty times an hour from the soap-box that the capitalist system is breaking down, if the people will not take your word for it? Better to begin with what your audience is willing to concede, and aeroplane it into the unknown. If Ibsen's plays of modern life are essentially rural or suburban, true it is that Shaw's stylus is pointed at the remnants of the middle class and that element among the working class intellectuals which is craning its neck to sniff aroma for inspiration from the putrefying upper class. Practically all of Shaw's plays, in which modern institutions are exposed, concern themselves with life among the middle class and present the middle class outlook. Instead of sanctimoniously anointing the head of the prostitute, or the smug dealer in human flesh, typified by Mrs. Warren, Shaw tells us, in the words of Mrs. Warren's daughter, that prostitution may be preferable to drudgery in a white lead factory, but that neither is a solution to the great social evil, and that there can be no solution under the profit system.

Right here it may be inserted and underscored, that Shaw has nothing but contempt for those among the working class who imagine they are "free and emancipated" when they are merely aping the immoralities of the idle rich. For their edification, he offers "How He Lied to her Husband" as an antidote for "Candida." (Anarchist papers please copy.)

This, indeed, is the keynote and the philosophy of Shaw's plays. Every man has a philosophy, as Shaw points out, an explanation of the events occurring about him, a theory outlining the interdependence of men's actions, the scope of the influence exercised by economic and ideological factors,—however vague may be the lines that unite these forces into one philosophical system. Shaw's plays and his philosophy are therefore the verbal vesture of the thoughts, the impulses and their restraints, the hungers and their satieties, the loves and the hates, the successes and the tribulations, the joy and the anguish, the hopes and the fears,—in short, all the transcendent aspirations and the

world dreams of that bundle of corpuscles and nerves, of gray matter and life force surging through the frame that men on the street recognize as Bernard Shaw.

The world is somewhat slow in learning that every man has an interpretation of life, be it never so crude and inconsistent; that an author pours out into his work his very life's blood,—aye, he sounds depths in himself the immensity of which startle no one more so than himself,—pours it out for the insatiable thirst of those who run and read and profit by it. It is small cause for wonder that Shaw's Socialism permeates all his work. Different language, different characters, different circumstances, different plots, different plays, but all carry the same message. Those who do not know what Socialism means, who have never experienced the sensation of being possessed, every fibre of you, with the concept of a mission that challenges humanity—such as these can never comprehend Bernard Shaw. For such as these the memory of Chatterton and Keats will waken no sentiment of aversion for a system that crucifies genius; such as these will never know why Eugene Marchbanks is possibly the finest character that ever sprang from a poet's imagination.

Once we accept the Socialist viewpoint for Shaw, the rest follows. Every one of his plays takes its place in the masonry of his philosophy, an integral part of the structure. Every play has for us a profounder significance than merely picturing the particular class institution which it satirizes. We forget that the "Man of Destiny" is Emerson's essay plagiarized; that "You Never can Tell" is Hauptmann's "Coming of Peace" more palatably presented. Embracing it all, infused into it and inspiring it, is the intensest hatred for private property, and class rule—a hatred so bitter, that, were it not for the relief to be found in merriment, would surely drive its possessor to desperation or madness.

With that, too, the characters of Bernard Shaw's plays become flesh and blood. Dickens never drew men and women truer to life. Who does not know the Reverend James Mavor Morrell? And who cannot see in Roebuck Ramsden another Elbert Hubbard?\*

To those who believe that Shaw's wit is extravagant, no apology need be made. Possibly the most striking instance of this fault would be considered the personnel of Mendoza's bandits, numbering among them, as they do, three Social-Democrats, none of whom is on speaking terms with the others, and an Anarchist. But is this humor too broad? If humor there be in

\* The linking together of the names of Roebuck Ramsden and Elbert Hubbard is purely gratuitous and uncalled for. In the play, Ramsden's ideas are of the vintage of 1860. As is notorious, Hubbard antedates Ramsden by at least a century.—J. E. C.

the scene of the bandits discussing philosophy when they ought to be about their business of holding up the rich, then it is the humor of the trades union, throwing its floor open to every votary of wage-slavery and denying a voice to the bearer of tidings of deliverance,—it is the humor of our own party, moving to rescind the Dred Scot decision and to repeal the Alien and Sedition laws, instead of dealing with the campaign of the year 1908.

Shaw has not written for the public of to-morrow, the working class. He has written for the public of to-day—even of yesterday. As he himself says, in the introduction to the "Irrational Knot": "I never climbed any ladder. I have achieved eminence by sheer gravitation." In fact, no better evidence is needed to show that Shaw is *behind the times*, that he has "dated," than that he is the subject of attention by those antiquarian twins par excellence, the Ethical Culture and Liberal League lecturers.

But will Shaw be understood tomorrow? We think of a plain, homely man-of-power, who was wont to open sessions of state by reading a chapter from the work of a contemporary humorist. Only in the light of coming civilization, is this plain man of democracy regarded as America's foremost statesman. In the crazy, beef fed world of to-day, *sane* Bernard Shaw is considered a brilliant, a witty, wielder of the shillalah, and a genius in the realm of letters. Is this the best we shall say of Bernard Shaw to-morrow?

JOS. E. COHEN.



## Economic Determinism and Martyrdom.

**T**HIS tremendous question of capitalist production, and its ultimate disruption, and displacement by a social system more compatible with the advanced conditions, is today agitating all manner of minds.

I venture to pour my moiety of thought into the river of ideas which is flowing from it.

By a study of the phenomena of history we readily perceive that all great reforms, all social advancement, all religious advancement, all intellectual evolution; all social transitions whatsoever have been accomplished by the red tooth, the quivering arrow and the gleaming steel. Furthermore, between the transition periods with which the course of the race in the past was marked off into stages of development, a certain element is seen to have existed in their composition by virtue of which each successive stage ripened, rotted, and fertilized the ground for the growth of the young organism which followed. We find an economic justification for slavery at the period when civilization was just beginning. It would seem that by an inexorable decree of nature that freedom could be reached through slavery only. The crack of the slave-driver's whip was the herald of a liberty we have not yet gained. It was the first groping effort of the race to organize itself.

Behind all the boasted greatness and glitter of Greece, was a dark and abiding background of hate and suffering. It was in the hells of her slave-worked silver-mines that we find the foundations of that brief splendor. Athens, with her beautiful architecture and sculpture, must have held her ears to shut out the human groans which echoed among the columns of her temples. We know how the slave-merchants followed the Roman armies, and sales on the battle-field were superintended by the state.

And so in similar manner did all ancient nations rise and fall; all of them, as they proceeded, unconsciously recording the symptoms of their own decline, and all leaving a foundation upon which subsequent nations were built.

In medieval society a parallel condition existed. Although the serfs did not have their shackles and manacles forged of iron, yet the shackles of circumstance were no less effective in binding them to a life of sweat and misery; while their masters sang and danced, studied literature and wrote poetry in luxurious courts.

When capitalism sprouted from the ruined pile of feudalism, it brought with it exhaustive researches in the different branches of science, and a more thorough devotion to art; the result of which was a so-called higher intellectual development. But still the pale nemesis pursues. With the increase of knowledge there is an ever-increasing load of misery, degradation and despair being heaped on the backs of those beasts of burden, the wage-workers, who, by their labor, gratuitously have given luxury to their masters and growth to the state.

By some apparently-inexplicable law this nemesis gives a slow torture to the innocent victims, the laborers, and eventually a quick dispatch to the plunderers, their masters. So it is seen that the great body which is the real savior of society, bears all the long years of punishment, while the guilty few are permitted virtually to go free. In a manner, of course, the guilty few come to grief at last, but it cannot be contended that the punishment they bring on themselves is commensurate with the crimes they have committed against the down-trodden mass.

Thus, we see, by analyzing the progressive stages of social advancement, that the way is paved with human hearts cemented together with their own blood. It is ever the prayer of the martyr mingling with the noise of commerce; the odor of burnt flesh blending with the perfume of the palace. The soul of the social organism is continually lacerated by the relentless claw of circumstance. A bridge of groans spans the chasm of the ages.

Whither is all this leading us? or what does it mean?

We understand from Marx that this is what is called economic determinism. In chapter XXXI, Vol. I of "Capital," he says, "Capital comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt." Verily it does, but he does not tell us that it is possible for capital and its concomitant proletariat-enlightenment, to come in any other conceivable way. He tacitly if not expressly assumes that it is only by the great highway of pain and sacrifice that the working-class can reach emancipation. He says, further, in chap. XXXII: "Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital. . . . . grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this, too, grows the revolt of the working-class. . . . . Centralization of the means of production and socialism of labor at last reaches a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds."

When Marx denounces Edmund Burke as a vulgar bourgeois, for saying, "The laws of commerce are the laws of Nature, and, therefore, the laws of God," it seems to me that he is

contradicting himself; for if God is interpreted as being the laws of Nature — that is, the immutable laws of economic determinism — it is obvious that Burke only uses different words to say that which Marx himself had striven all along to demonstrate.

Since he, in his analysis of social events, asserts that it is through the complete development of capitalism only that socialism can be reached, are we not justified in considering him unscientific when, in apparent approval of the full flowering of capitalism, he vehemently reproaches and condemns the bourgeois economists whose teachings are calculated best to accelerate the ruin of their own class?

He has shown us no other path by which we might attain comparative freedom; therefore, we are compelled gratefully to accept capitalism as our only remedy, crucify ourselves, and let our blood flow to irrigate the ground for the propagation of a future emancipated race. In all earnestness is there not something radically preposterous in this continual enslavement of one generation for the betterment of the next. We seem, even at our so-called high scientific and intellectual stage, to be still no better than the blind and brutal savages, our ancestors. Yet, so far as we know, or so far as Marx or any of his disciples has told us, there is no alternative.

"Then I bethought me," says Shelley, "of the glorious doom Of those who sternly struggle to relume

The lamp of hope o'er man's bewildered lot."

But I fail to see what constitutes the glory of the doom that awaits those who deliver up their lives in the services of their fellowmen. If man's highest desire is the attainment of self-happiness, then it is clear that, in the current estimation, the martyr's self-extinction constitutes the ideal form of happiness, as well as being the most expedient method by which his race may reach the realm where true liberty is presumed to be born. Is there not much pathetic absurdity in this: that the individual fired by the staunchest patriotism and the most love for his fellowmen, should always be the one selected for immolation on the altar of progress? And that the victim almost invariably goes singing to the fire, finding the highest happiness in becoming a sacrifice, seems to be in perfect accord with the theory of race-preservation. Yet, this fact contradicts all the known laws of self-preservation.

We darkly attribute this to the workings of the recondite forces of evolution. It certainly has no rational sanction within the community that involuntarily brings it about.

It appears, therefore, that Logic and Nature are mutually opposed — that Nature gives a sanction to murder; that she

puts into the hand of man the sword with which he stabs the brother who loves him most. Nature, the murderer, is clearly shown in cannibalistic tribes. She is just as blood-thirsty to-day as ever, but her murders are hidden from our eyes, as her murders were hidden from the eyes of the cannibal.

This, then, is her only method, as far as we know, of bringing about human solidarity and perfection! Through murder we hope to reach an ideal state! Through social dissolution comes social eternal life!

In all this we note the startling contradiction which overwhelms us from all sides. If Marx knew, as he must have known, the murder that economic determinism implies, why did he denounce the murderous methods of its victims, since those methods, according to his own theory, hastened the emancipation of society? Marx, assuredly, has not given us, of the present, any instruments which can be used with any degree of success in defeating our doom — I mean the workers of the present.

“The development of production,” says Engels, in “Socialism Utopian and Scientific,” makes the existence of different classes of society thenceforth an anachronism. In proportion as anarchy in social production vanishes, the political authority of the state dies out. Man, at last the master of his own form of social organization, becomes at the same time the lord over Nature, his own master — free.”

It seems to me that neither he nor Marx ever proved how man could become free, in the sense in which he uses the word. Since he and Marx admit that man has come up from savagery by the road of pain — by being slaves to Nature, how, then, can he consistently assert that by a transition more or less cataclysmic or revolutionary, man suddenly awakens to the fact that he is no more the slave of Nature, but Nature is thenceforth his slave? As he puts it, “man emerges from mere animal conditions to human ones.”

As has been pointed out, Nature, in her capacity of industrial developer, has been, and now is, a ruthless murderer. Engels, surely, does not mean to tell us that after the comparatively puny event of proletarian revolution, she ceases to act as murderer, and becomes a docile slave? If he does mean this then how are we to know that the race is not being hurled to a still worse form of despotism, or to extinction?

As we know through the medium of history, that man has ever been the slave of his environment — that is of Nature; and as we also know that what is commonly called progress has been made through this subjection only, — is it not logical to conceive that, by a reversal of relations between him and Nature,

social evolution might change from a progressive to a retrogressive movement?

Since it was possible for Marx and Engels to think only in the thoughts with which their capitalist environment inspired them, what warrant have they for asserting that after the abolition of capitalism, man will become the conscious lord over those forces of industrial and social evolution that, for so many centuries, have lorded it over him?

It is answered that Marx predicted the Trust, therefore his method must be scientific.

He did, it is true, predict the advent of the Trust, but it is also true that there are some phases of the Trust that he did not foresee, or, at least, did not mention; as we of this continent now perceive.

Seeing that our beloved Goddess, Logic, like all the other gods and goddesses, — Reason, Justice, Liberty, the Christian God, and all the pagan host — was engendered by the extremely complex interaction and unfoldment of social phenomena acting in an evolutionary manner on the psychology of man, she must in process of time become disfigured beyond recognition. Therefore, it is obvious that the oracles which our priests wring from her today, will be as inapplicable to the future society as the Delphine utterances would be to ours.

Reasoning from Marx and Engel's doctrine, and using the criteria and ideas provided by my capitalist surroundings (as we all perforce must do), I should be compelled to predict that if the future releases man from the necessity of blood-spilling — from the well known method of making martyrs, he must inevitably become extinct. Furthermore, I should be compelled to say, that since capital begat its own negation, and since this negation is the germ of a higher development, and that higher development will be Socialism, and since Socialism implies a reversal of the timehonored relations between man and Nature (as Engels says), Socialism will contain no negation; therefore containing no negation it will contain no germ of a higher development. Consequently, we are forced to admit that Socialism cannot be progressive. In other words Socialism precipitates a social organism in which no martyrs are manufactured by economic determinism. And as martyrdom, since the dawn of life on the globe, has been borne in the same womb with progress — is, in fact, its twin brother; therefore Socialism cuts off the possibility of martyrdom, and, at the same time, cuts out the womb which, it is held by Marx, gives conception to progress.

And to assume that Socialism would not need to move, evolutionarily speaking, would be the wildest Utopianism.

Let it not be inferred from the above that I have ap-

proached the subject in a spirit of careless levity. It has been done with all reverence and sincerity. I am aware that I am leaving myself open to the charge of being a fool or a heretic—or perhaps a lunatic.

I shall meekly accept all these epithets and more, if I only succeed in eliciting a spark or two of enlightenment on this all-important, and all-embracing question.

J. C. Mc PHERSON.

## The Class Struggle and the Undesirable Citizen.

OUR capitalistic masters and their hirelings of the political arena are fond of telling us that the Socialist propagandist (or "agitator") is bent on creating class hatred, and class antagonisms, though they declare in the next breath that in this great and glorious republic "there are no classes."

As a matter of fact, the history of civilization has consisted mostly in a series of class struggles "between a ruling class that is invariably destined to fulfill its mission and pass out of power and a rising class that, because of economic development, is destined to become a ruling class." The Socialist could no more create class hatred and class antagonisms than the Capitalist could create class love, or abolish the conflict between capitalists and laborers. When the street-car men of San Francisco went out on strike, it was not because they hated the owners of the United Railways, but because they needed more money with which to support themselves and their families: they felt that they were entitled to a larger share of the wealth which their joint labors created. But while it was to the interest of the workers to get the greatest possible reward for their services, it was to the interest of the owners to obtain the largest possible dividends on their investment. And just so, when the wives and daughters of the owning class showered roses and kindly words on the ignorant and unprincipled strike-breakers whom their friend, Mr. Calhoun, had imported for the occasion, it was not because they loved these unfortunate creatures, but because these ruffians, in turning traitors to their own class, had become what President Elliot of aristocratic Harvard calls "heroes" (of capitalism). The aforementioned bejeweled ladies, unlike the recipients of their gracious approval, were class conscious, and were grateful to any kind of brute who would help to preserve undiminished their unearned incomes. They would have cheered the same number of hyenas had they been turned loose on the recalcitrant strikers. Not that they hated the Union carmen. One does not hate a work-mule, one disciplines him. If he is unruly, he must be subdued, or beaten into submission, if need be.

No, the Socialist "agitator" does not create class antagonisms; he merely recognizes them as being vividly in operation before his very eyes. Going back to the dawn of history, he

sees the class struggle already well under way. As soon as men began to domesticate wild animals, and to rear them on a large scale, the need of a subject class to attend them began to be felt. Having captured wild animals and subjugated them for domestic service, why not capture a few human animals and domesticate them? Why not spare some of the captives of the battle-field? No sooner thought of than done. The class struggle began here, and has continued to this day under one form or another, sometimes openly, as under chattel slavery, sometimes slightly disguised, as under serfdom, and now still further masked under the guise of the wage-system. Under the specious principle of "freedom of contract," the wage-earner is held in the meshes of bourgeois "liberty." The three forms of slavery mentioned have this in common: under each of the three systems adopted, one class of man, the ruling class, have always managed in one way or another to live upon the labor of the working class, by owning the means whereby the exploited class must live. In former times the workers were owned as one owns horses now; later they were attached to the land; in modern times, under capitalism, they are enslaved to both the owners of the land and to the tools of production and of distribution.

Naturally, the owning or ruling class have always made laws and founded social institutions calculated to strengthen their mastery over the oppressed class. The prevailing conceptions of "good" and "bad" have, on the whole, always followed in the wake of "profit" and "loss." A savage, in a state of nature, would scorn to live wholly on the labor of weak women and little children; but our Christian capitalist moralists find ready excuses for those who grow rich on the labor of mothers and infants. Religions, codes of morals, legal systems, all take their form from the prevailing economic system. Not exactly "might," but "profit" is "right." A "good man," under bourgeois ethics, is one whose moral and economic views coincide, not with the preservation of life and human happiness, but, with the preservation of property in the hands of the ruling class, and the continued exploitation of the workers by the shirkers.

Our industrial masters, and their retainers, attempt to justify their brutally selfish course on the ground that confiscation of the wealth produced by the laboring class is their proper reward for "exceptional ability" in separating the workers from the fruits of their skill and industry. Our masters argue this way: Suppose each worker does produce eighteen times more wealth now per day (thanks to the gradual improvement of machinery by penniless inventors), than he could have done forty years ago, does he not have at least two times more comforts



now than had his grandfather who was just as poor as he? Why should not the capitalist-politician appropriate the remaining sixteen parts of the added wealth produced? What incentive would be left the workers for further exertion if the benevolent capitalist refused to expropriate from the workers the product of the land and machinery, and the "profit" derived from owning the means of distribution! To be sure it's a little hard on the workers to produce so much and enjoy so little; but think of the demoralizing effects of happiness and economic security! No, it is the decree of Nature that to the shrewdest and strongest the prizes of the earth belong. It is a case of "survival of the fittest." If certain men have proved "brainy" and energetic enough to gain possession of the land, machinery, and even the Government of the United States, they have but reaped the reward of their energy and enterprise. This is the ethic of capitalism as applied to the strenuous "captain of industry." But do these little golden rules apply with equal force to the working class? Let us see. „

Certain members of the working class, having educated themselves in history and economic science and the philosophy of Socialism, have discovered that what keeps them propertyless and poor is their foolish support of an industrial system and political regime which is no longer adequate to serve the needs of the common people—the wage-earning proletariat. Having discovered that capitalism has already served its purposes, and that the collapse of the prevailing system is inevitable, certain of the more intelligent workers propose to unite with the political party whose ultimate aim is the overthrow of plutocracy and wage-slavery, with a view to the establishment of an Industrial Republic, wherein the ownership of the land and the instruments of production and distribution shall be vested in the People: a system under which each worker would get what he earned, and under which every able-bodied citizen would have to earn what he would get. There would be no more "dividing up" with the owners of the land and machinery, since the owners thereof and the users thereof would be one and the same. Production would be carried on for use, not for profit, nor for the enrichment of a few at the expense of the many. In indorsing this high and noble purpose of the Socialists, the Western Federation of Miners have recently laid themselves open to the most absurd abuse on the part of the now alarmed ruling class, who begin to see the end of their brutal system of greed and grab. Consistently with what we know of the origin and purposes of ruling-class ethics and law, this intelligently directed effort of the proletariat (the "mob," as they are called by their admiring President) to better their condi-

tion is branded as anarchy, as an assault upon the American Flag! Those qualities and capabilities which, in a member of the ruling class would be vaunted as intelligence, self-reliance, or discernment, in the worker — the wage-slave — go to make up “an undesirable citizen.” What an insult to the trading-class, that a common wage-slave should presume to take a guiding hand in politics, should dare to attempt the organization of a party devoted to the aggrandizement of the common people, and the wresting from their throats the death-grip of a judicial oligarchy! On the other hand, this same exponent of the “square deal” and square jaw advises the gentlemen’s sons of dear old Harvard to go into politics to rule, or else “become one of the driven cattle of the political arena.” The gentleman’s son who will not fight for what he wants is a “molly-coddle.” The workman’s son who *will* is an “undesirable citizen.”

Not in many a day has there appeared such a glaring exhibition of class conscious class ethics as appeared on the editorial page of the Denver Post (June 25th). The article in question was indicted by one Paul Thieman, and while his effusion is totally void of logic or wit, it exposes the hollow mockery of capitalist morality, the utter pretence of bourgeois “patriotism.”

Now Paul Thieman is a class conscious minion of capitalism, brought up on small pay and Fourth of July orations. Paul does not own his own job, but he would have you know that he is no “wage-slave.” He objects to the phrase. It is undemocratic, and Paul is a thoroughgoing adherent of plutocracy, whose members are known throughout the world for their free and easy (verbal) democracy. Paul is no wage-slave. He is perfectly free to take the job that is offered him or — starve! No, there is always the chain-gang! But Paul’s freedom to jump from the frying pan into the fire constitutes for him true liberty. It has not occurred to him that the man or the class who own one’s means of livelihood owns the job-takers, and the job-hunters, as a class. Not so unsophisticated our worthy patriot forefathers. They knew wage-slavery when they saw it. At least old John Adams did. “It is of no consequence,” declared this plain-speaking nation-maker (in a speech in the Continental Congress), “It is of no consequence by what name you call your people, whether by that of freeman or of slave. In some countries the laboring poor men are *called* freemen, in others they are called slaves, but the difference is imaginary only. What matters it whether a landlord employing ten laborers on his farm gives them annually as much as will buy the necessaries of life, or gives them those necessaries at short hand.” Were John Adams to make that statement to-day, Paul Thieman would call him a traitor. The man who admits he is

a wage-slave insults the American Flag, the banner of personal freedom! Now what was the occasion of Mr. Thieman's patriotic outburst? It was simply this, he had read the proposed new preamble to the constitution and by-laws of the Western Federation of Miners, which reads as follows:—

Whereas, The present preamble to the constitution of the Western Federation of Miners is, in many of its clauses, contradictory of the truth inscribed on our membership cards, viz., "Wealth belongs to the producer thereof;" and

Whereas, We realize it to be utterly impossible to promote and maintain friendly relations between ourselves and our employers under existing economic conditions; and

Whereas, In view of the facts it is time for such a preamble to be relegated to the scrap pile of forgotten superstitions; therefore be it

Resolved, That the present preamble be discarded and that the following be substituted for it:

*We hold that there is a class struggle in society, and that this struggle is caused by the economic conditions.*

We affirm the economic condition of the producer to be that *he is exploited of the wealth he produces*, being allowed to retain barely sufficient for his elementary necessities.

We hold that the class struggle will continue *until the producer is recognized as the sole master of his product.*

We assert that the working class, and it alone, can and *must* achieve its own emancipation.

We hold, finally, that an industrial and concerted political action of all wage workers is the only method of attaining this end; therefore,

We, the wage-slaves employed in and around the mines, mills and smelters of the United States and Canada, have associated in the Western Federation of Miners," etc.

Here, then, we have a large body of wage-workers who have become conscious of the fact that the producers get the work and the owners get the wealth produced; conscious of the fact that the class which owns both their jobs and the Government, owns them also, in merely giving "them annually as much as will buy the necessities of life," instead of giving them, as under the chattel slave system, "those necessities at short hand." Realizing their dependent condition, they agree with that sagacious member of the Continental Congress, that "It is of no consequence by what name you call [laboring] people, whether by that of freeman or of slave," since "the difference is imaginary only." This recognition on the part of the workers, so far from being recognized as the product of intelligence, is re-

garded by Mr. Thieman, and his class, as the child of "hate." To quote The Denver Post:

"We, the wage slaves" — that line tells the story, for, surely, the men who run that convention are slaves to nothing save their hatreds. . . . . we can offer the advice to ANY convention that nothing can thrive — or even quite long exist — in America, except that which is American [bourgeois]; nothing can survive save that which is patriotic [namely, that which supports the views and policy of the ruling class]; save that which acknowledges the Flag, *and bows to it* [as representing trading-class rule]; we can offer the easy advice that, whenever a man acknowledges hate of the American Flag [which Mr. Thieman seems to regard as synonymous with exploitation of the working class for benefit of the owning class], he ought to be knocked down [since an assault on the "profit" system is an assault on the trading-class, whose business interests the Flag represents] . . . . . But there is one thing sure, and that is the awful impotency and terrible futility of hate [and false patriotism]."

Here you have a full betrayal of what "the Flag" and "Patriotism" mean to the trading class and their satellites: viz., profits, exploitation, class rule. For the owning class to use their brain and the militia to look after their private fortunes is an indication of intelligence, a proof of their fitness to rule; while, on the contrary, for the producing class to use their brains and their strength to look after *their* welfare is treason, an assault upon the Flag of capitalism: their desire to enjoy the good things of this world as the reward of their own labor is but "an ebullition of the doctrine of hate that has been preached in the name of Socialism—a *cult of hatred* that is both useless and responsible for much." (These are the very words used nearly 2000 years ago by the exploiters of the Orient in denouncing the Gospel of the lowly Nazarene!)

There, there, brother Thieman, we do not take your futile and foolish words very seriously. You yourself have written our reply: "all we can say is, that hate is impotent, that it is inexcusably bad, that all the wisdom of the ages is against it, and that the men who preach it are not good men, or brave men—if it comes to the test—or educated men, for education teaches, *and proves*, that we must not hate." So quit hating the humble workers, brother Paul, and don't expect to keep them always in ignorant awe of your class or the Flag behind, which they seek to hide their fears and hypocrisy and utter selfishness and complete contempt for the hopes and aspirations of those whom dear old Abe Lincoln called "the plain people." And there is something else that "education teaches,"

brother Paul. It teaches, in the famous words of Engels, that: "In every historical epoch the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; and consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; thus the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolution in which, now-a-days, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class-distinctions and class-struggles."

This, then, is the high mission of Socialism, the work which the Western Federation of Miners has had the intelligence and manhood and patriotism to undertake, the abolition of all hatred and oppression, all economic and social injustice due to inequality of opportunity and the evil effects of a vicious and effete social system; they, with the Socialists, would elevate all men to the rank of free and independent workers, self-reliant, self-supporting, happy laborers in the co-operative commonwealth, the Industrial Republic of the United States, whose Flag, whatever its color or pattern, would mean something real and worthy to the common citizens, because waving forever over soldiers of the Common Good.

MAYNARD SHIPLEY.

## Planlessness of Production the Cause of Panics.

The present panic has drawn forth considerable discussion in socialist circles as to the real cause of these periodical crises. Many authorities take the view that it is the surplus value extracted from the workers that causes the mischief.

It seems clear to me however that this surplus would not cause a panic if it were systematically transformed into new equipment. At any rate not until we reached that point where it is no longer possible to improve the world's productive machinery. Of course when that point is reached the surplus value must be wasted, or capitalism would rapidly go to pieces.

But it seems clear that previous panics have not been caused by our reaching that point, and there is no very convincing evidence that the present one was. So we may consider that the cause of the present disturbance is the same as that which caused the panic of 1893, 1873, etc.

What is that cause? It is said that it is the surplus value exploited from the producers, causing an overproduction, thus glutting the market. But how can the surplus value of itself cause an overproduction if it be metamorphosed into new equipment? If it be put into new plants the markets will be emptied, and there will be no reason why the wheels of industry should not continue to turn. Most of the surplus value is at the present time actually invested by the capitalists in new equipment. Of course it must not be put into machinery of which we already have a superabundance. Under the present regime this is very often done. But it is not due to the fact that a surplus value is withdrawn, but to the planlessness of management.

If the surplus taken for new machinery causes a panic, then we would have panics under socialism (which is absurd) as of course a portion of the wealth produced would be withdrawn for the purpose of improving the plant of civilization.

My conclusion is that the real disturbing factor is the *planlessness* in production and distribution and not the surplus value extracted.

It is likely that the anarchy in production will continue as long as capitalism. So we may expect these crises until the New Order is ushered in. But if we may be allowed to indulge in an impossible supposition, and imagine that the entire industry of the planet is brought under the complete control of

one trust, we would have conditions where the percentage of surplus value extracted would be greater than now, with no resulting panics, as, there being perfect system in production and distribution, the directors of the trust would be able to produce substantially the right amount of every commodity needed, and the surplus would go into improving the equipment. When no further improvement is possible, then of course the surplus must be wasted or the system would break down.

It is the ANARCHY in production and distribution that has caused all our industrial crises including the present one.

The appearance of the trust has a tendency to do away with this anarchy, but the planlessness is still so apparent, that it is preposterous to talk of the cause of panics having disappeared.

The planlessness in distribution is really more to blame than is the anarchy in production. During a crisis a myriad of small retailers is squeezed out and their stocks of merchandise thrown upon the already glutted market. And those dealers not forced into bankruptcy, being badly scared, are exceedingly cautious in giving orders for new goods. This continues for sometime, perhaps several years. During this period of "hard times" many factories are either shut down entirely or running on part time. Hundreds of thousands of workers are unable to find employment. When the glut of goods is pretty well worked off, the retailers begin to give more liberal orders to the wholesale houses and manufacturers, and then times are said to be "picking up." New firms now venture into the wholesale and retail business, and this means large orders to fill their shelves. Business is now "good." In a little while it is "very good," and factories are running overtime to fill orders. New factories spring up and as Engels says: "The industrial trot breaks into a canter, the canter in turn grows into the headlong gallop of a perfect steeple chase of industry, commercial credit and speculation." During this period we are producing more of the staple product than we are consuming. They are SOLD and apparently consumed, but in reality they are not consumed. They are on the shelves of the wholesalers, jobbers, and now increased host of retailers and small shop keepers.

Now it is evident that this is all due to the planlessness or lack of system in production and distribution. For had we been producing systematically, we would have produced each year but a small percentage more than was needed, and the balance of our energy would have been expended in improving the plant of civilization — digging canals, building railroads, irrigating the desert, etc., etc.

GEO. W. DOWNING.

## Major Barbara and Petit Bourgeois Philosophy.

THE comedy, "Major Barbara," by Bernard Shaw amuses and interests any reader and excites those of revolutionary tendency. The preface, "First Aid to Critics," with its mention of many of the world's most courageous thinkers, composes an index to a course of study of the philosophy of action. Few can boast a very deep acquaintance with Nietzsche, Ibsen, Bax, William Morris, Krapotkin, Gorky and Marx; yet they should become deeply saturated with the works of these pioneers of thought were they to follow the lines the introduction suggests. Students of the play and its preface should take up this collateral course if they want to be able to appreciate the characters of Major Barbara and Andrew Undershaft.

Barbara seeks religious understanding and Undershaft exposes some of the mysteries of the business world. Their acts and sayings are more lucid to those who have intelligently studied religious and business methods. However, the young student, if he misses these points, will admire the originality of the characters of these two new immortals.

Barbara leaves her home of elegance and luxury and becomes a Major in the Salvation Army. She wants to be of use in the world and she naturally turns to religion. She is too strong minded and willed to live the idle useless life of her class. Hence she leaves the established church, and the occupation of selfish but fashionable charity. She chooses instead to join that great organization whose motto is "Blood and Fire." And having made her choice, she throws her soul into the movement.

She finds that she can assist some of the poor in individual cases by giving them "tea and treacle." That she can buy their professions of belief by the bribe of bread. This partially disenchantments her and when she learns that the Army, like the church, can be bought by the donations of people of the stripe of Whiskey Bodger, she becomes entirely disillusioned and takes off her uniform and her silver S. Just as the young man who enters politics with the greatest hopes of being able to do good, and learns the whole mess is one of deep corruption, usually ends by washing his hands of the whole matter.

It is her father, Undershaft, who opens her eyes. He proves to her that her superior officers take his bribes.



In dismay she asks if religion is not the means of grace what is then?

Her father answers, his doctrine, "the Gospel of St. Andrew Undershaft," is that of the believer in money for the power it gives. He claims poverty is the greatest and the only crime. That no sane person should be poor. That rather than be guilty of being poor himself, he would murder and kill to get rich. He makes money by manufacturing gun powder and cannons. He chooses his motto, "Blood and Money," and he defines his position as follows: "When you shoot, you pull down governments, inaugurate new epochs, abolish old orders and set up new." "Whatever can blow men up can blow society up."

This is, in fine, the doctrine of the ruling class. In the finish it relies on brute power. Barbara asks him if "Killing is his remedy for everything," and she puts the crucial question to him and to the governing class of every country. For undoubtedly that is its remedy. Its structure rests on force. When the sacred institution, private property, is attacked, it calls out the militia and the private detectives.

The secret of the upper class is to slay in order to live in idleness, luxury and ease. Capitalists slaughter men in war and peace, all in the name of trade. They maim and murder children and women in shop and store. They destroy thousands in train wrecks and with poisoned food. They hold out the flag in one hand and the bottle in the other. They butcher the Indian and the Boer, they quarter the negro in the Congo, the Moor on the Mediterranean. Their motto is Undershaft's "Blood and money!" And woe to the courageous fellow who opposes their designs!

Undershaft boldly and brutally hoists the black flag. He justifies his piracy, he flaunts his Kiddism. He sanctifies his system and all with a glorious cynicism.

He is the typical "Honest" Capitalist. More than that, he admits the weapons that rear and maintain his class. And this constitutes the naive originality of his character. For the usual Capitalist hides even from himself the bloody means that he must use to rise above his brothers in the cruel war for success.

Barbara sees that with her belief in the power of God, she has to blame Him for the poverty and misery she sees all around her. He is all powerful, therefore, all responsible. But He could not alleviate the very misery for which He was to blame, without prayers being said, songs sung and sacrificial work being done. To have these accomplished, money is needed. To get money, she has to go to "Whiskey" Bodger and "Cannon" Undershaft. This she refuses to do. She finds that her superior officers take their tainted money and this disgusts her so much that she becomes somewhat disillusioned. Then she becomes

open to her father's bourgeois teaching. He had lifted up the men of his factory by attending to their physical needs. He had established a model factory town on the benevolent Capitalist idea. And she finds his men and women more promising for her work than the starvelings of the West Ham Shelter, because she can appeal to their intellects directly rather than by the circuitous way through their stomachs.

They didn't need to use the aid of hypocrisy as the poor devils of the slums did. They couldn't be bribed with a few crusts of bread. Therefore, she thought them a better field for preaching as she could appeal directly to their minds. Whether she accomplished anything or not is left an open question. That she obtained possession of her lover and was happy on that account, is made plain and perhaps that's all we can expect in a comedy.

There are revolutionists who would change governments, not as Undershaft would with guns and dynamite, but by the peaceful means of votes. They do not want to cure ills by killing the sick, but by furnishing them with an easy remedy. They fight poverty, not to get riches for themselves but to get wealth for each and every member of society.

Maxim Gorky in his tragic story "Mother," shows what they are trying to do. Undershaft's diagnosis of the ailment of society as poverty is correct. His prescription of the dose of money is good. The trouble is, how are the sick to procure the medicine? He suggests universal pensions for life; Gorky offers Socialism.

Maybe they hold out the same thing. In the effort of the wage slave to free himself from his servitude, he must first strike the wage system a death blow. The workers of the world must unite in a political party against the owners of the machines. They must capture governments. They must establish economic freedom by common ownership of the tools of production. Undershaft half developed the idea. He established the organization. The workers must take the next step and capture it.

Bernard Shaw is looked upon as a wit and satirist of the slapstick order by bourgeois writers, readers and play goers; and as a political economist of deep learning by the Fabians and intellectual Socialists of England and the United States. But he is really at bottom a critic. He makes fun of bourgeois society. He shows its weaknesses and its follies,—he tears down. The constructive school is largely German. Kautsky proves that man started his evolution from the animal when he learned to make tools. That is his great point of departure from the lower order of life; that is what mainly distinguishes him from the ape, the monkey and gorilla. These brutes can use stones to

crack nuts, they can build shelters with sticks, but they can't make tools. Their forethought doesn't go that far. The beginning of man's superiority dates from the moment he started to make the first rude tool, the stone ax or the arrow head. And the ownership of the tool remained in the maker. Kautsky, Dietzgen, LaFargue and LaMonte would restore the ownership of the tool to the worker; thus they would give him the money that appears to be the god of Undershaft.

The evils of poverty are caused from the separation of the ownership of the tool from the maker. This gives rise to society with its degrading poverty. Individuals of exceptional genius or luck may escape it; whole classes cannot.

Private property in the instruments of production causes the gross inequality of men. Public ownership re-establishes the equality of the early days when manly heroism, huge accomplishment, universal contentment were universally common.

As long as the maker owns his tools, he progresses in civilization, knowledge, science, art. He learns to co-ordinate, he groups, analyzes, comprehends. He evolves by leaps and bounds. No higher law assists him, no Satanic force holds him back. He is neither angel nor devil, but only animal;—MAN. He learns to know from experience things outside that are unknown because not experienced. Nothing is sacred to him and he is sacred to nothing. He is only animal, but he owns and operates tools.

When the ownership of these is taken away, from him or from the majority by the few, then mass evolution is stopped and the majority hark back to the primal savage state,— a state of poverty,—and the few move forward in the cycle of growth. Soon a difference between men appears and classes arise.

These classes are founded on a new idea, the private ownership by a few in the tools that are made and used by all. Tools become complex. It takes a multitude to operate some of the most productive machines. That is no good reason for private ownership but is a good one for public ownership.

But we are drifting away from Major Barbara. The play is Comedy like all of Shaw's. It makes fun of bourgeois society; not for it. That is why the usual reviewer can't understand Shaw. People go to his plays and laugh; but generally out of the wrong side of their mouths. They see his comedies trifling with the profit system, government, trade and private ownership; and look on the author as a witty scoffer at sacred things.

He shows that not only bourgeois marriage is founded on an illusion, the man "supporting" the women, but that the whole institution of marriage rests on the foundation of bargain and sale; therefore, is false, ridiculous. This makes the average

critic howl, the Capitalist editor yawp, the ordinary magazine reviewer explode. They hit the ceiling and see stars.

They can't understand why he makes fun of these holy things. He seems an unsolved puzzle to them. Hence they wash their hands of him. They call him *ex-communicado*.

Revolutionists say, let George Bernard keep, on. More power to his arm! He is doing a good work in making the long faced, sober, stupid, owl-eyed bourgeois wise-acre smile at his own bungling society where man is reckoned according to what he has accumulated or been given and not according to what he is doing; where private property is the hall mark of respectability and poverty is the only crime! After Shaw has caused the suspicion to arise that perhaps society is not so perfect as these wise-acres believe, he may then show these short-sighted folk the way out. He may even lead them to open a few shut doors of their minds so that they can enter the room before which they have so long shuddered, in knavish fear. He may even cause them to suspect the divinity of the ordinary bourgeois ideology, which takes for granted the division of classes into the favored few and the unfavored many; and to be inclined to listen to the proletarian philosophy, which teaches that the necessities of life should be free to all, the benefits to those who ask them.

ROBIN E. DUNBAR.

## A Friend Of Labor In Argentina.

TWO little books of interest to Socialists have recently appeared in Argentina. The first of these publications (The National Labor Problem and Economic Science) is a reprint of an inaugural address given by the author in the University of La Plata, Argentina, and outlines the course of political economy which he intends to run during the first year of study for the aspirants of the degree of Doctor. The remarkable thing about this outline, and this course of study, is that it emphasizes very strongly the idea of social evolution, and more remarkable still, that the author declares he will investigate "with the greatest honesty and conscientiousness the fundamental problem of Socialism, examine its various phases, from the extremely radical ones of the most utopian anarchism to the relatively conservative ones of state socialism and university socialism." He urges his students to study the original works of Marx, Engels and Dietzgen, and even warns them not to be satisfied with Spanish or Italian translations of these works, but to learn German and find out what these writers themselves had to say. From the bad translations of volume I of "Capital" he expressly excludes that of our comrade Juan B. Justo, which he calls "very correct." Again and again he asks his students to "look for the truth," regardless of prejudice or ultimate conclusions, for, he says, "many quote Marx without being aware that he very often said just the reverse, or did not say what is attributed to him" (P. 8). This sounds good and almost leads one to regret, that American university professors do not rise to the pinnacle of such eminent fairness and honesty as their Argentine colleague. But when we read a little further, we quickly come to the conclusion, that Quesada is a conspicuous type of those Spanish Dons who promise you a title deed to their castle, when you pay them a visit, and who chase you off their premises with blood hounds, if you ask for some soap and a towel. For his own leanings are not only antagonistic to Socialism, particularly to Marxism, but he belongs himself to those who attribute to Marx things which he did not say and who pose as great improvers of Marxian economics without understanding them. In fact, Quesada is one of those who have accomplished the remarkable feat of outgrowing and overcoming Marx without first understanding him.

We are not surprised, therefore, that he calls the opportunist legislation of New Zealand "a tyrannical imposition of uncompromising legislation, which paralyzes life itself" (P. 20), a sentiment which is heartily echoed by every capitalist, who is prevented by the legislation of New Zealand from exploiting children, importing coolie strikebreakers, poisoning rivers, or grabbing natural resources for his private benefit. But this sentiment ill fits into the professed policy of Quesada to establish harmony between capital and labor and keep the Argentina middle class supreme by preventing corporation rule on one side and working class rule on the other. For the legislation of New Zealand is all very mild, made principally in the interest of small capitalists and calculated not only to restrain large capitalists but also to hold down the working class. However, a man who so strongly prefers honest scientific investigation as Quesada will no doubt modify his views on this subject, when confronted with convincing evidence that he is mistaken, particularly if he should find on closer scrutiny, that the New Zealand legislation is realizing the very ideal for which he is so valiantly striving.

And since the "greatest honesty and conscientiousness" are to be his acknowledged guides, we may also hope that he will correct the following statement on page 6 of his lecture: 'Marx attributed to Ricardo the method of constructing absolute economic laws as though they were natural and eternal ones.' This, says Quesada, is a wild generalization. It would be, if it were true. But it is not. We recommend to Quesada that he "look for the truth" in the following statements from Marx's "Critique of Political Economy," page 69 of the American edition: "Ricardo confines his investigations exclusively to the *quantitative determination of value*, and as regards the latter *he is at least conscious of the fact that the realization of the law depends upon certain historical conditions*. He says, namely, that the determination of value by labor time holds good for such commodities 'only as can be increased in quantity by the exertion of human industry, and on the production of which competition operates without restraint'. What he really means is that the law of value presupposes for its full development an industrial society in which production is carried on upon a large scale and free competition prevails, i. e., the modern capitalist society. *In all other respects Ricardo considers the capitalist form of labor as the eternal natural form of social labor*. He makes the primitive fisherman and the primitive hunter straightway exchange their fish and game as owners of commodities, in proportion to the labor time embodied in these exchange values. On this occasion he commits the anachronism of making the primitive fisherman and hunter consult the annuity tables in current use on the London Exchange

in the year 1817 in the calculations relating to their instruments." — To consider capitalist labor as the eternal natural form of social labor, this statement assumes in the honest and conscientious brain of Quesada the shape of an assertion that Marx attributes to Ricardo the method of constructing eternal economic laws as though they were natural ones. The reader can judge for himself, whether Marx or Quesada have here indulged in "wild generalization."

The second publication (*The Labor Question and its study in Universities*) is a reprint of a lecture which was originally published in the *Bulletin of the National Department of Labor*. This Department is a recent creation of the spirit that moves Quesada and his like. To the great astonishment of the professor the socialists of Argentina cannot see what good a Department of Labor in the hands of capitalist professors and politicians will do the working class. This arouses the resentment of the messiah of the worn gospel of harmony between capital and labor. He pours the vials of his wrath out over the Argentine socialists, calls them intolerant fanatics, who don't want any reform unless introduced by themselves, and wrings his white hands in agonized dismay at the incomprehensible folly which gives the cold shoulder to a Department of Labor "which realizes one of the immediate demands of the Argentine Socialist Party" (P. 8). However, he tells us in the same breath that the idea of this Department, and his own lecture on this subject, was suggested by the barely settled strike of the railroad employes of Argentina and by the still pending strike of the 'longshoremen of Buenos Ayres. And no doubt the experience of other socialists in other countries has taught the socialists of Argentina that Departments of Labor in the hands of the ruling classes are Trojan presents to be watched with suspicion, and serve as a rule for the principal purpose of breaking strikes of organized working people.

Quesada brings in this pamphlet a vast array of data relating to the creation of Labor Departments in the United States, England, Germany, France, Belgium, Austria, Italy, Spain, and quotes numerous publications issued by these Departments. This portion of his lecture, pages 12 to 37, is a really valuable summary of the capitalist literature on this subject. But it can serve the purpose of the socialists as well as those of the capitalist teachers of social peace. In fact, it serves our purposes even better than theirs, for it is a monument of the paralyzing power of capitalist Departments of Labor upon the efforts of the working class to emancipate itself from capitalist rule. We are certainly much obliged to Quesada for this fine summary.

Another delightful feature of his lecture is the frankness with which Quesada explains that he does not include socialism in his curriculum, because he believes in it, but because he is of the opinion "that this stubborn contrarimindedness of the majority of our intellectuals cannot and must not continue in the matter of the burning antagonism between capital and labor, and of this disintegrating class struggle, with its Marxian gospel, which makes palpable progress in this country and threatens to convert into a fearful problem what may, perhaps, be but a more or less normal episode in the development of Argentina, if properly handled in time" (P. 5). Because the bourgeois intellectuals were so indifferent in this matter, the intellectual leadership fell into the hands of "professional agitators," so that the working people actually listened to speakers of their own class instead of following the advice of a capitalist professor with a large library of capitalist publications on the labor question. The poor Argentine government finally could not help itself in any other way than by using soldiers to suppress the unruly working people. That the socialists would precipitate such troubles was anticipated by Quesada. And now he can say to the capitalist politicians: "I told you so."

Even the *International Socialist Review* of Chicago, "which condenses the news of the world's labor movement, explained with much elation the Argentine plan of waiting for the harvest season, in which the crops of the country are exported, in order declare great strikes in the transport industries, in the ports, in the great export firms, and thus to paralyze the national life and call forth as much as possible measures of violent repression on the part of the government whereby the mass of the working people sink their differences, close their ranks, become bolder, strengthen their organizations and become a veritable power within the state, with its apostles and martyrs." (P. 5) (This refers to a communication sent by the Executive Committee of the Argentine Socialist Party to the International Socialist Bureau and published by the *International Socialist Review*.)

This is where the shoe pinches! The working people get together, because the socialists, and particularly the Marxian socialists, educate them on one side and the capitalist government drives them together by force on the other. And therefore bourgeois professors, who are interested in keeping the workers divided by government concessions, in order that the small capitalist may thrive in perpetuity, if that were possible, must teach bourgeois students to know what Marx really made the working people understand, so that enlightened bourgeois politicians, instead of working into the hands of the socialists by force, may take the wind out of their sails by prudent concessions to the



rebellious workers, "like the statesmen of England." But England is now becoming a rather poor illustration for the success of this policy.

In other words, Quesada is an Argentine Schaeffle or Sombart, who wants to familiarize bourgeois students with Marxism, in order that they may get together and find effective means of combatting it. This explains Quesada's partiality to Seligman in the United States, Marshall in England, Schmoller in Germany, Gide in France, all of them university "socialists," who do their best to build a straw Marx and demolish him with ponderous and dignified reflections about things he never said. Few of this class of "socialists" will disagree with Quesada when he claims that "the greater part of the bona fide socialist propaganda is distinguished by the characteristic mark that it is based upon a half assimilated science, which is dangerous, because it comes to results which are opposed to the true conclusions of the science of truth; and its own constant invocation of the Marxian doctrine, in spite of the schism between Bernsteinian and Kautskyan Marxians, ignores the fundamental rectifications, which have been made in almost all lines of argumentation of the famous agitator by the present copious investigations just enumerated. His sociological thesis of the economic interpretation of history and of the class struggle, of the boasted Communist Manifesto, his characterization of the proletariat, have undergone profound modifications through the evolution of the past half century. His renowned economic theory of value and his terrible fallacy of surplus value have not withstood the statistical investigations and the scientific analyses. Marx himself had a clear presentiment of this, when he decided not to put the finishing touches on his classic work "Capital," and to leave to Engels the task of reconciling the irreconcilable and to Kautsky the duty of saving the remainder of his much retouched surplus value." (P. 39).

Here the "greatest honesty and conscientiousness" do not prevent our bourgeois professor from repeating the silly slander, which Achille Loria had voiced many years before him and which Engels repudiated in his preface to the third volume of "Capital" by showing that Marx had completed the bulk of the second and third volumes before he published the first volume of his work.

Marx had "a clear presentiment" of Quesada and his friends in other countries, when he wrote in his "Communist Manifesto": "The socialistic bourgeois want all the advantages of modern social conditions without the struggles and dangers necessarily resulting therefrom. They desire the existing state of society

minus its revolutionary and disintegrating elements. They wish for a bourgeoisie without a proletariat..... A second and more practical, but less systematic form of this socialism sought to depreciate every revolutionary movement in the eyes of the working class, by showing that no mere political reform, but only a change in the material conditions of existence, in economical relations, could be of any advantage to them. By changes in the material conditions of existence, this form of socialism, however, by no means understands abolition of the bourgeois relations of production, an abolition that can be effected only by a revolution, but administrative reforms, based on the continued existence of these relations; reforms, therefore, that in no respect affect the relations between capital and labor, but, at the best, lessen the cost and simplify the administrative work of bourgeois government. Bourgeois socialism attains adequate expression when, and only when, it becomes a mere figure of speech: Free trade, for the benefit of the working class; protective duties, for the benefit of the working class; prison reform, for the benefit of the working class. This is the last word and the only seriously meant word of bourgeois socialism. It is summed up in the phrase: the bourgeois is a bourgeois, for the benefit of the working class."

The evolution of the last fifty years, so far from refuting the fundamental claims of Marx, has rather attracted a greater and greater number of organized working people to their support. The "true conclusions of the science of truth" are nothing but the frightened realization of the bourgeois that it is all up with him if the working class adopts the Marxian theories. This proves, not that Marx was wrong, but that the bourgeois "science of truth" is a "terrible fallacy" for the working class. And we need no better proof for the vitality and increasing strength of Marxian theories than the fact that even in so new a country as Argentina the bourgeois socialist has to systematize his policies and send his Quesada out to plough the sea of social life with his pencil and sweep back the tide of social evolution with his fake Labor Department, blaming Marx unjustly for attributing to Ricardo the idea of eternal social laws and doing all in his power to make small capitalism eternal. Or, if Quesada believes in social evolution and does not think that capitalism will last for ever, what does he think will come after it? His answer to this question will certainly be interesting. Whatever it may be, we feel sure that he will not give the same answer as Marx and the socialists of Argentina.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

## Bloody Russia.

The Russian revolution has reached the stage of books, and they are pouring forth at a most astonishing rate. Three lie upon my desk that have just come from the presses. (\*) All are bound in most brilliant red. Two of them have the word "red" in their tittle. All reek with blood. In fact the general impression gained by the combined reading of the three is of wading in blood. One closes either of them with a sense of sickening relief. Blood, blood, blood flows on every page. The French Revolution has long stood as synonymous with bloodshed. But it was a most gentle affair compared with the struggle which is now going on in Russia. Some day the world will come to realize this. A reading of these volumes will help to that end.

John Foster Fraser's work, "Red Russia" is manifestly the work of a newspaper reporter. It is much such a book as would be produced if the managing editor of the more enterprising metropolitan dailies should hand out as an assignment to the star reporter some morning, "the Russian Revolution," and should add the further instructions, "Take a staff photographer with you, fill it full of local color and plenty of interviews, and cut out all editorializing."

His ignorance of the philosophies back of the contending forces is rather refreshing, especially if the reader knows something of these himself so as not to be misled. It prevents the "editorializing" which fills up the majority of similar books.

Like a good reporter he selected the most striking point of the story for a theme and plays it up from the start. That theme is the cheapness of human life, and it stands out on every page. "The blessed, though rather namby-pamby thing called 'compromise' is not understood in Russia," he tells us. Each side appeals constantly to force. Both sides recognize this fact and make no complaint about tactics. "Killing is not murder" has become a national political maxim. Here is the way this law-abiding stolid British journalist sizes up the situation. "The throwing of bombs by the revolutionaries, and the meaningless sabreing of the mob by the Cossacks, though repulsive to and beyond the comprehension of people of Western temperament,

---

\* Red Russia, by John Foster Fraser. John Lane Co., Cloth, 288 pp., \$1.50.

The Red Reign, The True Story of an Adventurous Year in Russia, by Kellogg Durland. The Century Co., Cloth, 533 pp., \$2.00.

The Revolution in the Baltic Provinces of Russia, by an Active Member of the Lettish Social Democratic Workers' Party. Independent Labor Party, London, Cloth, 98 pp., 1 Shilling 6 Pence.

are perfectly in accordance with the aim of the rival parties within the Empire \* \* \* Not one-tenth of the atrocities perpetrated in Russia ever reaches the English papers. I am fairly sure the public at home are shocked and horror stricken at the telegraphic information sent. The Russians themselves are not shocked; stories of atrocious deeds excite them no more than incidents in a novel; the report of an assassination by bomb is regarded very much as an astute and successful move in chess."

Of conditions in Warsaw, he says, "Life is one long thrill. There is no telling when a bomb will be thrown or a revolver crack, or Cossacks come swinging along whacking all with their swords, or when you may be arrested, or when a policeman, with the instant conviction there is something suspicious about your appearance, may smash in your face with the butt end of his pistol, and a soldier crack your ribs with a blow from his gun."

All agree that the Jews are the most active revolutionists, and all agree that the *pogroms*, or Jewish massacres are organized by the government. In this work the new organization of "The Black Hundred" plays a prominent part. Fraser describes this organization by the following comparison with a well known English political organization: "If suddenly the Primrose League ceased to be illumined by the graceful presence of dame presidents and was flooded with the riff-raff of the populace, who got money from somewhere, spent their days drinking at Soho cafes, went forth at night and killed foreigners and smashed Radicals into senseless pulp, while the police stood on one side and grinned — you would again get near a parallel with the Russian Black Hundred."

His idea of the peasant is superficial (as indeed of everything else) but striking. "All peasants are revolutionaries. All want a Duma. But they only want a Duma because they believe it will decide they shall have more land than at present."

Everywhere it is the same story. Blood and yet more blood, varied occasionally by famine, and Black Hundred and Pogroms, all but different ways of taking life. In the Caucasus the revolutionary fight is complicated by race battles, equally bloody, and fostered by the government to prevent any union of revolutionists.

When we turn to the work of Kellogg Durland we are confronted with a wholly different presentation of the subject. The author is one of a group of brilliant young American writers including Wm. English Walling, Ernest Poole, Leroy Scott, Arthur Bullard, and some others who with more or less Socialist sympathies, have combined the work of student, socialist, writer and traveler in Russia during the last three years. These men are well equipped for the task before them. They know the

philosophy which animates the revolutionist movement, and they are in warm sympathy with it.

Kellog Durland has taken so active a part in the Revolution as to bring him in frequent conflict with the Russian authorities. Yet at the same time he has been able to come into close touch with officialdom and to study the facts from the governmental side.

To him the revolution is inevitable. "Revolution in Russia during the first quarter of the twentieth century is as inevitable as the bursting of a Pelee or a Vesuvius; as inexorable and pitiless as an earthquake, or the passing of ancient empires."

He gives a striking comparison with the French Revolution: "During the year 1906, according to official figures, more than 36,000 people were killed and wounded in revolutionary conflict; over 22,000 suffered in anti-semitic outbreaks, most of which were promoted by governmental agents; over 16,000 so-called agrarian disorders occurred. \* \* These figures loom large indeed when it is recalled that in France, during the Terror, only 2,300 heads fell from the guillotine block, and that during the entire French Revolution only about 30,000 lives were sacrificed."

Durland also went into all portions of Russia. He visited revolutionaries and traveled with Cossack officers, has been arrested several times, smuggled in forbidden literature, was cognizant of a plot to blow up the Ministers to the first Duma, traveled as an "illegal," secured the only interview ever granted with Marie Spiradonova, the girl whose horrible tortures by the police roused thousands to rebellion, and all these things he tells in an intensely interesting and dramatic manner.

He tells how the government is guilty not only of inciting to massacre, and of most hideous murders and pillage, but how it encourages professional assassins, and maintains torture chambers that rival those of the inquisition. The description of these tortures applied to young girls and women is sickeningly hideous.

He finds that the peasants as well as the industrial workers are everywhere ready for revolt. They know what they want. They are determined to have "land and liberty." They cannot be turned aside from these simple primitive demands and they propose to have these demands satisfied.

The horrors of the famine country seem almost unbelievable. "From the city of Samara" he tells us, "I made journeys in three directions — across the Volga and west, south and east. In all of the starving villages I passed through the same heartrending scenes were repeated — food supplies absolutely exhausted; thatch being torn from the roofs to feed to the horses and cattle; families doubling up, i. e., the occupants of one house moving over into a neighbor's in order to use the first house for fuel; relief kitchens so short of relief that only one meal in two days

could be dispensed; *during the forty-seven hours between meals the people prostrate on their backs so as to conserve every particle of strength*; parents deserting their children because they could not bear to watch them die."

Meanwhile "the very flour dispensed by the government is flagrantly adulterated in order that corrupt officials may glean a few thousand more rubles to spend on their dancing girls and French champagne."

The third book is of much less importance than either of the other two, although it fills a valuable niche in describing one of the most important phases of the Russian Revolution. There is a brief survey of the history of the "Lettish Social Democratic Workers' Party" with its platform and declaration of proposed reforms. This party grew in strength until it was sufficiently strong to conduct open rebellion. In this it was aided by the peasants, and for a time was successful. Then came the story of the horrible "punitive expeditions" with wholesale massacres and imprisonments and tortures.

No one can read these three books without realizing that we are today in the midst of a revolution infinitely more bloody, affecting far more people, and destined to bulk larger in world history than the famous one in France a century ago.

A. M. SIMONS.

## Will Socialism Break Up The Family ?

When in the past the reformer has attacked the wrongs and abuses of his day the cry has usually being raised, you are going to break up the family. Therefore the socialist philosopher is by no means surprised to hear the same objection to socialism to-day. As socialism is in the future no one contends that it is breaking up families at present. Yet families are being broken up and there certainly must be a cause. It is possible that the present economic system (or rather want of system) is largely responsible for the domestic infelicity we see on every hand. Surely it cannot be possible that the discomforts and miseries incident to a poor person's existence (I will not use the word life in this connection) are necessary to maintain the family integrity. As men and women are not angels observation teaches us that the reverse is too often true and that these conditions lead to ill temper, the saloon, desertion and divorce. Under socialism the home would be more attractive than the saloon, the wife, relieved of her grievous burdens, would be better company than the bar keeper. The husband no longer a drudge would remind his wife of the good old times before marriage and the baby well cared for would furnish more amusement than a circus. Why under the present system if you raise a man's wages he is very apt to take out a thousand or two more of life insurance and get something useful to add to the comfort of his home. If his day's work is shortened the average man will use his increased leisure to advantage around home. After working ten or twelve hours a day the condition in which a man sits down to supper are such that it is remarkable that there are so few divorces among the workers.

Under socialism the rich libertine would be unable with money to destroy the home of his less fortunate neighbor. Having something useful to do and think about he would be less apt to invade his friend's house and thereby provide a nice mess of divorce scandal for public consumption. In the good time coming no woman will have to marry a home and incidentally a man, neither will any man have to marry a fortune and incidentally a woman.

In the near future very few women will make the mistake of marrying a rake to reform him and afterward try to correct it in the divorce court. Then young man if you sow a crop of

wild oats you will be very apt to reap a harvest of single blessedness. So mote it be.

How is the home to be maintained? says one, if private property is abolished. My friend the vast majority of us will have more private property under socialism than we have now. Perhaps the brush and comb and a few other things public or semi public to-day will be strictly private then. Young ladies, in that glorious day whose dawn is already brightening the eastern sky when capitalism shall be thrown on the rubbish pile of the ages, Mary Jane will not have to stay at home while Sarah goes out wearing the family hat. Under socialism it is scarcely possible, that there will be any objection to any person or persons enjoying all the crudities and absurdities of the present day except of course living off another's labor if they believe such conditions are necessary to secure domestic felicity. In the foregoing I do not think there is anything visionary or anything that can be successfully disputed, but it is all rock bottom philosophy. In conclusion if you want a man to walk uprightly, to become a better citizen, husband and father, in the name of common sense, get off his back.

H. E. ENGLAND.



# EDITORIAL

## Looking Forward and Backward.

There have been few years more fraught with significant events for the working class than the one that has just gone into history. It held within its boundaries the crest of the highest wave of capitalist prosperity ever enjoyed. It saw that wave break into what promises to be one of the most serious crises of the same system. In the battle between capitalists and workers, it was also filled with facts whose deep significance will become more and more apparent as the years pass by. There were no tremendous violent conflicts, such as the Pullman Strike or the great coal strike. The nearest approach to a conflict of this character was the battle of the telegraphers, which developed into one of those long drawn out contests in which the dollar is bound to win over the human being.

The great event of the year was, without a doubt, the outcome of the trial of Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone. The effect which this struggle has had upon the working class and the sense of power for battle, laid the foundation of a determined class action such as has not hitherto existed in this country.

The new year comes in the midst of an industrial crisis. It comes in with a promise of reduced wages and the fierce conditions which always accompany such reductions. It comes in with capitalism triumphant, but trembling on its throne. The speech of Secretary Taft before the Boston merchants showed how great is the fear held by the rulers of present society. In this he told the assembled merchants that unless they were able to reform capitalism, Socialism was inevitable.

This was the same story that Roosevelt told in his message. It is a very common story now-a-days. It is the story that every observer can read in the events around him, and it fills the reader with fear or hope according as his class interests are bound up with the destruction or preservation of the present society.

This year is also a year of Presidential election. This election

will be a time of trial for the Socialist movement of the United States. If the Socialist Party can put aside the cheap jealousies, the contemptible struggles for leadership, the exaggerated demagoguism which has led to the elevation of those whose prattle of proletarian phrases are most glib, if it can make the Socialist movement a part of the whole great battle of the working-class, then it will have shown itself equal to the historical mission that it was created to fulfil.

There are some things that should impel us to a rigid self-criticism to determine if the Socialist Party is really equal to the task before us. That there is something weak about the Party we have worked so hard to build up can hardly be disputed. So long as the Party kept up with the Socialist thought and sentiment that the evolution of capitalism and active Socialist propaganda created it was responding to the tasks before it.

To-day there is more than ten times the interest in and knowledge of Socialism than existed four years ago. The fundamental doctrines of Socialism have permeated into every nook and corner of working-class psychology,—to a large extent unconsciously to be sure, but none the less certainly. Socialism is the dominant theme in literature, in popular discussions of all kinds and descriptions. Yet the Socialist Party occupies but a little larger space in the political world than it occupied at the last election.

We shall not attempt to analyze the reasons for this beyond offering a few suggestions. It is possible that the mere pointing out of the fact may be sufficient to arouse that interest and activity which will remove the defects.

Perhaps some things may be suggested however. We have come to look upon organization as an end in itself. We form Locals and Branches for the sake of holding Local and Branch meetings, for the sake of extending organization, for the sake of holding more meetings, and so on in an endless dreary chain. Is it any wonder that in some of the larger cities more new members have been taken in each year for several years than have ever been in good standing upon the books of the Party, and that the larger portion of the new converts come to but one meeting and then go away disgusted, or discouraged. If the new member hears nothing discussed beyond routine business save a general wrangle and denunciation of such of the Socialists as have sought to accomplish anything, if he finds that the taking up of any active work for Socialism without first consulting a small coterie is to open the vials of denunciation upon the head of the one who displays such pernicious activity,— he is apt to register a vow never again to enter a Socialist organization.

If, on the other hand, the new member finds comradeship, cooperation, and energetic association for Socialist work, then he becomes an active member from the start. He came into the Socialist

Party because he wishes to work for Socialism, and if that wish is gratified he will remain and grow more effective every day. If it is not gratified we have no right to expect to keep him.

Making New Year's resolutions is rather foolish work, but if the Socialist Party really expects to play any part in the coming campaign beyond that of a fault-finding agitational society it must turn over new leaves on several points and the quicker that fact is recognized the quicker it will be possible to get in action, and the more effective that action will be.

There were never such an opportunity offered to the workers of any country. The industrial conditions are ready for a campaign such as in England changed the whole political face of the country a few years ago. It is possible to put such a body of working-class representatives in Congress as will put the United States in the advance guard of the Socialist army of the world.

• • •

#### EDITORIAL NOTE.

With this number I sever all editorial connection with the International Socialist Review.

A. M. SIMONS.

# THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

The open shop agitation promoted by a certain faction of capitalists is really not an unmixed evil. The agitation among and hostile action of the master class has caused many of the contending parties in the industrial movement to get together, discuss their grievances and prepare plans for offensive and defensive alliances. During the past month the chief officials of five international unions in the printing industry held a conference in Indianapolis and came to agreement in the matter of presenting a stonewall front to the common enemy. It will be recalled that up to a few months ago everything was at sixes and sevens in the printing trade, and the compositors were forced to engage in an eight-hour contest singlehanded that cost them upward \$4,000,000. Finally the narrow-minded and short-sighted Higgins regime was overthrown in the pressmen's union and that action was the signal for a genuine alliance between the various crafts, which are now working together to clean up the eight-hour strike.

In the metal trades there has been much contention during the past dozen years owing to craft jealousies and trade autonomy disputes. About the middle of next month representatives of the metal trades will assemble in Cincinnati for the purpose of adjusting internal troubles and make arrangements to meet the onslaughts of employers' organizations wherever they may occur.

As was pointed out in last month's Review, the building crafts are coming together in an international alliance subordinate to the A. F. of L. For years there has been more or less friction between those crafts, and in some instances certain unions have gone to the extreme of scabing on each other. This unfortunate situation will be forgotten history in a short time and the building trades will put into practical operation the motto that an injury to one is the concern of all.

These moves on the part of aforementioned organizations are having their effect on other branches of industry, and we hear that the clothing crafts are agitating the question of forming a trade section for the purpose of smoothing out some of the rough spots in their particular lines of endeavor. Even the long-standing controversy between the cigarmakers and stogiemakers may be adjusted and an alliance arranged, which may include the tobacco workers, a third organization in the industry.

A New York report has it that the railway brotherhoods are likely to form a federation. There are such local federations in existence at the present time and quite likely the memberships are desirous of expanding the principle into an international agreement, which has been the dream of the progressive element among the rail-

way workers for many years. But it is extremely doubtful whether the engineers will enter such a federation. The old Arthur policy of "no entangling alliances" seems to dominate the B. of L. E. as yet.

It is claimed that representatives of the United Mine Workers and the Western Federation of Miners have already come to an agreement to exchange working cards and protect each others' interests wherever possible, and it is rumored that the W. F. of M. will join the American Federation of Labor in the near future. Certainly such a move would prove eminently satisfactory to all well-wishers of organized labor and demonstrate the wisdom of the miners. It cannot be disputed that the great mass of the A. F. of L. membership has been in entire sympathy with the Western miners throughout their struggles during the last decade, and that sympathy took concrete form in the shape of financial and moral assistance quite generously when most needed. While there may be differences of opinion regarding policies between organizations and individuals, yet those contentions upon matters of detail and theoretical propositions should not be permitted to interfere with our plain duty as organized workers, viz.: to establish complete solidarity upon the industrial field and be prepared to meet the onslaughts of the common enemy.

As I have pointed out before, to modern capitalism it makes little difference whether we are organized along craft lines or industrial lines, whether we are Republicans, Democrats or Socialists. The labor-hating capitalists do not stop to ask questions about what we believe or practice in an industrial or political sense, but they wield the big stick mercilessly against any and every organization and individual, that resists their mandates. Therefore, the first common sense thing to do is to get together in a federation and gradually amalgamate into one homogeneous whole, make the best fight possible industrially, and use our political power to protect our economic organizations.

---

The curtain has descended in the first act of the judicial drama that is being presented in Washington. The National Association of Manufacturers and its score of affiliated employers' organizations, which bodies have started in to raise a fund of \$1,500,000 for the purpose of making war upon trade unions and enforce the open shop, won a victory in the equity court of the District of Columbia in the celebrated case of the Buck's Stove & Range Co. versus the American Federation of Labor. The plaintiff petitioned for an injunction to restrain the officers of the A. F. of L. from publishing the name of the Buck's Stove & Range Co., St. Louis, in the "We Don't Patronize List." The boycott was declared because the Buck's Co., the president of which concern is J. W. Van Cleave, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, locked out the metal polishers for refusing to surrender the nine-hour day and return to the ten-hour system of work.

Justice Gould, of the equity court, after a hearing that lasted several weeks and in which the attorneys of both sides exhausted every effort to win a victory, granted the injunction and took occasion to arraign the action of the Federation as an illegal conspiracy. While the injunction is of a temporary character, it is reported from Washington that Justice Gould exhaustively reviewed the case, made copious citations of authorities, quoted precedents as to boycott definitions, and said there was no room for argument as to the conspiracy alleged being established. The judge also declared that he had not, in his decision, taken up the question of inhibition of the boycott "under the Sherman anti-trust law or the interstate commerce act. The

question of making the temporary injunction permanent will come up in the spring, and no matter what the decision is then the case will be carried to the United States Supreme Court for final hearing. Incidentally, Justice Gould embraced the opportunity to emphasize his decision by issuing injunctions at the same time against the carriage workers and bakers ordering those two organizations to cease boycotting several local concerns.

As has been stated in the Review before, this case is the most momentous judicial struggle in which organized labor has ever been engaged. It is well understood that the Buck's Co. is acting in behalf of many other concerns whose names appear upon the unfair list of the American Federation of Labor, and it can be readily surmised that if the United States Supreme Court upholds the Washington court one unfair form after another will produce an injunction to have their names removed from the "We Don't Patronize List," and thus the boycott list will have become emasculated and organized labor is robbed of the most powerful weapon in its possession at the present, for it is only through putting the fear of God in their hearts through the medium of a boycott that causes some of the capitalists to be fairly decent now. The fact that employers without exception are prone to rail at the boycott as "un-American," while at the same time they themselves do a bit of boycotting whenever they get the chance, is proof positive that they would be mightily pleased to have this weapon of the unions outlawed. I have it from excellent authority that the Buck's Stove & Range Co. has been losing a large amount of patronage because the concern has become known throughout the country as being unfair, and, inconsistent though it may seem, the real owner of the firm is not Van Cleave, but is said to be a Chicago capitalist who is regarded as a "friend of organized labor."

Howsoever that may be, the undisputed fact is that every capitalist in the land is desirous that labor boycotts be pronounced unlawful. If the Supreme Court upholds Justice Gould in the opinion that a boycott is an "illegal conspiracy," then the capitalists will be in a position not only to claim damages as a result of strikes, but may also imprison workingmen for committing misdemeanors. In other words, it will become a crime to strike against and boycott those who deliberately oppress the working class.

Whether or not the United States Supreme Court will uphold the District of Columbia equity court is a speculative matter. But judging from past experience organized labor has not much to hope for from that source. The higher labor cases are carried, the further away they get from the heart of the people, and the less sympathy and support is given such cases, by the august tribunals, who are amazed at the very audacity of labor daring to imagine that it has a grievance.

Rob the workers of their right to act in concert to resist the encroachments of combined capitalism, and the natural result will be that they will turn to their only remaining and too long neglected weapon, the ballot, to secure justice. So in the long run the Van Cleave-Parry-Post open shop agitators may not only be thanked for amalgamating labor upon the industrial field, but also for becoming a distinct political force. This is a great opportunity for the Socialists to spread their propaganda and rally the intelligent workers to their standard.

Just what a flat failure the Gompers political policy of "rewarding your friends and punishing your enemies" really is has been thoroughly illustrated by recent occurrences. In the Congressional

Campaign of 1906, when Gompers bestrode his trusty hobby and set forth armed cap-a-pie to conquer the enemy and reward friends, it so happened that the Milwaukee capitalist politicians, fearing the possible triumph of the Socialists in one of their Congressional districts, stacked up a professional union man who did not work at the business — one Cary, a telegrapher — to draw the votes of work- ingmen who were not grounded in the principles of socialism. As is well known, the Socialists of Milwaukee are nearly all union, and, as they have stood up consistently and defended the working class in the City Council and the State Legislature, they naturally believed they had the right to expect, if not the support of Gompers, at least that he would keep hands off in their contest. But despite the fact that the Milwaukee Trades Council had denounced Cary and refused to seat him as a delegate because of his perfidy as sheriff in purchasing scab bread and other unfair supplies, the doughty president of the Federation sent Cary a letter commending his election, which document was duly photo-engraved and bushels of fac-similes were scattered throughout the district. Whether this boost had much effect in the general result is immaterial. The fact is Cary was elected and was enthusiastically hailed in a section of the press as a "Labor Congressman."

Now comes the interesting sequel. Several months ago Gompers sent a circular letter broadcast requesting that all unionists exercise their influence to have Speaker Cannon defeated for re-election for the reason that that old fossil "held up" the labor bills in Congress or dictated their defeat. Did Cary stand up like a union man and fight the old Czar who has made a doormat of the labor bills for several years. Not so that you could notice it. Cary went into the Republican caucus and voted for Cannon. And then next day Cannon heaped coals of fire on Sam's head, saying that union men everywhere were his (Cannon's) friends, while Gompers was trying to play the part of boss, but was being repudiated, or words to that effect. Of course, Sam'l will get mad as a wet hen if the Socialists laugh at his chagrin, but since the "reds" never receive a pleasant look from him (in fact have been roundly scolded for daring to espouse their cause) they may be pardoned if they are unable to hide their smiles and look serious. It is not unlikely that the rank and file will get some distance ahead of Gompers during the next two years if he sticks to his played out political policies.

---

The seat of war against organized labor in the West has been transferred from Colorado and Idaho to Nevada. That section of the American plutocracy in possession of the mineral mines precipitated the strike in Goldfield by issuing a depreciated scrip in payment of wages. When the unionists rebelled against the daylight swindle the operators declared for the open shop and their puppet Governor Sparks telegraphed to Washington for government troops. It is significant that just about the time that the great "friend of labor," Roosevelt, "relieved the situation" in Goldfield by sending in soldiers, he also "relieved the situation" in New York by bonding the people for \$150,000,000 in favor of the hungry capitalists, who had already been fed upon \$200,000,000 of gold, silver and paper from the treasury. That is, while Roosevelt dumped \$350,000,000 of real money among the plutocratic hogs of Wall Street, he also dumped the U. S. troops into Goldfield because the workingmen refused to accept the mine owners' stage money and slink "back to the mines" as non-unionists. The contract was so glaring that even Roosevelt realized

that he was manufacturing campaign thunder for this year's campaign, so he quickly dispatched a commission to investigate the situation in Goldfield and later ordered the troops withdrawn.

In Nevada, as in Colorado and Idaho, the old, well-known methods of the mine operators are being exploited to the limit. The prostitute press has been filled with scare-head articles about hidden arms and ammunition being discovered, dynamite outrages and plots being detected, civil war brewing, etc., etc. Those innocent, God-fearing, law-abiding "guardians of the peace," the Pinkertons, strike-breakers and gun men by the score were imported and swarm through the district, and at an opportune time even a committee of alleged union men (probably composed of sneaks and spies) waited upon Furusio Funston and petitioned that the soldiers be kept in Goldfield permanently. Just how long the struggle will continue nobody knows. From all reports the miners intend to defend their rights against all hazards, and the reading public need not be surprised to hear all sorts of lying stories against them, for all of which the operators pay liberally.

It is not improbable that a struggle will also be precipitated in far-off Alaska, when the weather breaks up next spring. The Guggenheims, who are the dominating power among the operators of the West, have raised the black flag of the open shop in the Alaskan territory and everything that looks like a union has been put under the ban. But the workers declare they will not surrender without a contest to the finish and are making preparations accordingly. Stirring times are ahead in the American labor movement during the next two or three years.



# SOCIALISM ABROAD

## ITALY.

The Italian Socialist Daily, "Avanti", seems to have attained a firm position at last. After struggling on for several years, it has now increased its size and purchased a more complete mechanical equipment and is preparing to issue two editions a day. This firm position has been attained through the steady increase in subscriptions secured by the workers in the party.

## SWEDEN.

Elections which were held on the thirteenth of December resulted in two Social-Democratic victories. In the 5th District of Stockholm, Knut Tengdahl was elected by 3,040 votes. The opposing candidate, who ran as an Anti-Socialist with the solid support of the entire bourgeois press, received only 1,062 votes. In Gottenburg, the Socialist candidate, Linblad, Editor of the Ny Tid, received 3,960 votes, while the Conservative received 3,517 votes and the Liberal, 4,271. In the previous election of this District, the Socialists received only 1,200 votes. This raises the number of Socialists in the Swedish Parliament to seventeen and as a new election is to be held in the Districts where the Socialists are almost sure of success, it is possible that by the time Parliament assembles, this will be increased to eighteen.

## RUSSIA.

The government has been prosecuting the members of the second Douma, who signed the Vieberg Manifesto. This Manifesto, now regarded as being very ill-advised, called on the peasants not to pay taxes or to enlist in the army. It was ill-advised because it produced no effect. The members of the Douma were convicted and sentenced to a short time in prison and complete loss of civil rights. The Socialists in the French Chamber of Deputies made a protest against this action and there has been considerable International propaganda against it.

## FRANCE.

Gustave Herve and his paper "La Guerre Sociale", is being prosecuted again by the government. The case came up on the twenty-third of December, but no report of the result has as yet reached this country. It is strikingly characteristic of Herve that he seized this opportunity when the government was attempting to suppress the paper to issue it as a daily during the time of the trial, thus making what was intended to be a crushing blow a means of increasing his influence.

## BOOK REVIEWS

The Radical, by I. K. Friedman. D. Appleton & Co., Cloth, 362 pp. \$1.50.

The sociological novel is now so common that one must be exceptionally good, or strikingly different to commend attention. "The Radical" is a strongly written work. The author understands Socialism, which gives him a leverage not possessed by many of the writers of similar works.

The plot is strong, full of interest, and is as original as can be expected after several thousand years of story telling. The hero, Bruce McAllister, a "man of the people," a ward politician in method, but with an earnest desire to fight the battles of the working class, comes into conflict at the beginning with Addison Hammersmith, a man of wealthy antecedents and extensive present possessions, who however, is made little more than a foil for the main character. The two men are personal friends, and the rich man is not made the conventional villain which the hackneyed method of writing sociological novels would have required.

McAllister goes to Congress, and the principal part of the book is devoted to the intrigues of Washington society and politics. The methods by which wealth rules legislation, its multitudinous ways of securing the men whom it needs, and the general deviousness of legislative ways are exposed in a manner that commands attention and testifies to the thoroughness of the author's knowledge.

The political intrigues are not allowed to overshadow the romantic element, or rather the two are so closely intertwined that there is none of the impression of a political tract that damns so many theories of this kind.

Addison Hammersmith has a sister Inez, and after the first chapter she becomes one of the leading figures, and finally evolves into the heroine, although she is scarcely painted as strongly as Georgia Fiske Ten Eyck, one of those women who develop in the political atmosphere. The latter character is painted with remarkable strength and clearness and with a human insight that is seldom found.

The humorous element is furnished by Rossiter Rembrandt Dickinson, an eccentric artist, whose love-making antics with McAllister's sister have a direct and laughable simplicity that relieves the complex character of the other actors.

The relation of government to the great industrial combinations of to-day is strikingly set forth in the following paragraph:

"Scientists tell us that if a pea be placed at the side of a cocoon, the relative size of the sun and the earth will find their just proportion represented, and if one takes our United States Govern-

ment, the money it controls and expends, the number of people it employes, and place it beside Sir Anthony's Universal Trust, the same pea and the same cocoanut will do to show how the one shrinks in importance beside the other. Anthony, then, would be richer and more powerful than the Government; he would have a larger majority of its voters on his pay roll, and he intended to have the Government run to suit himself. The milk in the cocoanut, to say the same thing differently, was in no way designed for the fattening of the despicable little pea; but on the other hand, to extend the figure of speech a little further, the cocoanut had certain little designs whereby the pea was to serve its ends. The sun, huge as it is, and the earth, small as it is, are of mutual benefit in our vast solar system, and both help to keep the whole in motion. Surely if the cocoanut is kind enough to keep its place and distance, and does not roll over and crush the pea out of existence, the latter ought to show its thankfulness by sundry little deeds of kindness. The right kind of tariff, taxation and laws, were all the pea was asked to give for the privilege of existing. But why poke fun at Anthony? Why belabor and scold him? Was it his fault, was he too blame, if we prostrate ourselves and gave him stilts to stride over us like a Colossus."

When Things were Doing, By C. A. Steere. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Cloth, 279 pp. \$1.00.

If you were an orthodox Marxian Socialist, believing in a class-conscious political revolution, and you read a utopia that was deuced interesting, but which presupposed all sorts of violent, sudden, reconstructions of society through an autocratic semi-secret organization, and if you had just worked your indignation at the author up to the proper point, but couldn't stop reading the book until you had finished it, and then were told on the last page that it was all a sort of a cross between a pipe-dream and delirium tremens,—well it would jar you, wouldn't it. That is just what this book does. It is well, cleverly written, is full of suggestions, but depends upon a *deus ex machina*, or rather upon several of them, and the only danger is that it will be taken as a serious program for socialist parties. After having brought about his revolution by these very questionable means the author sketches a very life-like utopia. He puts into tangible form the dreams which many of us have had, and if now and then he throws in a touch of the night-mare just to break the monotony, we must remember that he is telling a story first, and writing a treatise on Socialism only incidentally. And he certainly does tell a very good story. It is funny, it is alive, it is interesting, and what more do you want?

The Scarlet Shadow, A Story of the Great Colorado Conspiracy, By Walter Hurt. The Appeal to Reason. Cloth, 416 pp. and Appendix, \$1.50.

In the form of fiction the story of the battle between laborers and capitalists in the Rocky Mountain states, is told once more. All the principle actors in real life appear again in the story, sometimes thinly disguised, sometimes under their own names. There are numerous embellishments of the facts to make the situations more dramatic,—something which was scarcely needed. Some rather remarkable hypotheses are propounded under the guise of fiction,—for instance it is suggested that Steunenberg was the son of McPartland, but on the whole no more liberty is taken with the facts than might be granted to "novelistic license." The style is decidedly melodramatic and sometimes crude.

Toilers and Idlers. By John R. McMahon. Wilshire Book Co. Cloth, 195 pp. \$1.00.

Of the writing of Socialist novels there is no end, nor will be until Socialism shall be here and men's minds shall be reaching out for something more. This is distinctly better than the mass of Socialist stories. It is a strong, well-written work to begin with. The writer knows the craft at which he works, something which cannot be said of many Socialists who will try to write novels. He also understands Socialism, something that cannot be said of many writers who try to put Socialism into their novels.

Otis Rensen, living upon an income whose very source is scarcely known to him, blase, and worn out for lack of something to do, is strolling by a foundry and decides to apply for a job. He gets it, and discovers he is working in his own establishment, which he has never visited. He becomes more and more enamored with his work, or rather with the problems with which his work is surrounded, joins the union, enters into the class struggle from the side of the men, and then at the dramatic moment steps onto the other side of this same struggle and establishes a co-operative foundry.

So much for the sociological plot. On the whole it has one grave defect in that it looks for leadership and guidance to the proletarian movement to come from the capitalist side. It may. Stranger things have happened, and the age of miracles may still be with us. But we have our doubts.

The characters are not mere dummies upon which to hang lectures. Rensen has real blood in him, meets and discusses and solves some real problems. One of the strongest figures is Sonia, the anarchist organizer of the "Ladies Shirt Waist Union." She is a distinct contribution to the characters of literature. So is Zienski, her anarchist lover, whose philosophy is most sadly mixed, but who makes one like him and regret the author's action in killing him in an endeavor to blow up Rensen's foundry.

There is a thumb nail sketch of "Bohemia" that is refreshing in its truthfulness in comparison with most of the rot that is printed about this famous locality, or atmosphere. The cheap tawdry posing of those who make such a pretence at being sincere, and the tinsel slap-stick character of actors and dialogue are excellently displayed.

There is a romance, of course, and it has features enough to give it interest by itself, aside from the moralizing that runs through the book.

On the whole the work is a distinct addition to the literature of the Socialist movement.

## PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

### THE BRAINS BEHIND THE VOTE.

The year 1908 is the year of a presidential election in the United States. In a few months the country will be in a whirlwind of excitement over how the people shall vote in November.

The issues of the campaign are still to be shaped. It seems reasonably certain that Taft or whoever is the Republican nominee will defend the mild policy of trust-busting which has been practiced by Roosevelt. Bryan will doubtless be the Democratic candidate, but the unknown quantity in our forecast is his platform. Will he advocate government banks and railways, thus appealing to the small individual producers and petty capitalists against the big capitalists, or will he choose a platform hard to distinguish from that of the Republicans?

The size of the Socialist vote this year will probably turn on this. In the former case, the chances are that it will be relatively small; in the latter case it will probably be much larger than four years ago.

But the real strength of the socialist movement of the United States, when the smoke blows away, will not be measured by the vote but by the brains behind the vote.

We are not going to elect a socialist president this year. But with millions of interested voters listening to our arguments, we have the chance of our lives to start new brains to applying the socialist philosophy in a way that will count later on.

By all odds the most important means to this end is the circulation of immense quantities of socialist books that are really scientific and will give people with brains the clue to using their brains in an effective way. The object of the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company is to put such books within the reach of the working men and working women of America at the lowest possible prices.

### OUR RECORD FOR 1907.

During the year just closed, we circulated books to the amount

of \$22,168.31 as compared with \$17,086.03 for the year 1906. And during the year we increased our capital stock from \$22,430 to \$26,380.

Both of these figures can and should be doubled during the year 1908. We have passed the stage of experiment. We no longer have to urge socialists to send us their money in the hope that possibly it may enable us to supply the socialist books that are needed. We have the books now, and our co-operative plan offers more of the best socialist books for a given amount of money than can possibly be obtained in any other way.

Without the work that we have done, few of the most important writings of European and American socialists could be bought by American workingmen. We now offer an excellent library at prices far below those at which other sociological books are sold.

We have now published two of the three volumes of the greatest of all socialist books, Marx's "Capital." And Ernest Untermann has nearly completed the translation of the third volume, a larger book than either of the others. To print this book involves a cash outlay of two thousand dollars. A profit-making house, if it were to publish this book at all, would probably charge \$5.00 for it. We intend to publish it at \$2.00, with our usual discount to stockholders. But only a small part of the necessary money can be raised from the advance sales of the book. For the rest we must depend on new stock subscriptions, and the sooner these can be secured, the sooner the volume can be published.

#### NEW BOOKS IN PRESS.

**American Communities and Co-operative Colonies.** By William Hinds. Second revision, cloth, 600 pages, \$1.50.

Of the first revision of this work, published five years ago, Morris Hillquit said in his "History of Socialism in the United States," it is "altogether the most elaborate and complete account of American communities." The present revision is still more deserving of this high praise. The author has amplified or rewritten many of the descriptions in the earlier edition, to make them more complete and up-to-date. He has added accounts of two new co-operative experiments in Massachusetts, one in Wisconsin, one in Michigan, one in Georgia, one in Illinois, one in New Jersey, one in Washington, D. C., two in New York and three in California. The number of illustrations has been doubled, sources of information on most of the experiments have been added, together with a full index in which are included the names of persons who have founded colonies or have been prominent in promoting the colony movement. There are not less than 170 pages of new matter. Of the newly described colonies, the following will attract most attention:

The House of David, at Benton Harbor, Mich., with its membership of over 700, and their peculiar doctrines and customs.

The Roycrofters of East Aurora, N. Y., of which Elbert Hubbard of world-wide notoriety is the founder.

The Helicon Home Colony of Englewood, N. J., with its plans for solving the "servant problem," and making a children's heaven, founded by Upton Sinclair, author of "The Jungle."

A Polish Brook Farm in California, founded more than twenty years ago by Madame Modjeska and her Polish friends, including the author of "Quo Vadis."

Admitting that the greater number of colony experiments have utterly failed to realize the hopes of their founders, and that political Socialism now largely absorbs and will continue to absorb the interest of those striving for better social conditions, the author of "American Communities" tells us of existing experiments that have continued for 64, 120, 175 years, affirms that such colonies antedated political Socialism, and that their history forms an integral part of the general history of Socialism. He is fully persuaded that they are yet to be greatly multiplied, for as soon, he says, as political Socialism becomes dominant in any country, "there will be a grand hustle for congenial conditions and associations," which can best be realized in communities and co-operative colonies.

We may concede all this while still holding that the active agents in the overthrow of capitalism must be the revolutionary trade unions and the Socialist party, or whatever party is the political expression of the united struggle of the working class. We recommend and circulate this book of Mr. Hinds because it is full of interesting and valuable data regarding the economic conditions which must be reckoned with in the work of tearing down and rebuilding.

Copies of this book will be ready by the time this issue of the Review is in the hands of its readers, and orders should be sent at once.

**Evolution, Social and Organic.** By Arthur Morrow Lewis. Cloth, 50 cents. We expect to have this ready for delivery before the end of January. It will contain ten of the lectures delivered by Mr. Lewis at the Garrick Theater, Chicago, and a large sale is already assured for the book among those who have heard the lectures. But the demand should be ten times greater from those who have been unable to hear them.

This is distinctively a socialist book. It is a survey of the progress of scientific thought from the time of the early Greek philosophers down to our own day, but if any reader does not see the connection between this line of thought and socialism, he had better read it and find out. In the book the connection is shown plainly enough.

We have an occasional complaint to the effect that we should confine ourselves to the publication of books intended to "make socialists." Now as for this, books don't make socialists; it is economic conditions that make them. But when economic conditions have brought a man to the point where he is ready to join the Socialist Party, it becomes a matter of some importance that he be able to get hold of books that will give him a clear idea of what socialism is, and fit him to talk about it intelligently. A few good propaganda books like those by Spargo, Vail, Blatchford and Ladoff are enough to convince a doubting inquirer that he should vote the socialist ticket, but a man who stops with such books will not be likely to understand socialism in a way to fit him to talk on it intelligently.

For socialism is not a scheme that can be tried on when a majority of the voters happen to take a notion some day. Socialism is the organized movement of the working class of the world for

taking control of the world, and on its theoretical side it is modern science applied to social problems. It is thus absolutely necessary for a man to know something about evolution before he can understand the elementary principles of socialism. We have therefore no apology to offer for advertising **Evolution, Social and Organic** as a socialist book. It is a book that ninety-nine per cent of the socialist party members would be benefited by reading.

**Human, All Too Human.** By Friedrich Nietzsche. Library of Science for the Workers, Vol. 8. Cloth, 50 cents. Ready about January 31.

Here, no doubt, is a non-socialist book. At least, that is the way we prefer to classify it. (So, by the way, is "American Communities," mentioned above, of which we sold one large edition without a sigh nor a protest from any one. And isn't it a little curious that our materialistic comrades who are so often called intolerant never raised the least objection to an avowedly Utopian book like "American Communities," while our religious friends shudder at the publication of the writings of Frederick Engels and Joseph Dietzgen? But to resume.)

Seriously, we always try to describe our books in such a way that they will be bought only by those who will enjoy them, and we hope to do so in this case. Take our word for what this new book is, and if you are disappointed, we will exchange it for you.

We obtained the manuscript in a curious way. The translation was made years ago for a New York house which formerly published scientific books, but after various changes has now gone into the publication of an entirely different line. They offered us the manuscript for a surprisingly small sum. We came near sending it back unread, for we had heard a good deal about Nietzsche that isn't so, —perhaps some of our readers have heard the same things. Fortunately we began reading the manuscript, and couldn't stop till the end was reached.

Here is what the book is. The author starts out with what is virtually the Marxian theory of determinism, and applies it with the most brilliant literary workmanship ever brought to bear on his theme, to human relations in this transition age where old institutions and ideals are crumbling and the new are yet unborn.

Simply as literature, whether you agree or disagree, the book is great. But we do not recommend it to those who love their present theological conclusions so tenderly that they can not hear them discussed without pain. The author's sub-title is "A Book for Free Spirits." Those who believe with Engels that the object of the socialist movement is to realize the completest possible freedom for the individual will find much to enjoy in **Human, All Too Human**.

**The Scarlet Shadow**, by Walter Hurt, is a story in which many real events connected with the Haywood case are intermingled. It is published by the Appeal to Reason at \$1.50, and we have made a special arrangement by which we can supply copies at the same discounts as if we were the publishers.