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

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

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

Yours fraternally,

Jefferson, Ohio. GEORGE LOUIS ARNER.

To the Editor of the NEW REVIEW:

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

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

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

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

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

Yours fraternally,

Washington, D. C. THERESA H. RUSSELL.

FEBRUARY 1914 Ten Cents

The New Review

A-MONTHLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

150 Nassau Street New York

The New Review

Published Monthly
by the
New Review Publishing Association
150 Nassau Street, New York City

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

Herman Simpson, - - - - *Editor*

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

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

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

The New Review

Vol. II. FEBRUARY, 1914 No. 2

The Industrial Crisis

In the early summer months of 1913 every trained observer of financial events could have predicted with confidence that an industrial crisis was rapidly approaching. For months prior to that the stock exchanges of the world had been engaged in an almost uninterrupted process of liquidation. The period of industrial revival and prosperity, which in America had reached its end with the financial panic of 1907, had continued in Europe without any serious interruption until the outbreak of the Balkan War. The booming of the cannon on the fields of Kirk-Kilisse and Lule Burgas, the military mobilization of Russia and Austria, and the dread of war between Triple Alliance and Triple Entente caused universal fear and distrust and snapped the bonds of credit. Banks as well as individuals began to hoard gold. Securities of all kinds were liquidated as fast as possible. Emissions of new securities and the starting of new enterprises were reduced to a minimum. Business operations were curtailed in every direction and unemployment became a pressing problem for the European labor movement, particularly in Germany and Austria.

As might have been expected, the European financial crisis has reacted upon every country depending upon Europe for advances of capital. The great land and railroad boom of the Canadian Northwest was stopped. Brazil, which is suffering from a rubber and coffee crisis of its own, Argentina, Australia, British India, were drawn into the vortex. The financial collapse of the Huerta regime in Mexico in its turn reacted upon Paris and Berlin. The United States alone seemed to be in a safe financial position, for here liquidation had been drastic and thorough in the crash of 1907, and with the exception of brief spasmodic revivals in exceptionally situated industries, such as oil and steel, business has ever since that year been in a state of stagnation. Hence it might have been assumed that the United States would

escape the visitation of financial stringency and industrial depression that was spreading over the rest of the world. But in the present era of world-commerce the nations of the world are linked by a common fate, and every nation is affected by the conditions of the rest of the world. Moreover, in relation to European countries the United States are a debtor nation. In normal times Europe absorbs immense quantities of American bonds and stocks. Hence during the past year European holders have been steadily liquidating in the American market their American securities, and American banks have repeatedly been called upon to furnish gold to Paris as well as to Canada, Brazil and the Argentine. Thus the financial collapse, which in Europe followed upon the heels of a period of prosperity, was transmitted to the United States, although the latter had hardly begun to emerge from the depression of 1907-8.

In the American financial markets liquidation appears to have reached its climax in the first half of June last. The industrial decline followed. The Steel Trust began to report an ever increasing decline in incoming orders. The production of iron declined from 2,822,217 tons in May—the highest monthly production in 1913—to 1,983,607 in December. Stocks of copper kept on decreasing for a while, owing to the great strike in Michigan; nevertheless the surplus of copper on hand grew from 29,793,094 pounds on Sept. 1, 1913, to 91,438,867 pounds on Jan. 1, 1914. The railroads have for months past been reporting decreasing earnings. The number of idle cars on Jan. 1, 188,850, was the largest since March, 1911. Other industries have a similar tale to tell.

The capitalists are feeling the depression in the shape of lower profits, but the whole weight of the measureless woe falls on the wage laborers, particularly the unskilled. On Sept. 30, 1913, over 16 per cent. of the members of unions in New York State were idle, and the Commissioner of Labor assures us that this was due not to labor troubles but to lack of work. The percentage of unemployment on that date among the unskilled and unorganized can only be conjectured, but it certainly was much larger. The vast extent of unemployment throughout the country is indicated by the fact that at the end of 1913 the plants of the Steel Trust were working at 50 per cent. of capacity. A slight improvement has since taken place, for on Jan. 14 it was reported that operations had increased to 56 per cent. of capacity, but no one presumes to say whether the improvement will hold. On the contrary, the responsible trade organ, the *Iron Age,*

issued a warning against a possible relapse in February. In general, the experiences of the Steel Trust are most instructive. When trustification on a large scale began, capitalist economists, as well as Socialist "revisionists," predicted the end of industrial crises. The trusts, these economists asserted, would be able to ascertain exactly the requirements of the markets and would regulate their production in accordance with the prospective demand. The elements of uncertainty, hazard and speculation, which characterized individualist capitalist production, would be reduced to a minimum under the trusts, production would proceed in an orderly and regular manner, crises would be eliminated, and capitalist society would thus be relieved of one of its worst scourges.

A glance at the reports of the Steel Trust shows how utterly unfounded these predictions were. The fluctuations from top-notch prosperity to the depths of depression and crisis are just as great and violent in these present days as they were before the era of trusts.

Are these violent fluctuations due to the inability of the trust to ascertain the demand and regulate its production accordingly? Very likely this is one factor. The trust may be unable to ascertain even the national demand, not to speak of the world-market. But there is also another factor, which possibly is of even greater importance. Trusts are organized to exploit the consumers as well as the laborers. The trust strives to obtain the highest possible prices for its products, hence consumers must be kept in the dark, and even actually misled, as to the conditions of the market. At one time, as now for example, consumers are led to believe, by the publication of figures of decreasing orders and diminishing production, that business is going down hill and are frightened off from putting in their orders at the prevailing low prices. Then all of a sudden orders pour in from all quarters, particularly from the railroads and public utility corporations, which are controlled by the same big banking interests that control the Steel Trust itself. The figures are published, showing an increasing tonnage of orders on hand. The independent consumers are now frightened into putting in buying orders, for fear that later on they may not be able to get their orders filled at all, or that prices will rise abruptly. This itself results in an abrupt rise of prices and a further rush of buyers. And thus all the conditions are present for overproduction and consequent depression and crisis, just as if there had never been any trust at all.

But there are also other factors working in the same direction Almost invariably it will be found that the banks restrict credit when production and prices are low, and release it when they are high. In the former case they deter consumers from entering the market just when the industry needs stimulation, in the latter case they encourage them to enter upon new commitments just when caution is called for. Nor is it necessary to assume that the banks conduct themselves thus perversely with malice prepense. On the contrary, in most cases, as at this present time, their attitude to prospective borrowers is determined by conditions in the international money and capital markets. The same is also true, though to a less extent, in regard to fluctuations in the prices of trust securities. The ups and downs may be determined in the long run by the conditions of the money market, but as they furnish a perennial source of profit to the big banks, it is obvious that there exists a powerful motive for stimulating them. And one of the surest ways of rigging the market, up or down, for the securities of a corporation, is to expand or contract the productive activity of that corporation. The operations of the stock exchange thus furnish an additional motive at one time for overproduction, at another time for underproduction, particularly in the case of individual corporations.

But whatever be the general causes of industrial crises under capitalism as a whole and whatever their special causes under trustified capitalism, there can be no doubt that we are now in the depths of such a crisis. In the metal and allied industries alone there are several hundred thousand unemployed. In Los Angeles, with 450,000 inhabitants, the chief of police has estimated the number of unemployed at 40,000. In Seattle, Wash., a citizens' committee has found it necessary to obtain the use of abandoned buildings to give shelter to the unemployed. Professor Charles R. Henderson, president of the united charities of Chicago and secretary of a committee on unemployment appointed by Mayor Harrison, states that the number of unemployed in Chicago is unusually large, mostly unskilled laborers, for the railroads have been discharging thousands of trackmen and other employes. In New York City the authorities have felt obliged to take cognizance of the existence of an unusually large number of homeless unemployed persons. The problem of providing for the unemployed is daily becoming more pressing, but capitalist society is unwilling to cope with the problem. Relief works by municipal, state and national governments require large sums of money at a time when money rates are unusually high. Even for ordinary charitable relief money is hard to get at a time when the revenues of the bourgeois have been substantially reduced. And so quack remedies are proposed. Thus at a meeting in Chicago of state labor and employment bureau officials it was proposed that the national government undertake the work of properly distributing the men out of work and of warning them away from overcrowded fields,—when work is nowhere to be had and all fields are overcrowded. On the other hand, the unemployed are made to feel the full measure of police brutality, as at Los Angeles, where on Christmas Day a peaceful meeting of the unemployed was broken up and one man was killed with a policeman's bullet. In San Francisco also there was a clash in which one patrolman and four unemployed were seriously injured; but there the insolence of the unemployed was really provoking, for they refused to accept lodging in the municipal barrack and demanded work instead of charity! From Canada come similar reports, as in Regina, Saskatchewan, where the police have prepared for battle with the unemployed.

And while the workers of the nation are thus submerged in misery and woe, the representatives of the capitalist parties in Congress are trying to make political capital out of their plight. Not a proposal for the benefit of the unemployed, not even a word of commiseration, but each thinks only of his own and his party's advantage. The Republicans and Democrats have now changed roles. The Republicans are now the "calamity howlers." The Democrats are now "advance agents of prosperity." The Republicans enumerate the closed mines, the stacked furnaces, the idle plants, the unemployed or partially employed. The Democrats, unable to deny the staggering facts, grow indignant, reply with torrents of words, throw the responsibility upon the Republican administrations of the past, almost accuse their opponents of high treason to the country and the flag. To these callous politicians the millions of starving and freezing unemployed workers are mere pawns in the pleasant game between the "ins" and the "outs." And it is almost certain that practically nothing will be done to relieve their present most trying situation, and that nothing worth while will ever be done in similar situations, until the workers are strong enough to help themselves through their own unaided efforts, until they acquire the enlightenment, the organization, the self-discipline and the initiative to become the masters of the society which rests upon

their labor, has the means to satisfy the needs and even the comforts of all, but which condemns ever increasing numbers of industrious workers to involuntary idleness and starvation.

H. S.

The Middle Class and Progressivism

By Frank Bohn

Theodore Roosevelt has declared finally that he considers the Progressive party an established institution. This statement he has made explicitly from the public rostrum, to the press and again in an article contributed to the October number of the *Century* magazine. In this latest discussion he examines the political situation at length and reaffirms his adherence to the Chicago platform. Had Roosevelt accepted the invitation of the progressive Republicans to return again to the fold, the Progressive party, still in its formative stage, would undoubtedly have been broken up. The reason for the continued existence of this party Mr. Roosevelt finds in two facts: "First, the absence of real distinctions between the old parties which correspond to those parties; and second, the determined refusal of the men in control of both parties to use the party organizations and their control of the Government for the purpose of dealing with the problems really vital to our people."

So the nation must reckon with this party and this movement, in all its various aspects, as a primal force in its political life during the coming decade. Let it not be overlooked that the movement is still divided into three sections. It has created a strong new party; it is controlling and transforming the Democracy; and it still exists in the regular Republican organization, where it numbers men of the first rank in current political life. Had the leading members of the Progressive party coalesced with the Republicans, the Progressive movement in its larger aspects would have been postponed but not destroyed. In that case it would undoubtedly have made use of the organization of the Socialist party as its principal outward expression. The cause of Progressivism is economic discontent. Its goal is State Capitalism. Had this cause and this purpose been popularly named "Socialism," the Socialist party would have

been rushed to an early victory in cities, states, and probably throughout the nation. But the real triumph of both Progressivism and Socialism would thereby have been long postponed.

NATURE OF THE UPHEAVAL

The great mass of Americans of all classes, quite likely ninety per cent. of the population, are in a critical frame of mind regarding things political. Probably a majority have come to the conclusion that very radical changes in government should be made at once. The discontented include everybody except the very rich, the hopelessly reactionary, and the densely ignorant. A national campaign fought out on the single issue of government ownership of the railroads would undoubtedly end with a large majority in its favor. The population of New England as a whole has been making war on the New Haven railroad. The Interstate Commerce Commission has risen to a degree of influence in transportation affairs such as the most sanguine advocate of government control ten years ago would not have thought possible so soon. Radical changes in political and legal forms, such as the initiative, the referendum and the recall and the reform of the criminal law, are now being practiced in many states, and the list of reforms must be re-tabulated every month. Meanwhile the labor movement is taking the form of rebellions against authority, as witness West Virginia, Colorado, Paterson and the Lake Superior iron ranges. Most significant of all, the spokesmen of great capitalism are now on the defensive. They have given way entirely at certain weak points, such as supervision of the railways, the federal income tax and the direct election of Senators. They are rapidly weakening in the matter of minimum wage laws, a rigid inspection of mines and factories and public ownership of public utilities. Proof of this is now too abundant to require specific citation.

For Socialists to claim that this movement is, in its larger aspects, "revolutionary" or "socialistic" is to practice self-deception. But the public will not be deceived thereby. Little has been suggested by Progressivism in America not already well on its way to fulfillment by the radicals of England or the conservatives on the continent. In the United States this movement finally crystallized on the field of national politics as late as 1909-10. During that year the Republican insurgents in congress turned their backs upon the "full-dinner-pail" platform of the dead McKinley and Hanna and struck blindly at the powers which controlled the Republican party. Since then the current

has been accelerated with each passing month. It draws its power from a re-awakened and now socially conscious middle class.

THE MIDDLE CLASS

"The middle class is dying. It is being crushed between the upper and the nether millstones. The trusts have got the little fellow's business and now he is whining and wishes to 'divide up' and try again. The middle class Democratic party is dying, too. The field will be left to the Republican and Socialist parties. These are the political representatives of the plutocracy and the working class."

So ran the now exploded fallacies of the Socialist agitator of ten years ago. The wish was parent to the thought. Our Socialist optimists of that time observed the death of some forms of small business. They saw the all-devouring trust loom up. The psychology of the panic years of 1893-6 was still with us.

"Another panic and the middle class will be completely wiped out, the first act of the revolution will have been accomplished, etc., etc."—so ran the Socialist declamation. What we then failed to reckon with was history and certain very significant immediate facts which Socialists rather wished to overlook.

The middle class spread the sails of North Italian commerce in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and created the Renaissance. It defied the Pope in the fifteenth century and won out in the greatest revolution of history. It cut off the heads of Charles I. in 1649 and of Louis XVI. in 1791. It built the British Empire and the American Republic. Finally, only a generation ago in America it fought the Civil War. Its life has constituted the regime which we know as the modern world and which has lately permeated and awakened the Orient. To try to think of it, with all of its ideas and its institutions, as out of existence, has been a regular Socialist discipline for fifty years. But that does not help us. Nine-tenths of the American born wage-workers who become members of the Socialist party are forced to that step because the "sacred principles of Jefferson and Lincoln" have been outraged. On the mind of the American wage-working class as a whole these traditions of the middle class bear down "like a nightmare." Give this ardent individualist a "steady job," "good wages," a "decent home" and a goodly supply of "Bull Durham," and his normal tendency is to ask for no more. Three factors enter to destroy this middle

class character of the worker's life—the unsteady jobs, the rising prices and the positive educational propaganda of Socialism. Yet in the average American community this man's discontent is at first voiced by the radical young capitalist politician, whose smart talk he admires, and by the conservative labor leader, for whom he helps build a career. The mere existence of a nether class does not of itself create a social revolution. Changing economic conditions must drive and revolutionary knowledge and ideals must inspire, before a lower class will be urged to function intellectually and politically as a ruling power in the State. The great rich bourgeois class of Germany has thus far been unable to rule the empire. The jobs of the American working class are owned by the plutocracy, but the minds of the American workers are dominated by the middle class. Such is the influence of the political power which is now remoulding America.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER

The rule of the small property holding farmer and tradesman with their professional servants was synchronous with the nineteenth century. It had entered upon its mighty career with the election of Jefferson to the presidency in 1800. Its native home was in the West. Socially it created a rough individualistic democracy. Politically it sought to weaken the State in every limb and to secure the freedom of the individual in the realm of property rights. "The less government the better," declared Jefferson. "The ideal of a free government is no government at all," wrote Carl Schurz in 1900 while he was bitterly opposing the subjugation of the Philippines. In fact the Spanish-American war and the establishment of over-sea colonies merely furnished a sensational outward advertisement of fundamental inner facts then transpiring in the nation's social life. A great navy was established and the army largely increased. The government of dependencies forced the surrender of the democratic theory of self-government. Dollar diplomacy grew as the figures of export trade mounted. But underneath all this was the primal fact of the industrial reorganization which followed the panic years of 1893-7. Had "Degeneration" not been already written, Max Nordau might have found in these events curiously interesting material for his *fin de siecle* witticisms. The individualistic regime was in reality dead. Would the middle class survive? It took twelve years to prove its vitality.

It is customary with Socialists while hating the bourgeois

regime as a whole, also to despise the bourgeois as an individual. This latter-day shop keeper, scheming to save pennies, cheating his customers through the use of false weights and measures, and bewailing his poverty to the tax collector, must necessarily present a sorry spectacle to the eye of a revolutionist. Liebknecht declared that the political representatives of this class "lacked the courage of rabbits." American Socialists have too often adopted similar language without stopping to reflect upon the difference between the American middle class and its prototype in Europe. In Europe the member of the middle class has never been anything but a sort of peddlar. Physiographic and economic conditions developed the American farmer class, from which our shop-keepers have come, into the most virile and intelligent class in the world that ever labored with its own hands. The class which produced both the rank and file and the leadership on both sides during the Civil War possesses other elements of character than those which arise purely from profit seeking. Our American business and professional class west of the Alleghanies is composed of the sons and daughters of farmers. The young men on the drill grounds of West Point and Annapolis or on the athletic fields of our universities are weaklings neither in body nor in mind. Let no one vainly imagine that they cannot or will not fight. Woodrow Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt and Robert M. La Follette are all bound by the intellectual limitations of their class, but let them set out on a course of action and they will pursue their ways relentlessly. Socialists will quite generally admit that these men will not suffer in their standing if compared with the leaders of the Socialist party.

Thirty years ago the aspiring young men of the middle class went into business or the professions with a fair chance of success. To-day the organization of big business has locked the door to individual enterprise. The tens of thousands who are graduating from universities and technical schools are lending ears to the Progressive agitator and organizer. Instead of a seat in the game of profit seeking where they are foredoomed to failure, they desire remunerative positions in the public service. Progressivism is a movement of the younger generation of the middle class.

THE NINE LIVES OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

The Socialists, in reading the funeral ritual over the hopes of the middle class in 1900, failed to reckon with two essential facts. The first of these was that the working class hardly made

a beginning toward its preparation for its social mission. The second was that, while it was indeed true that the plutocracy had seized the most valuable machinery of the country, middle class social and political ideas still dominated both possessors and producers. The plutocracy has not been able to establish anything remotely resembling a general social régime. It is constantly apologizing for its own existence, boasting of its middle class antecedents. The whole heritage of American historical precedent is against it from the very start. Live and thrive it must. But it will be only too glad to compromise with the middle class, probably cutting the loaf well in the middle. So the middle class obstinately refuses to "shuffle off."

Nor is the middle class present in spirit only. The census of 1910 is most illuminating in this connection. That awful volume, the census abstract, slayer of so many pet theories, bears most eloquent testimony concerning the lusty old age of small property *de facto* and *de jure*.

In the manufacturing industries of the United States there was in 1909 a total of 275,952 proprietors and firm members. This number showed an increase of 2,687 over 1904. In the mining industry there were 35,208 proprietors and firm members. But these figures only begin to tell the tale of the numerical strength of the middle class. The salaried employes in these combined industries reached in 1909 a total of 838,862. At present this army of nearly a million clerks of all grades, to which must be added several times its number of store and office clerks, is totally unorganized on the industrial field and almost untouched by Socialist propaganda. It is more middle class than the middle class itself.

During the ten years from 1900 to 1910 the number of farmers in the United States increased from 5,737,372 to 6,361,502. Meanwhile farm property of all kinds doubled in total value, rising from $20,000,000,000 in 1900 to nearly $41,000,000,000 in 1910. While the number of farmers increased 10.9 per cent., the amount of land included in farms increased 15.4 per cent. The value of farm buildings increased during the decade 77.8 per cent., of implements and machinery 68.7 per cent., of live stock 60.1 per cent. But the value of farm lands, the fertility of which actually decreased during the decade, increased 118.1 per cent. True, there were 300,000 more tenants in 1910 than in 1900. The number of farm owners, however, showed the same increase. Farms free from mortgage increased 100,000, those mortgaged, by 200,000. But a further most

essential fact is not included in the census and can only be guessed. How many hundreds of thousands of farmers, during the decade, having accumulated wealth sufficient, had rented or sold their farms and removed to towns, there to send their children to the high school and pass their old days in leisure? The number must have been very great, for the rural towns of the Middle West are now peopled largely by this class of retired farmers.

The farming class is the backbone of Progressivism. As Democrats they have followed Bryan through four campaigns. As Republicans they have supported La Follette in Wisconsin, Cummins in Iowa, Bristow in Kansas, Borah in Idaho, Hadley in Missouri. As Progressives they carried Michigan, Washington and California, and came near carrying Illinois for Roosevelt.

Even on Manhattan itself, the population of Riverside Drive and Central Park West outnumbers that of Fifth Avenue a hundred to one. But if the investigator wishes to gain any adequate notion of the size of the new middle class at work in New York, let him journey to Flatbush or the Oranges of New Jersey. In Worcester (Mass.) and Columbus (Ohio), in Spokane (Wash.) and Portland (Ore.), in Kansas City (Mo.) and Fort Worth (Tex.) one may see mile upon mile of quiet. shaded streets, lined with decent cottages and often with quite luxurious mansions. Here dwell the families of the 392,000 persons whom the income tax list shows to have incomes ranging from $3,000 to $25,000 a year—they and the million or more others so fortunate as to have escaped the eye of the tax collector. In Ohio and Wisconsin, California and Washington, the political influence of the great railroads and other plutocratic interests was dominant only so long as this middle class was utterly careless. It had but to stretch forth its hands to recover control of the states from the Alleghanies to the Pacific Coast

Had the Progressive party not been founded, the Democratic party would now of course be much less radical. Wilson began his political career as an extreme conservative of the academic variety. His fight against corruption forced him to align himself with the progressives of his party. Driven into the way of political success, he has not failed to seize his opportunity The inevitable forces have now carried him and his administration far on the way previously taken by the Progressive party. The struggle for popular favor from now until the end of the campaign of 1916 will urge the Democratic and

Progressive parties to a competition the like of which has never been witnessed in the political history of the country. Each will drive the other to an ever more extreme radicalism. Before proceeding to a discussion of specific policies we shall describe the general nature of the historical period into which the nation has now been launched.

THE TRANSITION PERIOD

The evolution of American industrial society from competitive capitalism to Socialism is divided, roughly, into two periods. The first of these, that of industrial reorganization, has now been completed. The second, into the current of which we have now plunged, is that of State Capitalism. Of course these two sub-periods, in a sense, parallel each other and merge together in a way that makes accurate distinction quite impossible. The process of trustifying manufacture, transportation and commerce produced a period of commercial greed unlicensed by public consent and ungoverned by the law. The typical trust operator, as pictured by the cartoonists, is now to be sweated down to something like normal size. The drill master is to be the federal government. Roosevelt declares that "we hold it to be the duty of the National Government to put all the governmental resources of our people, national and state, behind the movement for the wise and sane uplifting of the men and women whose lives are hardest" (*Century* magazine, October, 1913). Meanwhile the income tax passed by the Democratic party, and based upon a constitutional amendment accepted by all parties is to yield $82,000,000 of revenue during the first year of its operation.

The period of State Capitalism thus begins. The trusts are to be brought under a rigid control. Great wealth is to suffer an increasing taxation. The proceeds are to be used to "help the poor." Inevitably this policy will lead to government ownership on a scale still undreamed of by the rank and file of both the Progressive and Democratic parties. In Anglo-Saxon countries political facts always precede political philosophy. More than thirty years ago, at a time when the theory of State Capitalism would have been scouted by almost every American, Congress created the Interstate Commerce Commission. As the scope of that great legislative and administrative body grew, there came the demand for other similar commissions. The impossible Sherman Anti-Trust law was legislation of the same character. But only during the past five years has the middle

class begun to regenerate its political philosophy. In the Bryan campaign of 1896 the appeal of the crushed and debt-ridden portion of the middle class was the same as that made by the paper money agitators immediately following the American Revolution. During some ten years William Randolph Hearst developed a very powerful independent reform movement, but never once suggested a policy which took the new philosophy for granted. Neither La Follette nor Wilson have as yet publicly stated their adherence to it. But their acts have gone farther than their words. The Rural Life Commission, rural free delivery of mail, public lecture courses organized on a gigantic scale by Western state universities, the forestry and reclamation services—these indicate how far the nation has moved from the old moorings. That the provincial and sectional opposition of Southern Democracy to this general policy has now come to an end is indicated by the activities of the Wilson administration. The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Franklin K. Lane, is to recommend the expenditure of $100,000,000 for Western irrigation projects alone.

To weld these scattered opinions and incoherent policies into a single constructive movement there was needed a striking example of the utility and efficiency of the new method. The century old truisms which still controlled many minds could be overcome only by actualities. The corruption, high cost and general inefficiency of governmental enterprises were seldom denied even by advocates of government ownership. The desirable example has now been furnished to the nation by the Panama Canal Commission. Progressives are arguing that if the federal government can complete the Canal with such distinguished success, it can control the flow of the Mississippi River and its tributaries, develop water power plants everywhere and work the Alaska coal mines. It would not be surprising to find both the Democratic and Progressive parties demanding federal ownership and management of the railroads in 1916.*

The old middle class desired a weak government. The new middle class desires the strongest possible government. The old middle class was ultra-individualistic. The new middle class

* Since this article was written important events have transpired to substantiate its thesis. Among the most notable are, the out-spoken advocacy of the government ownership of railroads by Hearst's magazine, an official organ of Mr. William Randolph Hearst; the proposal by Mr. Vanderlip, president of Standard Oil's National City Bank of New York, that the federal government establish and conduct a great central bank; and the nomination and election by the fusionists in New York City of Mr. John Purroy Mitchell, an advocate of municipal ownership.

proclaims the virtues of paternalism. The old middle class worshipped at the shrine of individual success as expressed in great private fortunes. The new middle class is possessed of a social spirit. The middle class view of the nature of the State has thus been completely revolutionized. The frontier has written its last word into the history of the nation. In the new industrial America every class is being driven into collectivism by the spur of economic necessity.

The justifying political theory of the new régime is succinctly expressed by Roosevelt in the article already quoted: "We are obliged to face certain new facts. One is that in their actual workings the old doctrines of extreme individualism and of a purely competitive industrial system have completely broken down. Another is that if we are to grapple efficiently with the evils of to-day, it will be necessary to invoke the use of governmental power to a degree hitherto unknown in this country, and in the interest of the democracy, to apply principles which the purely individualistic democracy of a century ago would not have recognized as democratic." This, then, is the position of our regenerated middle class. To the tune of "Hail Columbia" and "Onward, Christian Soldiers" it marches out of the nineteenth century theory of the State into the social concepts of the new régime.

THE TEXT-BOOK OF PROGRESSIVISM

During the campaign of 1912 and thereafter a group of Progressive leaders began to make speeches and write articles which possessed real interest for intelligent minds. Their arguments came to be based upon historical facts. They accepted the evolutionary processes of history as a basis for their reasoning. The American government and American character were traced directly to economic causes. Even Mr. Roosevelt, whose public utterances have been anything but profound, began to talk of things fundamental. In short, the leaders of the Progressive party stopped criticizing the trusts and began to analyze and criticize the United States.

This development among Progressive leaders of an intelligent view of the processes of social life is largely due, we have every reason to believe, to a volume published in 1912. We refer to "The New Democracy," by Dr. Walter Weyl. Dr. Weyl is a member of the national committee of the Progressive party. With an understanding of the Marxian historical method possessed by few American Socialists, the author has analyzed the

entire social and political history of the United States. Upon this foundation he has built his argument for an extremely radical progressivism. However much Socialists may object to his reformist conclusions, all sound scholars of American history are quite likely to agree that the first ten chapters of "The New Democracy" constitute the most satisfactory analysis of the forces which have gone to make American history as well as their results in our present day political and social conditions. We can here only briefly summarize the intellectual foundations of Progressivism as stated by Dr. Weyl.

"The prevailing social unrest tends to the disenchantment of America," he says. The history of the foundation of the federal government is then traced and the constitution of the United States is shown to be a class document. The industrial revolution wrought by the change from small tools to great machines is shown to be the real cause of our modern social problem. "Our Resplendent Plutocracy" is the title of a chapter in which Dr. Weyl indicates how naturally our modern ruling class sprang from the older democratic order. "The gathering forces of the democracy" arise from a score of causes and are enlisted from every social class. In this positive program the author is found to be considerably ahead of his party. The business ventures of the federal government he views with great approbation—the post office engaging in the banking business, the forestry bureau as a lumber merchant, etc. "In certain industries socialization may involve a governmental monopoly," he goes on to say. He sees governmental efficiency and political democracy advancing along parallel lines against the plutocracy. Step by step we are to grow into a "socialized democracy," whose method is to be a placid opportunism, whose form is to be a renovated State, and whose purpose is to be the salvation of the poorest among us and the elevation of all. Such is Progressivism as analyzed by perhaps the most scholarly mind which has yet appeared to champion the new cause.

PROGRESSIVISM AND SOCIALISM

The social conditions, the class, the movement, and finally the specific organization now loom gigantic with possibilities and probabilities against the political sky. They seek to establish a new historical régime and they are going to have their opportunity.

We have shown that the transition period from individualistic competition to Socialism, the second phase of which is State

Capitalism, is a logical and natural epoch in the development of capitalist society. The position and tactics of the Labor and Socialist movement during this coming period must needs be profoundly influenced by the new conditions prevailing. It is evident at first glance that the program of "socialistic" reformism has been swallowed up by Progressivism. Had the Progressive movement not taken concrete form, the Socialist movement would already be permeated and controlled by middle class opportunists. These middle class reformers, because of their wealth, their leisure and their undoubted ability, would have destroyed the Socialist political movement. In the Progressive movement their labors will be fruitful of reforms, which, taken by themselves, the most ardent revolutionist does not despise. They would speedily carry into effect the most pressing reforms demanded by the social spirit of the age. Child labor is being abolished. The number of industrial accidents will be decreased and industrial insurance laws are being passed. In the City of Chicago the proletarian can already go to a well appointed public gymnasium. After taking his exercise he can proceed to a public bath where he is furnished free towels, or to a free public bathing beach where he can make use of a municipally owned bathing suit. In the development of all such social opportunities the Progressive movement possesses immeasurable advantages over the Socialist party. It unites the middle class to a majority of the skilled workers and it does not arouse much antagonism even among the members of the plutocracy. It will find the Catholic Church advocating its program everywhere as an antidote to Socialism. Finally, upon capturing a city or state Progressivism does not find its path blocked and its hands tied by a bitterly hostile state or federal administration. The work of reform is the work of the middle class, not of the working class. It is the business of political opportunists and has no part in the ideals of social revolutionists. To repeat what Dr. Weyl has so cleverly stated, Progressivism is "likely to proceed in a tentative, experimental and rather illogical way; to sail forward by tacking; to break as little and as gradually as possible with our ingrained individualism." In another place he describes the movement as "conciliatory, compromising, evolutionary and legal." Against so wary an opponent the Socialist party can make headway only by relentless fighting for ideals. To compromise in the face of such an enemy would be suicidal.

From now on the Socialist party must align itself more and more with the economic organizations of the working class. For

only against the strike will the tactics of Progressivism crumbl and give way. Upon the industrial field the working class ca proceed step by step and lose neither its spirit nor a clear vie of its goal. The Progressive State will be a great employer o labor. As such it will inevitably appear as the enemy of th industrially organized workers. Were the Socialist party t capture and long maintain this employing State, it would b come the enemy of the working class. But as a scourge upo the back of progressivism the Socialist political movement wi become a most vital element even in reformist progress. Durin the decade to come the Socialist party will now and then captu the government of a great city, and now and then the gover ment of a Far Western state. As its organized educational work doubles the Socialist vote, Progressivism must ever redouble its efforts to hold the working class in check. If Progressivism deals with strikers with careful regard for their legal rights, it will be because of the ever watchful, ever growing Socialist party.

State Capitalism will be fully realized within a decade. The Socialist society is quite a different matter. The technique of industry is ready for the establishment of Socialism. For the education, the organization and the complete socialization of the working class, history requires this transition period.

The Patron Saint of the Progressives

By Rose Strunsky

Writing after the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Hegel said that he could not apply his philosophy of history to America because it had as yet no "real government," since it did not contain "distinction of classes." This condition was still true of the America of Lincoln's time and, with more or less truth, could be said to have existed until 1890, when the frontier line was no longer visible on the map.

The free lands were the basis and safeguard of the American system of government. The statement in the Declaration of Independence that all men were created equal and that they held the same rights to the pursuit of happiness was founded on the belief of equal rights to the free land. But no principle was laid down by which an actual democracy could be main-

tained after this free land was gone. That American democracy had a very fortuitous and ephemeral basis was foreseen by de Tocqueville, writing early in the thirties. The Americans, he said, were so busy with their material problems and so successful in acquiring property, that they neglected to remain their own masters.

To-day the sharp criticism of these two clear thinkers still finds its application. The free lands are gone, property is in the hands of monopolies and trusts, America has at last become a "real government with distinction of classes," and the American is no longer his own master.

Naively unprepared for this sudden change of affairs, the American is harking back to the golden age when not the social adjustment but nature herself gave him wealth, and is calling for that time as for the perfect state. In his search for a hero to lead him from bondage he has hit upon the gaunt figure of Abraham Lincoln. This arch-representative of the small homesteader is to crush large capital and restore each man to his little plot of land, or rather, since there is no more land to divide up, he is to "bust the trust," destroy the money magnates, restore competition, give each man a bank account, and lower the cost of living.

"There is in the United States a historic party," said our good friend, the Colonel, in Chile the other day, "the one to which I then belonged, which if true to its origin would have championed without exception every single one of the reforms which the Progressives have championed. Every single one of these reforms can find its justification in the principles and policies of Abraham Lincoln."

But what can our dear father Abraham with his backwoods philosophy do to-day? What he did do we are only just now beginning to understand, and that the small capitalist should be pleased with his progenitor, the small homesteader, is not to be wondered at. But why should he expect him to work the same miracle over again?

Lincoln made a very good job of cutting off the large landlord from the virgin territories of the West, but few seem to realize that that problem is over and settled with. Lincoln's society is dead. His ideals, his problems, and his solution of them have no bearing on the conditions of to-day. The struggle of his time was one between two distinct forms of proprietorship establishing themselves in an unsettled region—a nation

yet to be. Slavery itself is the concomitant of primitive conditions. With accessible backwoods to which he could escape, the laborer had to be tied to the land by police laws and property regulations. This state of affairs was as old as the beginnings of civilization, it occurred in the seventeenth century in Russia when the borderlands were finally freed of Tartars, and it was the reason for the blossoming of slavery in the New World. The form it took here was that of slavery on the race or color basis instead of caste.

The great influx of immigrants from Europe, due to the spread of railways and canals, soon reduced the vast wilderness, with its scarcity of labor, until only a section of it remained. At the uttermost edge of civilization, in the American West, the two forms of proprietorship met, that of large landholdings with slave labor, and small landholdings with the owner and his family as laborers. Both forms had been travelling along in two parallel lines, one South, the other North, since the country's beginning. Because slavery was "necessarily incompatible with the one hundred and sixty acre farm," it was overwhelmed and crushed by the hosts which the small homestead system represented.

Had the South waited ten years the "irrepressible conflict" would have been solved not by war, but by the arts of peace: by the great transcontinental railways, which destroyed the wilderness and produced close at hand an unpropertied laboring class. Even at its greatest height slavery was doomed in the United States It was defeated by the failure of the Lecompton constitution in Kansas, long before it was defeated by the national vote of 1860 and by the test of arms that followed.

Even in the border states slavery was declining and the only thing untouched by the breath of the newer order was the reactionary southern doctrine of State Rights. This was true of Missouri, as it was of Virginia, of the newer border states as of the older. But such was the onrush of civilization that the end came before the weakness of slavery was apparent to itself, and it made a desperate fight for life.

It was his determination to maintain the American republican principle of government in the face of almost utter ruin that made Lincoln the great hero of the popular mind. The ideal of American democracy still continues to be equal opportunity for all. The War of Independence, basing its philosophy on Rousseau and the Rights of Man, was fought against the introduction of an hereditary aristocracy and "special privileges"—this equally significant term in American history. The North in the Civil War, basing its philosophy on the War of Independence, on Washington, on Jefferson, on the framers of the Constitution, fought against an oligarchic land monopoly which prevented the division of the land into small homesteads and threw the dispossessed farmers, to quote Lincoln, into the "state of wage-earners or slaves." Though land had been cheap before the War, it had never been free until after the Republican party had come into power. In 1862 land was actually thrown open to the individual settlers, the principle still being maintained that a republican form of government is incompatible with "special privileges." The solution of the land monopoly of the South was the legal prohibition of chattel slavery and the opening up of the new land in the West.

But if this prevented land monopoly, it did not prevent the eventual disappearance of the free land or the development of inventions, which quickly transformed this country from an agricultural state into an industrial one. As a result the spectre of "special privileges" has again arisen and again the "fathers of the country" are invoked to bless the new reforms. But this time the name of Abraham Lincoln is heard above the rest. He is called upon to help break the trusts and monopolies, as he helped break the power of the large landlord, but no new adjustment of property is asked for now as it was then. The reform sought is a more equitable division of property. Individual ownership of public property is always insisted upon, although the war against "special privileges," the principle "that all men are created equal" in economic opportunity, the conception of a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," must be read to-day in the terms of present day America. The solution can no longer be to open more wells of property to be exploited by first comers, but the giving over of the control of property to all comers. In the meantime Lincoln will be called upon to lead the Progressive hosts to the very seat of government for a larger "dividing up" of the spoils.

Legislation by Exhaustion

A Scene in the United States Senate

By Julian Pierce

At "ten o'clock and 50 minutes" Senator Owen addresses the Chair.

"Mr. President—"

"The Senator from Oklahoma," responds the Vice-President.

"I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill seven eight three seven."

"Without objection the Chair lays before the Senate the following bill, which the secretary will report," continues the Vice-President.

The secretary of the Senate, with a phonograph drawl that comes from years of practice, reads the title of the bill: "An act to provide for the establishment of Federal reserve banks, to furnish an elastic currency, to afford means of rediscounting commercial paper, to establish a more effective system of banking in the United States, and for other purposes."

"The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized," concludes the Vice-President.

The Senator from South Dakota takes the floor to "support" his amendment. The Senator comes from a state where farming is the basic business. Farming is done on credit. There isn't enough credit available. Section 24 of the Owen amendment releases some of the credit hitherto tied up by the provision in the National Bank Act prohibiting national banks from making loans on farm lands. But there isn't enough of it released. Of the three classes of banks—country banks, reserve city banks, and central reserve city banks—the country banks alone are permitted to make farm loans. And even the loans thus permitted are limited in the aggregate to 25 per cent. of the bank's capital and surplus.

Senator Crawford's amendment provides that the prohibition

shall be raised from the reserve city banks, and that the aggregate shall be changed from 25 per cent. of the capital and surplus to one-third of the time deposits. There isn't much verbiage in the Senator's statements. He offers ten reasons why his amendment should be adopted. Senator Smoot asks for information relative to the method of determining the value of farm lands. Senator Crawford gives the information.

The Vice-President puts the question: "The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota. Those in favor will say 'aye'" Senator Crawford and a half dozen of his colleagues vote "aye." "Those opposed, 'no.'" Senator Owen and half a dozen of his colleagues vote "no."

"The 'noes' seem to have it. The 'noes' have—"

"Mr. President," says Senator Crawford, "I ask for the yeas and nays." This demand brings Senator Owen to his feet. A roll call will take considerable time. Moreover, there might not be a quorum in the Capitol building. If the Senator will withdraw his demand for the yeas and nays the matter might be arranged in conference. This arouses Senator Smoot. "How can the matter be arranged in conference? This is new matter. The conferees can not put new matter into the bill." Senator Shafroth thinks it is not new matter. Senator Smoot insists that it is new matter. A mere matter of detail, persists Senator Shafroth. "Detail, indeed!" exclaims Senator Smoot. "The conferees have no right to do it and no power to do it." And he smites the desk with his fist to emphasize his contention.

Senator Owen now has a way over the difficulty. The object sought by the Senator from South Dakota is creditable. It is acceptable to the Committee. The form of the amendment, however, is objectionable. If the Senator from South Dakota will permit, the Senator from Oklahoma will offer the amendment in appropriate form. He offers the amendment. Senator Crawford considers it with suspicion. He knows what he wants, and he thinks he knows how to frame his thought in English. Then occurs a long colloquy, each Senator trying to "catch the meaning" of the other Senator. It takes a page of the *Congressional Record* to record their attempt to fathom each other's intentions. Once they agree to disagree, and Senator Crawford indicates a persistent desire to demand the yeas and nays. "If the Senator will permit another suggestion," interrogates Senator Crawford. He makes another explanation. This time they succeed better. Senator Crawford finally accepts Senator Owen's

substitute, although expressing a conviction that it is inferior to his own both in phraseology and comprehensiveness.

The secretary reads the amendment in clarion tones.

"The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment. Those in favor will say 'aye.'" Half a dozen Senators respond.

"Those opposed, 'no.'" No one votes in the negative. "The 'ayes' have it, and the amendment is agreed to."

And "House bill 7837" is amended so that all national banks outside of the central reserve cities will be permitted to make loans on farm lands and to place one-third of their time deposits on such loans.

It is now ten minutes after 11. There is a lull. Senator Owen looks up. Is it possible that this talkfest has at last run its course? The "discussion" has continued for 110 hours—10 days, 11 hours to the day. Are the talkers talked out? He hopes so. He proceeds on the hope: "Mr. President, I move the adoption of my amendment as amended."

Before the Vice-President can open his mouth to put the question, Senator Newlands is on his feet. "I yield to the Senator from Nevada," says Senator Owen, deprecatingly.

Newlands is a lawyer by profession, a politician by habit, an officeholder by preference. He is at home in the Senate. All Senators are at home there.

And this Senate of the United States is unique. It is the only open legislative forum left in America. Every state legislature has cloture rules. The House of Representatives has cloture rules. But absolute free speech obtains in the Senate.

Senator Newlands claims to have studied the question of banking and the currency. He has, statesman-like, worked out a system. He wants a reserve bank in each state, including little pocket-borough Nevada. He also wants a central bank in Washington. His proposition received scant consideration in the Democratic caucus. And when the Democratic caucus spoke, the currency bill was written into law. Further proceedings are fictional, designed to allay personal irritation with the salve of "freedom of discussion."

Will the Senator from Oklahoma permit a question? He will. Lines 9 and 10, page 2, of the bill provide that the reserve bank organization committee shall designate "not less than eight nor more than twelve Federal reserve cities." Will the Senator

consent to an amendment making provision for the designation of not less than eight cities to be known as Federal reserve cities? Senator Newlands is clever. If he can get the provision limiting the maximum number to twelve removed, there may be a chance for little Nevada to confiscate one of the proposed Federal reserve banks.

Senator Owen regrets that he cannot accept such a revolutionary proposition. The matter has caused great controversy. It has been debated and debated. The caucus has spoken. The bill is to be voted on before the close of the legislative day.

Will there be a further caucus of the Democratic Senators? asks the Senator from Nevada.

The Senator from Oklahoma knows nothing about such a caucus. Owing to the few hours elapsing before the bill will be put on its final passage, he sees no possibility of such a caucus.

In spite of the "parliamentary situation" caused by this authoritative declaration from the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Senator Newlands offers his amendment.

The "parliamentary situation" is an example of parliamentarism *à la mode*. Senator Newland's action is the quintessence of parliamentary action in a capitalist democracy. The caucus has spoken. Therefore the Senator knows he is wasting his own time. He knows he is wasting the time of the Senate. He knows his amendment will be voted down with machine-like precision and express-train speed.

But there is a well-recognized principle of bourgeois parliamentarism which the Senator understands. At least it is recognized in the Senate. The privilege of amendment is always open. There is the privilege of direct amendment and of circuitous amendment. An amendment may be put to a vote and defeated, hopelessly defeated, unanimously defeated. Parliamentarism consists in reintroducing the amendment as often as possible, in as many places as possible, and in as many forms of phraseology as possible.

And the sovereign parliamentary privilege of Senators is the right to "discuss" the amendment, and discuss it to a finish. The Government pays the hall rent. The Government publishes the *Congressional Record* free and circulates it freer. The Government prints the speeches of Senators and carries them to every hamlet without postage. So with free access to the means

of production, why shouldn't a Senator take advantage of this social heritage?

Senator Newlands announces that he wishes to "say a few words" in regard to his amendment. He is one of the Democrats who believe there should be a Federal reserve bank in each state, and a central reserve bank in Washington. There are many Democrats who believe as he does. Consequently they are in an embarrassing position. Their embarrassment is caused by the fact that the platform of the Democratic party declares against a central bank. Well, the Senator is a Democrat. He supports the platform of his party. Every Democrat should. Nevertheless, he hasn't served a quarter of a century in the Capitol for nothing. If you can't obtain what you wish directly, obtain it otherwise. Therefore he has a plan by which a central bank system can be worked out without doing violence to the Democratic platform.

Evidently the Senator's colleagues do not care much about the plan. The Senate consists of 96 Senators. There are 25 in the chamber. Eighteen out of the 25 are either reading, writing, or visiting. But when a Senator gets used to it, it isn't half as annoying as a novitate would think to speak to the "insensate timber in the empty seats."

The Senator admits that he is embarrassed in another way. It is late. Two weeks have been devoted to the discussion of this important measure. It must go to a vote before the close of the legislative day. Consequently there is not the time for the careful consideration of his proposition that he would otherwise like to have it receive. Besides, his proposition has been voted down in the caucus. And he yields to the decree of the caucus. It is far from his intention to exercise either his independence of thought or of action and thus "mar the symmetry of the bill and throw this whole legislation into confusion." Senator Shafroth smiles at this act of abnegation and philanthropy. "Confusion!" Shafroth knows to a fraction of a vote just how many Senators will answer "aye" at 7 o'clock to-night when the roll is called.

The Senator had thought he would urge another conference of the Democrats. His colleagues opposed it. Therefore he would not push the suggestion further.

Nevertheless the bill has its defects, and even at this late hour it will not be amiss to call attention to them. Refusing to recognize the principle of a central bank is one of the defects.

But it has another and a more serious one. It does not provide proper safeguards against "inflation."

According to the Senator the world in general and the United States in particular are suffering from an inflation of "basic money and credits." Over two billions of money in circulation! Bank credits are also heavily inflated. In short, the whole country is suffering from an "inflation of money!"

The country is likewise suffering from rising prices. Who is responsible for rising prices? The manufacturer? The farmer? The middleman? The trusts? Not if the Senator from Nevada has the facts. "The tremendous increase in the output of gold" is the culprit. And the contingent increase of bank credit is the accomplice to the crime.

It should not be the purpose of the Democrats to increase the volume of money. There is money enough for everyone. What is the trouble? The tracks are rusty. The channels of commerce are full of driftwood. The machinery of exchange breaks down from time to time. The purpose of the Democrats should be, not to increase the quantity of money, but to oil the tracks and clear the channels of commerce so that the money we already have will pass along "easily, continuously, unobstructedly."

Commerce is an organism, contends the Senator. It has its arteries. The arteries are full of blood. The blood is money. There is enough of the blood and to spare. We should keep the blood circulating. When a bank panic occurs, what happens? The banks withdraw "basic money" from the arteries of commerce and pile it up in their vaults. Barricades are thus constructed. The blood ceases to circulate freely, congests, and finally bursts the arteries themselves. When this emergency occurs, the Government should have a supply of "emergency money" to pump into the aforesaid arteries and keep it circulating right along until the banks get tired of the game and bring back to the commercial organism the commercial blood that they have confiscated. Then the Government will "retire its emergency currency," and not leave it continually in the arteries of commerce. Thus there would be no inflation. Mr. President, we should not increase the supply of money. We should rather sand the rails so that the wheels will grip them tenaciously and flange the rails so that the money locomotive will never jump the track.

At which point the Vice-President interrupts the statesman: "The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired." And Senator Newlands is up against the nearest approach to a cloture

rule that a Senator ever encounters. It is a "unanimous-consent agreement" that is reached after a "full, free, and fair debate." It was entered into the day before. For nearly two weeks the majority side has been carrying on what the minority facetiously denominate "legislation by exhaustion." If Senators wish free speech, said the majority, we will give them all of it they want. Instead of meeting at noon and adjourning at 5 o'clock, we will meet at 10 o'clock a. m. and adjourn at 11 o'clock p. m. We will let you talk by day and we will let you talk by night. When you get enough of it, let us know. When they do get enough of it the Senators make it manifest by "reaching a unanimous consent agreement" limiting debate and fixing the time for a final vote. There is no "gagging." If one Senator objects, the agreement can not be entered into. It has been unanimously agreed that to-day no Senator shall speak for more than 15 minutes on any amendment or on the bill itself and that the vote shall be taken before adjournment. The semicloture is effective. Fifteen-minute speeches are the rule. And Senator Newlands has had his 15 minutes. The Senator didn't intend to press his amendment. He introduced it in order to "air his views" on the dangers of inflation. So he withdraws the amendment and retires to the cloakroom.

The next statesman to bite the dust in this parliamentary arena is Senator Crawford. The Senator feels vigorous and combative. Why shouldn't he? He amended Section 24 half an hour ago. That success encourages him. Now he doesn't like the looks of Section 14. This section provides that the Federal reserve banks shall be permitted to buy and sell drafts, bills of exchange, cable transfers, and acceptances of sundry sorts and sizes. Now in the world of commerce there are "instruments" called "notes" and "bills." The Government is going to create a market for those species of private property known as "drafts, bills of exchange," and so forth. Why shouldn't the Government provide a market for the species of private property known as "notes" and "bills"? This "open market" provision is designed to control discount rates. Drafts and cable transfers will not make the control effective, alleges the Senator. Consequently the privilege of purchasing notes and bills should be added.

Senator Owen rises. The caucus has spoken. "I hope the amendment will not prevail."

"The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota. Those in favor will say 'aye.' Those

opposed, 'no.' The 'noes' have it, and the amendment is not agreed to."

Nothing daunted by this rebuff, the Senator offers another amendment. This time he wishes to revolutionize page 59. The bill says nothing about interlocking directorates in the national banks. His amendment prohibits interlocking directorates. There has been a great outcry against the "money trust," a great outcry against the concentration of credits in New York, and against voting trusts. Is this outcry based on fact or is it a sham and a fraud? The outcry has come from the Democratic side in tones that make the earth tremble. The time has come to test their sincerity.

Senator Owen waves his hand. The caucus has spoken. "I hope the amendment will not prevail."

The question is put. "The 'noes' have it, and the amendment is not agreed to."

Senator Newlands is again at his desk. He sends up another amendment. Senator Smoot gets the floor. He knows the tactics of the Senator from Nevada. His suspicions are aroused. Is this not the identical amendment the Senator offered a few moments ago? Oh, no. The Senator is sure about it? Oh, yes. The Senator understands that if it is the same amendment it is a technical violation of the unanimous consent agreement? Oh, certainly. Senator Smoot's suspicions were unwarranted this time. Senator Newlands submitted a new amendment.

As the bill stands, the Senator contends, the Federal reserve board can command Federal reserve banks to discount the paper of other Federal reserve banks. The Senator wishes to go further and give the board power in emergency cases to take from the Federal reserve banks one-third of the reserves deposited with them and use the money to discount the paper directly, without the intervention of the reserve banks. Conditions might arise under which the Federal reserve bank would not be able to take care of the contingencies arising in its own district. The Federal reserve board should then have the power to go directly to the relief of the bank in distress rather than by the roundabout way of pressure on the regional banks.

However, the Senator admits he does not expect his amendment to be given consideration. He rose "to say a further word" on the subject of inflation. The introduction of the amendment was the usual parliamentary ruse to finish the aforesaid speech in spite of the semi-cloture agreement.

Inflation! Inflation! Inflation! The Senator sees inflation in everything.

Twenty years ago the annual production of gold was $150,000,000. To-day it is $450,000,000. Inflation!

There is "covered" paper money. There is "uncovered" paper money. A good Government should retire all its "uncovered" paper money and rely simply on "basic" money. "Basic" money is in the form of gold and gold bullion. And Nevada produces a goodly portion of it.

There are $700,000,000 of national bank notes outstanding. They are "uncovered." The bill does not provide for their retirement. Inflation!

The bill makes provision for an enormous issue of Federal reserve notes. It is contended that they are emergency notes. Then they should be retired automatically when the emergency is over. The way to retire them is through a high interest rate. The interest rate the Government is authorized to exact for them is so low they will not be retired. They will be added permanently to the volume of currency. Inflation!

The reserve notes are not money. They are simply promises to pay. Yet the banks are authorized to hold these promises to pay as a part of their reserves. Reserves should be in cash. The cash should be in money. The money should be basic money. Basic money is coin. Coin reserves are cash reserves. Promises to pay are not cash reserves. Inflation!

It isn't alone the inflation of money that worries the Senator. The bill provides for an inflation of credit as well. Have Senators considered the section pertaining to the amount of reserves required? Under the National Bank Act the average reserve required is 18 per cent. of the deposits. Under this communism of inflation known as the Owen amendment the average reserve is reduced to 13½ per cent. Under the existing law the banks are permitted to loan $6 of currency for every dollar they have in their vaults. Under the proposed law they are permitted to loan $8 for every dollar they have in their valuts. Inflation! Inflation of bank credit!

"The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired," drones the Vice-President.

"Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment."

The Senator from Nevada is a gesticulating orator. Arms, hands, head, legs—every member is in motion when the Senator addresses the Senate. He wipes the perspiration from his brow, saunters to the rear of the seats, and flings his wearied body into the capacious depths of one of the leather-covered lounging chairs that are conveniently scattered in the open spaces of the Senate Chamber.

And so it goes hour after hour in this seething maelstrom of parliamentary verbiage.

Academic Slavery

By Arthur Wallace Calhoun

Professor of Sociology and Economics, Maryville College

The prophet Amos concludes a write-up of Hebrew plutocracy with these words: "Therefore the prudent shall keep silence in that time, for it is an evil time." Amos seems to have been a soap-boxer, and perhaps not overly prudent. It is not to be supposed that he was using his prophetic gift to forecast the academic probabilities of Twentieth Century America. Many a reader slips over the passage with scarcely casual notice. But a view of the collegiate world from the inside recalls the old granger's text with pungent emphasis, especially to the professor who has been guilty of "imprudence."

We that are so unfortunate as to be born members of the middle class, and are accordingly under the necessity of "bringing forth fruits meet for repentance," do not always feel duly humble toward the proletarian, whose claim to eminence is that he is the bearer of the burden of capitalistic slavery. Some of us think that we know as much what slavery means as does the man in the ditch. We have less trouble in keeping our hands clean, and our shoulders straight, but find it just as hard to keep our souls clean, and our spines straight. To our middle-class friends, who dislike to hear capitalism stigmatized as slavery, we would suggest a simple experiment. Get a college or university chair, and then pretend that you are a Socialist, and watch for the reaction. It may not always come, but when it does you will have no doubt about the proper synonym for capitalism.

The writer has in mind the case of an instructor in a State

college who had just been ousted for his "imprudence" as an advocate of Socialism. One evening another professor, calling on him, remarked: "Is Professor so-and-so friendly to you? .... Because," he continued, "some people like to live very close to the pantry." That is the modern version of our text.

With a tinge of sadness, I recall the case of a head professor in a state college, who in response to a casual remark that the author of a certain gentle book on sociology would never get himself into trouble, replied, "Now you're hitting at me, aren't you? Well, I've a family to support, and I propose to tread carefully till I become indispensable to my institution." And he is still pursuing the same policy. "Poor chap," thought I to myself, "you'll never become indispensable," For, though he is a most brilliant teacher, he could not stick if he gave free rein to his judgment in social policies. And so he will spend his days in servitude, losing year by year the inspiration of life, because he is conscious that the masters would not let him call his soul his own.

A few months since, an eminent economist, who is probably not outranked by any in the United States, at the end of a course that he was giving in a university away from home, was asked, "How many of the economists of the country feel as you do in this matter?" (The reference being to the professor's view on a certain urgent economic problem.) "Well," he replied, "so far as I can see from talking with them, nearly all do, but not more than two or three will come out and say so. That shows you the power of wealth. Now, I talk very freely, everywhere except in—(mentioning the state in whose university he holds a chair). But I have to make a living, and I would not care to tell all my thoughts on this subject to every voter there." The writer interposed mildly with the sugggestion that there are more ways than one of making a living, whereto the great man responded, "But for myself, the only way I see is to draw a salary. I am not telling you these things in any spirit of pride. I just want to be honest." But was he honest with the people of his home state? And how can one help but wonder whether he calls himself honest in his dealings with his regular classes?

Time and again one must face the issue if he continues in the academic world. If he chances to make a public address on Socialism, it is insinuated in the yellow press that he spends most of his vacation with "the comrades." If he writes an article for a Socialist paper, some eager citizen will lodge complaint

with the powers. Let him belong to the most conservative church in Christendom, yet he will be stigmatized as infidel or atheist, if he ventures to display his colors as a Socialist. People will ask his friends whether he believes in free love, and he will be characterized as an enemy of civilization and a subverter of the social order. If he manages to hold his job through such a tempest without selling his soul, he is lucky. These words are not the vaporings of a keen imagination. They are reminiscences. And let it be added, that the academic chair is a very easy place to lose one's soul. And to the man that has experienced the "ins" and the "outs" of it, more than one temptation comes, not so much when he is looking for a new job, as after he has gotten it.

The sponsors for the state of affairs just described do not leave it comfortless. They have developed a philosophy. "One should not inject feeling into the class room," urged one eminent college president. His ideal seems to be "the passionless pursuit of passionless intelligence,"—that opiate soothing syrup of plutocracy. Education must be cool, forsooth, and calm, and politely decorous! One must banish from the vocabulary such words as "plutocracy," using some euphonious synonym instead. The professor must not be an advocate! He must remember his responsibility, and beware of exercising any personal influence over the tender minds submitted to his care! Better let them reproach him years after for not telling them what kind of world they have to meet, than to run the risk of implanting any bias toward revolution.

Suppose one should apply this philosophy to the teachers of art? Here would be the rules: "Present all types of art with absolute impartiality, and let the students take their choice. For the life of you don't try to shape their taste. Let pure reason reign. You must not be an advocate. The fact that you detest the Sunday supplement is no justification for any attempt to prejudice your students against it. If you like Millet, beware of letting your bias bear upon the tender minds of the youth. Do not inject feeling into the class room!"

But then who would expect a slave philosophy to be consistent?

Peace in the Balkans

By Michael Pavlovitch (Paris)

I. European Capital in the Ottoman Empire

With peace in the Balkans assured it is interesting to examine the prospects which a termination of the war affords. This grand bit of war history will, no doubt, radically modify conditions of life on the Balkan peninsula; it is pregnant with developments of high moment for Europe, but particularly for Asia Minor and the entire Mussulman world.

European publicists, confronted with the riddle of the Balkan crisis, usually fall back upon two ideological factors as an adequate solution. The backward stage of Turkey in general and Macedonia's misery in particular, the reign of terror and the poverty that fanned the late war were due, according to this publicist theory, first, to the civil and nationalistic feuds that had been ravaging Macedonia, and second, to the religion and spirit of Islam, which is incompatible with any kind of progress.

The mere overthrow of Ottoman rule cannot stop the racial war in the Balkans. The interests of the Greek, Bulgarian, and Servian sections of the Balkan bourgeoisie are not identical, and this fact is bound to lead to ever new conflicts among these Christian nationalities. But this question of nationalities now assumes a new aspect and enters a new phase of development.

To the thoughtful student closely and dispassionately viewing the whole situation, it is clear that the theocratic character of the Mussulman state does not account for all the misery and all the dark sides of the Turkish regime. Let us probe the matter further.

It is wrong to view Islam *per se* as the sole check upon the regeneration of Turkey. For in the first place, every religion is, at bottom, conservative and inimical to progress. Nor, indeed, is Islam in any way more harmful than the Japanese worship of the Mikado as a being of solar descent. That Christianity itself no longer seriously retards European progress is due to the fact that the material and social conditions shaping life in Europe have shorn this religion of many features that could act as a drag upon progress and forced it to adapt itself to this new life.

Secondly, Islam itself has recently shown in a striking manner the ease and rapidity with which it adapts itself to the new scheme of life brought about by the overthrow of the old despotic regime and the inauguration of the parliamentary system in Persia and Turkey. Islam's plasticity to the new imperative needs of our time is best shown by the prominent part which the Persian priesthood played in the events of 1905-1907 as the vanguard of the revolutionary army. Many Persian priests fell in the cause of the revolution; some were killed by blows of the soldiery in street demonstrations, many died on the gallows, and others were shot down or tortured to death in the prisons.

Again, Mussulman society, when watched at close range, is just now displaying a decided breakdown in its spiritual make-up and aspect. Its more advanced elements in India, Morocco, Algeria and Tunis are in the throes of an internal revolution affecting spiritual and ethical standards and beliefs and traditional modes of thinking and feeling in connection with religious and social matters and problems. It is a new intellectual wave sweeping even over the darkest spots of the creed of Islam.

The race war in Macedonia, far from explaining anything, itself needs explanation. This nationalistic conflict owes its specific character to the archaic methods of production still prevalent in European Turkey, or what lately was such. Moreover, the cause of the whole deplorable situation in the Ottoman Empire lies rather in the economic system which European capitalism has forced upon this weak country than in race, religion, law or any other ideological factor. The backward state of this empire is primarily due to the peculiar ways in which foreign capital operates in Turkey.

Official statistical data show, approximately, how the tremendous bulk of foreign capital invested in the Ottoman empire is distributed: French capital, $500,000,000; German capital, $180,000,000; English capital, $150,000,000. The French investments in Turkey represent one-fifteenth of all French capital invested abroad. In spite of this, the degree to which Turkey's manufacturing industry is developed does not in the least correspond to this enormous amount of foreign investment in the empire. As is well known, this industry is still in its infant stage. True, there are the power tanneries in Salonica, Constantinople, and Smyrna. Of late, especially since the abdication of Abdúl Hamid and the beginning of the new regime, textile works, fez factories, and other industrial plants have been opened in Salonica and the interior of Macedonia. But these weak

beginnings of large industry were fostered into life by the legislative efforts of the Young Turks, aided by the expedient of raising the tariff rates on certain imports from 8 per cent. to 11 per cent.—a measure which Europe was forced to sanction. European capital as such, however, has done very little to develop large industry in Turkey. The entrance of European capital into backward countries unable to resist economic pressure from abroad first stimulates the economic activities of the country in question, breaks down traditional forms of life by undermining their very foundations, develops the market both at home and abroad, and helps the native commercial class to greater wealth, numerical strength and power. But the moment the merchants, tired of playing the middleman between foreign capital and the home consumer, evince a tendency to shoot off a sub-class of native industrial entrepreneurs, the economic pressure of outside European capital becomes a check upon the development of the productive forces of the backward country. This tendency is especially noticeable in the case of the French investments in Turkey.

Of the $500,000,000 of French capital operating in this empire, $300,000,000 are invested in Turkish state securities; $80,000,000 in railroads with a trackage extending from tidewater to the interior to a maximum of 186 miles; $20,000,000 are invested in real estate; $10,000,000 in marine transportation; $16,000,000 in banks; $12,000,000 in commercial agencies and only $12,000,000 in coal mines supplying fuel for the above railways and in other industrial undertakings. We see, then, that only 2.4 per cent. of the French capital in Turkey operates in a purely productive capacity by utilizing industrially the natural resources of the country. French capital provides Turkey with wharf facilities for unloading European goods; it builds railways connecting points along the seaboard with the interior and forming mere extensions of the French merchant marine; it opens and maintains banks, export and import houses, postal bureaus, and, in short, creates a great variety of facilities for flooding the markets of Turkey with foreign manufactures.

Foreign capital kills the small native industry and home handicraft; it helps in breaking down the strength and stability of the Turkish peasantry, once the sturdy bulwark of the Ottoman state during the most trying times when the nation's life was at stake. But foreign capital is not constructive in a capitalistic sense; it does not develop large industry in Turkey, nor does it contribute to the rapid growth of new social classes,

those builders of the future. The same is true of English and German capital.

The Ottoman empire is still a peasant country. Farming is the basis of Turkey's economy. It is the only source of income for over 95 per cent. of the people and supplies the main items of state revenue. The poor Mussulman peasantry, the only toilers and producers in the empire, were always hampered by the necessity of supporting the large landowners, the military and the civil officials. There are few Mussulmans in business, while the Mussulman proletariat is made up largely of harbor and railroad workers. The Christian element of the population in the European territory conquered by the allies consists chiefly of peasants and intellectuals.

Macedonia's intellectual class had suffered at the hands of the Ottoman bureaucracy. Though yielding to the spirit of the times in other directions and ready to grant many reforms, the young Turk government persisted in shutting out Macedonians from civil service, especially the higher offices. Foreign capital has no need for native proletarian brain power. And so an intolerable glut of the intellectual market arose when the universities and technical schools of Western Europe, Bulgaria, Servia, Greece and Roumania unloaded their output on Macedonia. This vast army of young graduates could not be absorbed either by the civil service or by the infant industry of the Ottoman empire. Many of them took up teaching, but many were left stranded. It is this reserve army of school teachers and floundering intellectuals which proved a powerful ferment for breeding popular revolt. The peasantry were merely the plastic dough which the intellectuals of Macedonia, urged on by the sheer instinct for self-preservation, attacked like a subtle leaven. The risen bread was the Balkan war.

The influence of this intellectual class, with its narrow mentality and its clannish group interests, gave the political conflict in Macedonia its nationalistic tinge. Not large issues on the broad lines of social-economic cleavage, but narrow race squabbles determined the make-up of the parties of the Conservative, Liberal, Radical, and Socialist types. Macedonia has now a full crop of political clans shouting their Bulgarian, Servian, Greek, Roumanian and other race slogans.

However, the social situation will now begin to undergo a radical change. The Servians, as reported by foreign consuls, are already abolishing, of their own accord, the so-called "capitu-

lations"* in their territory—a step in the right direction, which will undoubtedly be followed by the Bulgarians and Greeks. Europe will now have to accept mutely this bold attitude on the part of the young and daring Balkan countries. Disregarding Europe and the interests of English, French and Austrian manufacturers, the Balkan governments will revise the existing tariff system upwards. Such tariff protection is imperative for them, as for every country at a certain stage of economic development, so as to shield their embryonic industry against foreign imports, and especially against imported articles that can be profitably produced at home. The next move will be the overhauling of the shipping rates operative on the railroads still owned by western European countries. Foreign capital drawing its dividends from Macedonia but located in Vienna, Berlin, Marseilles, Birmingham, and Manchester, will be forced either to give up the Balkan market or to become domiciled in the Balkans. Thus fears were recently voiced in the special French press that some of the tanneries located in Havre and other French cities would have to shut down at home and in the guise of Bulgarian, Servian, or Greek firms, transfer their plants to the Balkan peninsula. The same will be the case with many scores of other plants located in Europe and doing business in the Ottoman empire. No wonder, then, that at the beginning of the war a great many of the French papers were so biased against the Balkan allies and so sympathetic to the Turk. They will now have to tone down their hostility and bow to the victors, since they will from now on dictate the terms upon which foreign capital will be admitted to the former European dependencies of Turkey.

Soon Macedonia will have its new social-economic classes, its industrial bourgeoisie and factory proletariat. The latter will leave its stamp on the map of the country's future. The Tobacco Workers' Federation already has a membership of 50,000 in Salonica, Cavalla, Drama, Seres, and other towns. These organized workers have shown grit and fighting mettle in the recent battle with the employers, which was waged during the heat of the Balkan war. In a few decades these will be joined by the harbor and railroad workers, and unions in other industries.

*Exemptions and immunities granted by the Porte to the subjects of foreign Powers by special treaties.

II. The Agrarian Revolution

The Agrarian revolution which is bound to follow the downfall of Turkish rule will play a tremendous part in the economic transformation of Macedonia. The principle underlying the agrarian laws of Turkey is that no real estate can be alienated to pay a debt. This old legislation was essentially an effort to preserve certain types of the Mussulman peasantry, the bulwark of old Turkey. It successfully warded off any attempt at divorcing the farmer from his means of production. But such a law is incompatible with modern capitalist economy.

The advent of the victorious allies will change the scheme of land tenure in the conquered territory of Turkey. The governments of Bulgaria, Servia and Greece will obtain immense tracts of fertile territory, hundreds of villages and ploughed fields deserted by poor Turkish peasants who have quit Macedonia and Thrace forever. True, the peasants of Bulgaria, Servia and Greece, and the cotters of Macedonia who went to war against the "infidels" and so lustily mowed them down, thought that they themselves would be the first to step into the shoes of the conquered ones. But the hopes of these landless peasants will never materialize.

A part of this fertile land has already been grabbed by all sorts of land sharks. Taking time by the forelock, they have cornered what is best for a song. As usual after every successful war, a fair share of the territory seized will go to reward doughty war generals, or endow ministers or favored members of the Balkan royalty. Finally a part of the land deserted by the Turks will go to the agrarian banks to be sold; the buyers will be Macedonian refugees returning home, and Bulgarian, Servian, and other peasants.

But whatever the outcome, land in Macedonia and Thrace will henceforth become a commodity to be bought and sold just like any other "use-value" in modern capitalist economy. From now on, in all Macedonia not a single rood of land whose owner has become insolvent will be immune from forcible alienation.

It is for the near future to decide whether or not the new agrarian order soon to be crystallized into law will confer any benefit upon the small landowners and the Turkish peasants who have not fled. But the immediate effects of the Balkan victories, at any rate, may be forecasted with certainty. They will speed up the development of capitalism in rural Macedonia and facilitate the entrance of private industrial capital into a terri-

tory hitherto walled in from any direct contact with "agrarian banks" and other agencies of financial capital. In the near future this will lead to a more or less disguised but none the less real expropriation of the greater bulk of the rural population, this time Christian in its make-up, followed by a stampede to the cities on the part of a great mass of formerly independent farmers. Then will follow mass emigration and the building up of a rural reserve proletariat. In short, Macedonia and Thrace will be completely trimmed down to fit the scheme of modern European economy.

III. The Eve of a New Dawn

The result of this war will be to lash the revolutionary movement to a quicker pace, both among the Christians in the territory wrested from Turkey as well as in Bulgaria, Servia and Greece themselves. The millions of peasants and workmen in these three countries, now dazed by jingoism, will sober up and realize how far the Socialists were right when they vigorously denounced the attack on Turkey. Sakharoff, the Bulgarian Social Democrat, fearlessly denounced in the Bulgarian National Assembly the aggressive policy of his country's ruling class. Zaxos, the Greek Socialist, court-martialled for his daring anti-war propaganda and sentenced to death, was saved from the hangman only through the mighty protest raised by the Greek Socialists against such judicial murder. Many Balkan peasants and wage-workers who blindly followed their generals and colonels and marched to battle against their Mussulman brothers, very soon came to look upon the above two Socialists as prophetic heroes. The masses in the Balkan peninsula are bound to go through fundamental changes which will result in the dawn of class consciousness.

This is borne out by recent history elsewhere. At the start of the Russo-Japanese war the Japanese were told that their country could not live without Korea, that its conquest would open a vast new industrial market which would absorb Japan's unemployed and raise wages at home. And though the Japanese victories were beyond their wildest dreams, the veterans of this glorious war tramp the streets of Tokio to-day in search of work they cannot find. Many of them are literally dying of starvation, for the cost of living has increased to a great degree, and rice is selling for twice as much as during the war. There were 10,000 suicides last year. A spirit of revolt has seized the whole country. Here and there are underground rumblings which herald in an unmistakable manner an approaching social upheaval such as Asia has never known before.

In Italy also the masses are beginning to recover from their jingoistic trance. They were told that at the close of the war millions of Italians would emigrate to Cyrene and Tripoli. When the first few thousands prepared to go, the Italian government announced that only those who had previously procured employment would be allowed to emigrate, as there was neither work nor prospect of it in the conquered African territory. The Italian masses are disillusioned. While the war enriched a handful of manufacturers and financiers, it gave the people nothing but thousands of new cripples and invalids to care for, an inflated state debt, and higher taxes.

The Balkan Slavs and Greeks will soon realize that economic gains obtained through war are short-lived and never repay one-thousandth part of what is lost on the battle-field. And that lesson has to be learned before they are ready to take up the battle of their class and finally unite with the international proletariat in the combat against wage slavery.

THE GIFT

By Louise W. Kneeland

I sought, O Love,
To lay upon thy shrine
Some perfect gift
In memory of all
Thy glowing hours,
Thy rapturous days.
The beauty of the stars
I thought 'twould be,
The spring's fair flowers,
Some bird song
Sweet and wild.
From end to end of earth
I sought that perfect thing—
But could not find.
The beauty of the stars had fled,
The songs all silenced were,
Faded the flowers.
Then Life, smiling divinely,
Laid upon my heart
Her hand, heavy with pain,
And now, O Love,
Take these, my tears.

Poems

By Harry Kemp

The Scarecrow Woman

[The poet writes to us from London: These lines were written while in a cell in Southampton, awaiting my commitment to Winchester. The police there blossomed out as patrons of literature—they provided me with paper to write on. As I was taken in I saw the miserable object which served as the original of my poem. She was being led off to the work-house.

I let the police read the poem, and it pleased them very much.

"Blimme," said one to another, "that was 'er to a T," referring to the woman, of course. But I meant the type—the kind you see sitting about on the park benches both here and in America.]

Poor Scarecrow Woman, worn and marred,
Unhymned as yet by any bard—
No limb but what is hung askew . . . .
No joint but what the bone shines through . . . .

Broken by need and greed and lust . . . .
With shambling foot and flattened bust . . . .
Removed from beauty or the saints,
You are the thing no artist paints!

What brought you down so low as this
From all that men feign woman is,
What hidden shame or dreadful chance
From all that poets deem romance?

Yet, whether born, or brought to be
This crawling thing of misery,
You shall not go unsung to death
With rheumy eyes and wheezy breath—
I'll force my loathing Muse to sing
Your fame, at last, poor scarecrow thing!

Monotheism

How lonely it must be to be a monotheistic God,
To sit alone in one's universe
Exalted beyond all created kind,
Wiser than seraphs, higher than the angels,
With no companion equal to one's self
With whom to hold communion—the old Greeks
Were good in giving partners to their gods.

Ah, Sweet The Birds!

Ah, sweet the birds are singing, and mead and shaw are green;
The sky shines like a mirror, by winds and rain washed clean;
The flocks are out to pasture, the world wends two by two;
The sheety mill-pond captures high noon's remotest blue,
And even in the city I wot that sparrows sing,
And sickly shoots of leafage take color of the spring—
And universal gladness in every heart doth call
And laughs, and knows no reason. . . God, how I hate it all!

This Paltry I

At times I sicken of this paltry I,
At times it seems oblivion would be good.
'Tis hard to know the truth and live the lie,
Caught in the maelstrom of the multitude,
And in the common cloth of fools endued
To think like God and like an insect die.
To give up what I have not were not vain.
Call you this Life I drag from day to day?
My dreams have wings of fire, but crawl in clay.
I see the heights, yet cannot leave the plain . . .
O, He is cruel who makes known the way
And gives not strength the summit to attain!

Alter Ago

I walked beneath the stars by night
And beneath the sun by day,
But a spirit-shape I could not 'scape,
It went with me alway.

"What manner of thing art thou," I asked,
"That matchest me tread for tread,
And bidest with me wherever I be?"
"Thine other self!" It said.

The Tiger or the System?

By Felix Grendon

Oscar Wilde once said that an author should choose his admirers for their money and his critics for their brains. It is a pity that Mr. Bynner did not practice this maxim, and thus keep the paper cover of "Tiger"* from flaunting press notices by critics who compare him with Brieux, Maupassant, and Blake, to the lasting disadvantage of these classics. Edwin Markham, for example, announces that Mr. Bynner's play "carries its lesson with more of art than any of the Brieux dramas—it is a perfect bit of work." Does a young author who is making a bid for a thoughtful audience really stand to gain by such "criticism"?

"Tiger" is a dramatization in one act of the same theme that was treated later in Bayard Veiller's "The Fight" and earlier in a play which flourished last year at the Princess theatre. A woman who runs a high-grade brothel—she is the girl-eating Tiger of the play—causes an inexperienced girl of 16 to be lured into her den. Her object is to cater to the jaded appetite of a patron who has exhausted the routine brothel fare and demands fresher and choicer tid-bits. The climax is swift and dramatic. When the patron jauntily enters the room in which the naked girl is held prisoner—it is his own daughter that rushes into his arms with a terrible cry.

Mr. Bynner has written a play in which the situations are well worked-up and in which there is plenty of movement and artistic verisimilitude. One may say unreservedly that the character of Tiger, the mistress of the disorderly house, is drawn with fine effect. An excellent business woman, Tiger has no sentimental nonsense about her, she simply happens to be trafficking in prostitutes instead of in sewing-machines or collar buttons. None the less she is an altogether natural product of our industrial civilization and we can easily picture her supporting the efficiency movement, or giving her girls the benefit of the Eight-Hour Law, the Legal Minimum Wage, and a Model Welfare Home, or furthering any other reform whereby enlightened selfishnesss may swell up the fat returns from trade.

* Tiger. By Witter Bynner. Mitchell Kennerley, New York, 1913. 60 cents.

So much in praise of "Tiger." But I am obliged to add that the theme is not exactly cut to fit the dimensions of the purpose. The author sets out to throw a strong light upon the system of prostitution. But his theme whittles down to a mere sermon against lustful fathers. In effect, Mr. Bynner says to every incontinent parent: "If you take an active part in the social evil, your own child may be victimized." Observe the incomparably deeper, bolder treatment of the subject Brieux gives us in "Damaged Goods." Says the French dramatist to every *continent* parent: "Even if you take no part in the social evil, your own child may be victimized. For a social evil involves every member of society as a passive if not an active accomplice, and the sins of society may be visited upon any of its accomplices to the third and fourth generation."

The fact is, Mr. Bynner has studied Othello with the Moor left out. He has written a social drama with the chief character, Society, left out. What I mean is that in the father and daughter scene he endeavors to move us by an appeal to our fear for our own skins, and not by an appeal to our pride in the dignity and health of society. The author just skirts the social side of his question when Annabel, one of Tiger's employees, casually explains how she took up her "profession," the explanation being the familiar one that society had limited her to a Hobson's choice between a degraded life as a home or factory drudge on the one hand, and a comparatively independent and luxurious life as a public prostitute on the other.

Here is the real tragedy of the White Slave trade, as Mr. Bynner might have seen, had he grasped the fact that it is the division of humanity into masters who own and slaves who are owned that has put the blight of prostitution on every form of human intercourse, including that of the sexes. Against this staggering social fact a million real fathers brought face to face with real daughters in real houses of shame would count for nothing. For when an irresistible economic pressure backed by a strong human desire meets a mere revulsion of feeling, it is not the economic pressure that yields. As for the chance seduction of one well-to-do girl, or her chance meeting with her father in a brothel, these are circumstances of relatively small account, of hardly greater social account, indeed, than if a burglar, driven to crime by the same Hobson's choice that

Annabel had, should burgle the premises of his own mother, or if a hungry cannibal should eat his own child.

I feel tempted to ask why "Tiger" was written in verse. No doubt some one will tell me that Mr. Bynner is a poet and a redoubtable member of the Younger Choir to boot. But I refuse to accept the excuse. Verse is all very fine in the right place. It is a perfectly proper medium for a writer who deals with whatever is fantastic or sentimental, romantic or moribund, shadowy or obsolete, in short, with whatever is totally unreal. But the modern drama deals with men's passion, will, and experiential conflicts, and these call for the virile expressiveness of prose. This is not to deny that quite as many things are now written in prose for which metric speech would be a better medium, as vice versa. For my part, I am ready to point out numerous fantastic works now issued in prose which would appear to advantage in Marlowe's mighty line, for instance, a novel by Henry James, an essay by Chesterton, or Mr. Roosevelt's views on bichloride of Socialism. But shall we marry verse to a play on so living and realistic a topic as the abduction of a girl into White Slavery? No, by all that's eugenic! We might as well ask Haywood to menace Capital in alexandrines, or beg our own André Tridon to set his diatribes on the party machine to a tender anapestic lilt.

But Mr. Bynner has actually perpetrated this unnatural union of meter and the modern stage. How does the mongrel progeny appear? I cite an extreme example:

"Why, it's Friday! Then he won't be home till Monday.
I hadn't thought of that. He always goes
To the country somewhere with his friends.
Poor Aunt Louisa will be scared to death
When I'm not back for dinner."

And what is the author's punishment for this? I quote from one of his lady reviewers: "You have achieved poetry of a stark, stripped, merciless kind in this fearsome thing!" Unless Mr. Bynner wants to be damned by such quaint praise again, I invite him to write his next modern play in the finest rhythms of the common tongue. It will be vastly harder, but, if the author's non-metrical stage directions do not deceive me, his quiver contains the silver bolt of prose.

Syndicalism As It Is

By Robert Rives La Monte

Eighteen months ago the difficulty in this country was that the average man knew nothing whatever about syndicalism and sabotage. To-day the difficulty is that the same average man knows so many things about them that are not so. In every magazine one finds articles, and on every book-shelf one finds volumes replete with entertaining and astounding misinformation about these dread subjects.

Under these circumstances it is a positive relief and joy to come across a book on Syndicalism* written by a man who knows his subject, and whose sole concern it is to tell the truth and tell it lucidly. I do not mean the book is absolutely without bias. If it were it could hardly be a sympathetic interpretation of a contemporary movement. I think it was Lord Acton who said in the introduction to the Cambridge History that no good history could be wholly impartial. Whether this be true or not it is certainly true that Syndicalism cannot be rightly comprehended or correctly portrayed by a bitterly hostile critic. Fortunately the present volume is written by a man who cordially grasps and sympathizes with the spirit of Syndicalism.

It is difficult to overstate the possibilities of the good that might result from a wide distribution of this volume, and every lover of truth owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. Huebsch for bringing out the cheap paper edition which makes it so widely available.

The book not only describes the movement and its underlying philosophy (to be true to Syndicalism, one should not speak of the philosophy as "underlying the movement," but rather as emerging from the movement), but also gives a well-informed statement of the present status of the various syndicalist and industrialist organizations in all the countries where the movement has emerged.

To point out trifling errors in this illuminating volume seems like petty cavilling, for whatever errors it may contain the fact

---

* The New Unionism. By André Tridon. B. W. Huebsch, New York, 1913. 12mo, 198 pp. Cloth, $1.00 net; paper, 25 cents net.

remains that no man can read it without gaining a fairly accurate concept of Syndicalism. It would be possible to question (to put it mildly) the economics of this sentence: "Thus shorter hours and higher wages could be obtained at least for the organized minority, the aristocracy of labor, at the cost, it is true, of an increase in the cost of living for unionized and non-unionized workers alike" (p. 4). When Citizen Weston put forth this fallacy that a rise in wages necessarily implied a rise in the price of the product, Marx apparently thought he had killed it once for all in the address which has since been so widely distributed and so little read and understood under the title, "Value, Price and Profit." But the fallacy will not die, it is perennial, it has more lives than the traditional cat. May not the explanation be that while high wages do not necessitate high prices, yet as a matter of actual experience is not a rise in wages more often than not followed at once by a rise in the price of the product affected? I suspect that this is so, and if it is, Tridon's fall from economic grace does not vitiate his argument.

Most party Socialists will feel irritated by the reference on page 11 to "the failure of several Socialist ministers and of one Socialist premier in France to accord to the workers a treatment different from what they would have expected at the hands of a radical or reformist," etc., and the book would undoubtedly have been the stronger for its omission. Renegade Socialists who become members of capitalist cabinets afford no measure of what can be accomplished by Socialist political action.

Very admirable is the way in which our author brings out (p. 32) that to the syndicalist, or "New Unionist" as he prefers to call him, strikes are not the whole of the class war, but mere incidents in it.

One of the most unsatisfactory chapters in the book is that on "The New Unionism and the Intellectuals." This is the more surprising inasmuch as Tridon himself is a critic of art and literature of no mean rank. But art critic as he is he persists in looking on art as something apart from work and life, a sort of decorative addition that syndicalists should be willing to retain for its utility in providing ideals (pp. 65-6). Now, art is only real and vital when it issues live and palpitating from life and work. And work freely and joyously performed merges into and becomes art. The Syndicalist ideal is for all work, not done automatically by machinery, to become art. This is the sum and substance of the message of Syndicalism's great

John the Baptist, William Morris. I suspect that Tridon's failure to grasp this is due precisely to the myopia induced by his *metier* of critic of bourgeois art, which in most cases has little or no relation to real life.

I find it difficult not to regard as an affectation his implied condemnation of the art of Van Biesbroeck and Meunier (p. 65), because they take workingmen as their subjects. This condemnation is based on the notion that to make art the handmaiden of a theory is to debase it. We may admit a work of art should not be a tract, but that does not mean we must swallow whole the bourgeois theory of "art for art's sake," which, if it has any meaning at all, means art should be wholly unrelated to life. And art unrelated to life ceases to be art or anything else intelligible.

Surely to one who believes the Social Revolution is to be achieved by the workers there is no more heroic contemporary figure than the class-conscious worker, and no more tragic figure than the hopeless, unawakened worker. Both are ideal subjects for the greatest art. Or so it seems to me.

The latter part of the book appears a trifle hurried, and in the chapter on Germany Tridon is not very convincing in his contention that "Localism" is closely akin to Syndicalism. On the other hand, very admirable is his exposition of the tendencies toward industrial amalgamation both in the German Socialist Unions and in our own American Federation of Labor.

One cannot but regret the too great brevity of the closing chapter on the influence of Syndicalism on modern thought. It may almost be said that the most valuable portion of the book is his demonstration of the very slight, almost negligible influence that Bergson, Sorel and other philosophers and metaphysicians have had on the actual development of the Syndicalist movement. But I fear it will take a surgical operation to get it nto the heads of most American Socialists that Sorel was not tl.e father and mother and Bergson the midwife of Syndicalism.

Most interesting and appetizing for more is his quotation from the starkly frank ethical exposition of Le Dantec, a lecturer at the Sorbonne, the most famous of universities, who apparently paraphrases in academic language the most startling "immoralities" of Haywood, Pataud and Vincent St. John. This brings us to the most deplorable defect in the book—it contains no bibliography. Those of us who would pursue our researches further are vouchsafed no aid. This is largely unavoidable in a book dealing with a movement that is still in the

making, but surely Tridon might have told us the source of his quotation from Le Dantec. But we must forgive him in view of the fact that he has compiled the most accurate and useful handbook on Syndicalism that has yet appeared on either side of the ocean.

Book Reviews

Sabotage. By Emile Pouget. Translated from the French, with an Introduction by Arturo Giovannitti. Chicago: Chas. H. Kerr & Co.

This book is a description of Sabotage by a protagonist and man of action, who played an important part in its development in France. This indicates the chief defects of the book. It is a vivid confession of faith, vibrant with the spirit of the man of action immersed in the practical aspects of his subject, but uninterested or incapable of interest in its theory or systematic analysis. How does sabotage affect the revolutionary morale? What is its relation to the totality of the Movement and not alone to local struggles and immediate ends? On the larger and really vital aspects, Pouget is silent.

While the book is sober as a whole, it is not absolutely free of hysterical claims. Pouget indicates that sabotage is a weapon of emancipation. Giovannitti says: "Sabotage is the most formidable weapon of economic warfare, which will eventually open to the workers the great iron gate of capitalist exploitation and lead them out of the house of bondage." They refute their own claims. Pouget excellently compares saboters to "guerrillas" in national wars. When were guerrillas the "most formidable weapon" in such wars? Was not a people dependent upon guerrillas alone ultimately conquered? Sabotage "consists only in slackening work or temporarily disabling the instruments of production." Sabotage develops instinctively as a proletarian weapon of last resort. It is most necessary and effective, according to Pouget, when workers on strike are beaten back to work; and then sabotage, terrible and silent, may win where the strike lost. This places sabotage in its proper perspective,

and simultaneously proves that it is *not* "the most formidable weapon of economic warfare."

What Pouget proves, and proves convincingly, is that sabotage is a valuable *auxiliary* weapon of the revolutionary union. Pouget's sabotage does not mean violence, actually excludes violence; yet other saboters, as the German Arnold Roller, consider any act of violence—sabotage, even the "blowing up" of the "social tyrant," the capitalist. "The consumer must not suffer from sabotage," says Pouget; yet there are saboters who stop at nothing. This confusion of ideas is responsible for much of the opposition to sabotage.

There is another defect in Pouget and Giovannitti, and nearly all saboters. They are cursed with the mania of their opponents, the mania of justification. Its opponents generally condemn sabotage as being "ethically unjustifiable"; while saboters retort vehemently by damning ethics or justifying sabotage as in harmony with "proletarian ethics." Giovannitti's brilliant introduction is largely an "ethical" defense of sabotage; while Pouget alternately sneers at and answers the "ethical" argument. The principle involved in sabotage, says Pouget, is that the end justifies the means. To prove that the end justifies the means, however, is not at all to "justify" sabotage or prove its validity as a proletarian weapon.

Rejecting the end-justifies-the-means theory means rejecting the facts of human experience. The individual and the mass have generally acted, consciously and unconsciously, in the spirit of the end justifying the means. It has been a vital impulse in all ages and all philosophy. Pragmatism, that eminently respectable philosophy, blesses it; for to hold that things must be tested by experience, that it matters not whether an idea or action is right or not so long as necessary and effective, is to hold that the end justifies the means. Particularly is this principle necessary in a revolutionary movement, since the ruling class uses all the mystifications of morality and justice to paralyze revolt.

The principle involved in sabotage, accordingly, is a vital one. But it is not necessarily a revolutionary principle. It is a method, a mode of action, determined by expediency. The capitalist, according to Pouget, practices sabotage; is the capitalist, then, revolutionary? The conservative craft unionist must be a revolutionist, since he is an instinctive adept in sabotage.

Sabotage needs a systematic analysis of its relation to American conditions. How much of the alleged success of sabotage

in France is due to small-scale industry? To what extent is it applicable to the large, highly organized American industry, with its intricate methods of superintendence and its efficiency system? Giovannitti might profitably discuss these phases of sabotage, necessarily neglected by Pouget.

LOUIS C. FRAINA.

Horace Traubel. By Mildred Bain. Albert and Charles Boni, New York. 50 cents.

In this well-written and affectionate little book we have one of those evidences of group realization in an individual. Mildred Bain's book shows us a man saturated with love for his fellows and at the same time striving to express himself as an individuality in the midst of the mass of which he feels himself so vitally a part. The antithesis of society and individual is strongly brought out and the resolution of that antithesis makes most interesting reading. Whether Horace Traubel's art be of the highest order or not fades into insignificance beside the fact of his so evident standing as an expression of what his friends and admirers wish to have expressed—what they themselves feel but are incapable of expressing. He is at least the true democrat, representing to a considerable extent a number of his fellow-beings in a manner highly gratifying to them and receiving from them encouraging appreciation and support.

That Traubel's art is considered by her to be of a high order Mildred Bain makes clear. She considers him not as a mere imitator of Whitman, but as holding a unique and advanced position in his own right. Whitman's influence on Traubel's art is not denied, but it is claimed that his work as a whole springs spontaneously from the self-same soil that produced Whitman's own, *i. e.*, the social conditions of the times. This places Traubel's work in the category of the New Art over which is now being waged much controversy as to whether it be a manifestation of the final stages of individualism or of the initial steps in the development of Socialism, and from this point of view we are likely to hear more of this little group of democrats in the not distant future.

LOUISE W. KNEELAND.

A Socialist Digest

Edited by WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

Larkin and Governmental Interference in Strikes

The Dublin strike and the Larkin agitation in England seem to have created almost as great public excitement as the nation-wide strikes of 1911. And the net result, as at that time, seems to be a vastly increased demand for governmental interference and a governmental settlement. The demand is made "in behalf of the men" and comes both from Radical and from Labor and Socialist sources.

As early as November 15th the *London Nation* demanded such benevolent intervention, and against the employers. Larkin was released, but only after his agitation had defeated the Liberal candidate for Parliament at Reading. The Radical policy of benevolence towards the masses is based, however, not upon the fear of their power, as Larkin supposses, or the fear of their votes, as the Laborites believe, but on a feeling that their weakness is a danger to the military and industrial position of the nation. The *Nation* is concerned on account of "the weakness, the poverty, the physical and intellectual anaemia of the masses." And it is genuinely grateful to Larkin for advertising this weakness and misery to a callous public that knows it has no reason whatever to fear physically:

> What does Parliament hear of this world from which Mr. Larkin comes? What, in point of fact, has that world gained from all the vast expenditure of the last few years to compensate for the cost of living? Who are its ambassadors? Bishop Gore, who is rapidly becoming the chief tribune of the poor, has remarked, very justly, that if it had not been for Mr. Larkin, the world would never have heard of the uncivilized life of Dublin. How many people in England have been told all the facts about the men and women who are in Mountjoy prison to-day? What reason is there for thinking that their punishment is any juster than Mr. Larkin's was? It is a fatal blot on our Parliamentary system that the grievances of these great masses of unorganized or ill-organized poor can only be put before the world by men outside that system—the Russells and the Larkins, the poets and the agitators.
>
> It is not very different in the English towns. The great unions have their representatives in Parliament, but who speaks there for the carters and the dockers? From time to time they strike—and sometimes, as it happened two years ago, victory, sudden and surprising, sweeps port

after port. Sometimes they are beaten; there is a riot, heads are broken, the upper classes organize a civilian force of police. The strike ends. The men go back to their homes, even the women can no longer resist, and all is over. Who, in the interval, talks to them, or tries to provide them with any of the amenities of life? How much does Parliament hear of them, "except when they disturb its peace"? They beg, or steal, or rob among their betters; they starve, or freeze, or rot among themselves.

In accord with this policy of economic uplift and kindly treatment for those who "beg, steal, rot, freeze, and starve" at the bottom of society, the *Nation* went so far as to advocate the right of wide-spread strikes and even of the right to work. This was after the repudiation of Larkin's General Strike idea by the special Trade Union Congress, and shows once more how close together are the Radicals and Laborites.

The refusal of a general sympathetic strike by a majority of ten to one must not be misunderstood as an absolute repudiation of this method of industrial war. Most trade-union leaders have now so clear a conception of the solidarity of labor that they are willing to contemplate the use of the sympathetic strike, exending at least to a group of national trades, as a weapon of last resort. What they rejected was the impatient dismissal of other more feasible and less perilous modes of settlement.

The demand for general reinstatement by the men is in effect the assertion of a novel doctrine of business structure, which has so far obtained no recognition in law, and very little in the sentiment of the employing and professional classes. That demand is a particular application of the "right to work," an assertion that the men who have been in regular employment in a business possess an equitable claim to retain their posts unless some inefficiency or other personal defect can be adduced against them. The fact of membership of a trade union, and even of the temporary withdrawal by a strike or lock-out as a method of collective bargaining, they do not admit to cancel their claim upon their job. There is a real equity underlying this attitude. The Dublin employers must learn this lesson of equity or of discretion if they are to hope for future peace in the conduct of their businesses. They must not penalize the men who resisted their attempt to stamp out the Transport Union.

But "Larkinism" has not only strengthened Radicalism, it has brought new light to some Fabians and Laborites. In explaining the Dublin strike the Fabian *New Statesman* comes very near to endorsing the policy of non-recognition of the union and of timeless agreements which are the very basis of our I. W. W. The unsigned article from which we give the following extracts is doubtless written by the great labor union authority, Sidney Webb, since he is one of the editors:

The objection to Mr. Larkin, if we may get below the ordinary resentment which one party always entertains for any successful leader of the other party, seems to be based on the allegation that, with him in

command, the employers have no assurance that agreements will be adhered to. The men in his union, it is said, have repeatedly, on some pretext or another, broken the contracts into which they had entered, and left their work.

What, however, the employers often mean is, not that the laborers have committed any breach of contract in a legal sense, but that they have refused, more or less suddenly, to enter into the new contract that each hour involves, and have thus caused interruption in that continuity of work which the employer (though he has abstained from contracting for it, in order not to be himself bound) always expects and desires.

. . . . If manual workers are to be restrained from striking—that is, from refusing to continue at work on the old terms—employers must be restrained from dismissing their operatives, and even from reducing their staffs.

As Webb knows that employers are not going to be restrained from reducing their staffs, this means—for the industries he is discussing—a recommendation of the policy of timeless agreements, with the accompanying feature of non-recognition of the union—and freedom for "sympathetic" or general strikes, as the article expressly demands.

To the *New Statesman,* however, this is merely a temporary makeshift, a half-way position, which they welcome precisely because it is temporary and untenable and will compel the middle classes to demand the governmental fixing of wages and the practical abolition of strikes—only an empty right remaining that it would be made very difficult and expensive to use. The Fabians formerly advocated compulsory arbitration. The *New Statesman* now suggests—for governmental employees—"that the representatives of organized workers as a whole, outside the services affected, would prove a fair body of arbiters between the malcontents and the community." The suggestion is radical—if vague. But it must be taken in connection with the preceding sentence, that with a liberal policy on the part of the government "there would be no strikes."

The non-Socialist organ, the London *Nation,* believes, on the contrary, that there always will be strikes, and uses the strongest possible argument against compulsory arbitration, namely, that it simply could not be carried out. The *Nation* asks its readers who want to abolish strikes (especially in government service), "What are you going to do about it?"

It is easy to talk about legal prohibition of the strike, compulsory notices of stoppage, withdrawal of pensions, refusal of reinstatement. But a calmer consideration will show that none of these menaces is very effective. You cannot force men to continue working who decide not to work, and no pecuniary or other penalties of any severity can be exacted from a general body of employees even for a plain breach of

contract. The threat of refusal to reinstate must, in skilled important services, be largely "bluff." No great public service could meet a general strike of its employees by a general refusal to reinstate, and the punishment of leaders could be met by a refusal to settle on such terms. Those, therefore, who take the diabolic view of public employees, will find cold comfort in the purely coercive powers of the State or the local authority.

Brilliant Socialist Victory in Bulgaria

In the Berlin *Vorwaerts,* Janko Sakasoff, the only Socialist in the former Parliament, gives the following account of the recent election campaign:

The central point of the electoral agitation was the apportionment of the blame for the national catastrophe. For a month a mass of matter has been published on this question and each side has naturally striven to absolve itself from all blame. The parties of the former government are calling especial attention to the fact that the order for the disastrous attack did not proceed from the government but from the commander-in-chief, namely the King. The present government, on the other hand, is saddling all blame upon the former government. But no one in Bulgaria is in doubt where the only guilty one is to be found. The King's guilt cannot be concealed and this knowledge is penetrating throughout the land.

However, it is not a question of this single case only, but of a reckoning with the entire system of the personal and oligarchic regime, to which all governing parties had formerly paid homage and which bears the responsibility for the former misgovernment, and the latter was to blame for the war with Turkey and with the Allies and for all the fearful suffering that the soldiers and those at home were obliged to undergo. Everything that the people felt to be unjust, violent and horrible during the war is now responsible for the campaign slogan: "Away with the old parties of oppression, long live the Socialists!"

The war, that kept all sections of the population in the same terrible condition, gave the rural population the opportunity to become better acquainted with the Socialists and their political views. "During the war we had no other friends and helpers than the Socialists," say the peasants, and in masses they are flocking under the red banner. In the former parliament we had only one representative. (Com. Sakasoff is one of the leaders of the so-called "Weitherzigen," the more opportunistic wing of the still unfortunately divided Bulgarian party. The "Engherzigen," the radical wing, were formerly not represented in parliament.—The Editor of "Vorwaerts"). This campaign mood favorable to Socialism will not in the future, it is true, be easily held to the same degree. But the causes of the present mood will remain for many years, since there is at present no other political party in Bulgaria that so incorporates the spirit and the interests of the masses as does the Socialist party.

The campaign resulted in extraordinary Socialist success.

The general elections, held on Sunday, December 7, have resulted in a great victory for the Socialist party, or, we should say, parties,

as there are two, the more Opportunist section and the Radical section, reports London "Justice."

The former has twenty-one members returned, the latter sixteen—a total of thirty-seven out of a Parliament of 204 members.

In the last Parliament there was only one Socialist, Comrade Sakasoff, belonging to the Opportunist section. The three Liberal groups, which support the present government, have managed to return ninety-five members in all. These parties are, in a general way, anti-Russian, as far as foreign politics go. Their leaders are able, but quite unscrupulous men. In fact, two of them were, some time ago, condemned for abuse of official powers and misapplication of public funds. Another leader, Ghennadief, and General Savof are awaiting a trial on similar charges.

The old coalition parties, which engineered the war against Turkey, and through their bungling brought about the war against the allies, have been practically wiped out. The Conservatives (Gueshof's party) have returned five members, and the Progressives (Dr. Danef's party) one member. There have also been returned fourteen Democrats and five Radicals, and last, but not least, forty-seven members of the Agrarian (or peasant's) League. This is a recently formed organization, which, as implied by its name, has for its object the furthering of the economic interests of the bulk of the Bulgarian nation, the small freeholders, or peasants.

The present government, whose business it is to save the dynasty and all that is implied in the maintenance of the present regime—militarism and capitalism—has only 95 supporters against 109 opposition votes. It will probably attempt to win over the nineteen Democrats and Radicals.

It would hardly be possible for it to satisfy the demands which the peasant deputies will be sure to put forward, in which case the peasants and the Socialists will form a strong opposition. In a country like Bulgaria, without large industries, the Socalists must of necessity study the interests of the agricultural population, which is all the easier as the great mass of the peasants own only small farms, and in their economic position, standard of living, etc., have more in common with the town workman than with the other sections of the people.

The program of the peasants' league demands that the famine and fearful suffering of the country be met by the most rigid economies, including *the dismissal of all ambassadors and higher army officers.* The Socialists demand *a democratic republic* and *a federation of the Balkan States,* to improve the condition of the Macedonian Bulgarians by peaceful means.

The Berlin *Vorwaerts* also reports:

The opposition parties have put a program of 15 points before the government. In case their demands are not granted they threaten to bring into the new Parliament a law abolishing the monarchy and establishing a republic. Since such a law might easily secure a majority in the present Parliament, the day of its opening [which depends upon the consent of the "Czar"] is extremely uncertain.

The Socialist Defeat in Baden

The German Social-Democracy has just met one of the worst defeats of its history. The time and place of the defeat are significant. It occurred immediately after the voting of the military supplies by the Socialists in the Reichstag and the support of this policy by the national Socialist congress. And it happened in Baden, where the Socialist party has for years been more opportunistic than in any other German State. In recent elections and in this election it had an alliance on the second ballot. not only with the Progressives but with the conservative and plutocratic Liberals—thus becoming merely an anti-clerical and anti-agrarian party.

It is to this alliance that the *Vorwaerts* and *Neue Zeit* attribute the crushing defeat, which, the *Vorwaerts* says, greatly increases the danger of the control of South Germany by clericals and other reactionaries. The *Vorwaerts* claims that the policy of compromise is overthrown by the defeat, but as Kolb and other leading Baden Socialists claim, on the contrary, that what is needed is a still closer alliance with the Liberals, this is evidently not the case.

In answer to this obstinate conclusion of Kolb's, *Vorwaerts* says:

> If this is so then the Social Democracy must forever abandon the hope of winning and enthusing the masses as an independent party with its own program. We are told that we can trust ourselves in electoral battles as anti-clericals, as part and parcel of the Liberal and Progressive parties, that the only hope for us to set the voters in motion is to become allies of the Liberals in their battle against the Centre party. That this is the opposite of a proletarian policy is clear. But how stupid it is to defend such a policy at the very moment when it has led to the severest defeat.

The defeat was indeed a crushing one. The Socialist vote decreased from 28 to 23 per cent. of the total. The Socialists lost 11,000 voters, while the Radicals and Liberals gained 4,000, and the Catholics and Reactionaries gained 24,000. The Socialists lost chiefly to the Catholics, but also to the Liberals. Their seats in the legislature were reduced from 20 to 13. There is still a Liberal-Socialist majority of one. But three Liberals elected by Catholics are considered as unreliable, so the Government is practically lost to the Reaction.

Lehmann in the *Neue Zeit* says that many votes were lost because the workingmen saw no real difference between Socialists and Liberals and so voted Liberal. But Lehmann's article develops at length a still more important cause of the defeat. The Socialists have been co-operating with the Liberals in the last Parliament and so took a less advanced position on the income tax than the Catholics, voted for a partial maintenance of a class system of voting in local elections, and supported a school law that neither put religious teaching out of the schools, nor provided either free instruction or free text-books. Lehmann quotes an important article of a Liberal statesman (Dr. Rebmann) where the Socialists are congratulated for their eminently conservative position on these questions.

It is the opinion of Germany's leading Socialists that the voters of Baden did not value the Socialists' conservative position so highly as did the National Liberals.

Other smaller reverses have also occurred recently in Germany, but the Baden defeat, in a general way, typifies the rest.

The General Strike in Switzerland

Several factors tend to give the recent discussion of the General Strike in Switzerland an international significance. The labor movement in Geneva and the French and Italian parts of Switzerland is largely Syndicalistic. There was recently a General Strike at the Swiss metropolis, Zurich. And finally the central situation of the country and its politically democratic government give it a special significance.

The resolution passed by the Social-Democratic Congress was by no means anti-General Strike, as its German character might have led us to expect, but a compromise.

The *Neue Zeit* (in an article by Zinner) thus states the essence of the resolution worked out by the Party Executive in co-operation with the Labor Union Executive:

> The agreement expresses the idea of both organization upon the justification of the general strike, its prerequisite conditions, its conduct and the mutual rights and duties of the participating organizations. First of all, the agreement rejects the so-called syndicalistic-revolutionary general strike, at the same time emphasizing the fact that the general strike cannot replace former normal labor union actions. If the case arose the organized workers would be required to refrain from participating in such anarchico-syndicalistic experiments. The recognition as general strikes of general trade and sympathy strikes within one industry was also rejected. Mass strikes as weapons of necessity and protest can only be supported by the labor unions when it is a question of preventing measures on the part of the authorities by which the common and vital interests or the indispensable rights and liberties of the working class are seriously threatened, and in such cases where the honor of the working class has been so flouted that the self-respect of

the organization cannot be better preserved by any other means of protest than by a mass strike.

But even such mass strikes can only count upon the support of the labor unions and Labor Federation when compliance is had with such conditions for the support of a mass strike as are agreed upon between the Committee of the Federation and the Committee of the Social Democratic Party of Switzerland.

The mass strike as means to the conquest of political power is rejected, since it is not adapted thereto in Switzerland with its democratic institutions. If the Social Democratic Party of Switzerland desires to employ the mass strike as a weapon in the defence of constitutional rights, the Federation of Labor Unions must be invited to the discussion and decision.

This resolution was passed by a vote of 89 to 17. But the resolution of the Berne Socialists was also passed (by 67 to 49), which laid special emphasis on the superior importance of economic over political actions, for the disfranchised mass of Italian and other foreign laborers who compose a large part of Switzerland's unskilled workers:

With the intensification of these [class] struggles the class character of the State is revealed ever more clearly. It expresses itself especially in the rendering difficult the exercise of the right of coalition, in the police, judicial and military measures by which the common vital interests and the indispensable rights and liberties of the working class are threatened.

This misuse of the power of the State by the ruling class is facilitated by the disfranchisement of great masses of workers who, indeed, are in position to make their power effective upon the field of labor union struggle, but cannot participate directly in the shaping of the national life.

This fact and the indifference still to be met with in great sections of the workers, who either do not exercise their civil rights at all or only exercise them in a direction opposed to their own interests, bring it about that the parliamentarian struggle of the working class against the brutal misuses of the State's power often fails of the desired purpose.

The General Strike Against the Church

The above is the way the Berlin *Vorwaerts* heads the news of the mass-movement away from the Lutheran St. e Church. Hundreds have left the Church at single meetings and the movement continues to disturb Empress and Kaiser, aristocracy and the ruling-classes generally. An editorial in *Vorwaerts* summarizes the movement, its causes, and the Socialist attitude towards it.

The State gives large subsidies to the Catholic and Lutheran churches. As these subsidies are paid for out of the general

taxes they cannot be avoided. But the government also exerts a pressure on many occupations.

Everybody who is an official or wishes his child to become an official, everybody who wishes to study himself or to have his children study must be baptised and allow his children to be baptised.

The Socialist party cannot officially endorse the movement. But the Socialist papers give it a big place in their columns, and by taking the opportunity vigorously to assail the Church, do all in their power to give the movement their moral support.

Government Ownership Without Profits

In view of the approaching nationalization of telegraphs and telephones and the growing discussion of government ownership of railroads in the United States, the Socialist attitude in the matter becomes of the utmost importance. Socialists will have little to say about the price to be paid as the nationalization will probably take place in the near future, before they have any political power. But they may have a good deal to say a few years later about the economic policy to be followed by industries nationally or municipally operated.

Both in Great Britain and in America one of the most popular formulations of a Socialist policy for national industries is that they shall be operated without profit, for the public good. The fact that two members of President Wilson's Cabinet officially endorse it throws a flood of light on this "Socialist" policy.

As to his general financial policy Postmaster-General Burleson says:

"The dominant policy of the present administration will be to conduct the postal service for the convenience of the public and not for profit. In the extension of service and in the imposition of charges the government must be guided not by the consideration of profit, but by the needs of the people who have a right to expect the most efficient postal service administered in the most economical manner possible, and made available to them at rates involving, for the service as a whole, no element of taxation. The service should be extended, with due regard for the exigencies of public revenue, wherever its benefits, commercial and social, warrant the expenditure necessary, irrespective of whether or not the revenue from each extension will defray the cost thereof."

In recommending government railroads for Alaska, Secretary of Interior Lane directs attention to the fact that he has already expressed to Congress his belief that it was wise for the government itself to undertake the construction and operation of a system of trunk line railroads in the Territory. He continues:

"The rates and the service of such railroads should be fixed with reference to Alaskan development—not with regard to immediate returns. The charges fixed should be lower for years to come than would justify private investment.

"I would build and operate these highways in the same spirit that the counties or the States build wagon roads—not for revenue, but for the general good. After all, a railroad is little more than an operated wagon road. If this is our task, it should be done whole-heartedly and with a consciousness that the dollar spent to-day on an Alaskan railroad will yield no more immediate return on the investment than the dollar spent on the Panama Canal."

The space we have given to these quotations is justified by the vast importance and immediate imminence of the problem of government ownership in this country. In America the nationalization of the means of transportation and communication would involve from $20,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000—practically half of our industrial capital (excluding land and agricultural capital). It has been accomplished in other countries, but only where transportation absorbs a smaller part of the national capital. The *momentum* also of proceeding from almost no government ownership to this vast measure would almost certainly carry us still further in capitalist collectivism. And finally we are nearer to political democracy than these other nations and will be nearer still before this nationalization is accomplished.

If, then, the Socialists can get a considerable part of the American people to demand *a Socialist policy* for nationalized industry it will mean a vast increase of Socialist votes and influence. What is this policy? Evidently it is *not* operation without profits for the general good. On this point the present Government of the United States agrees with the Socialists. Or, rather, to be more honest, the Socialists agree with the Government. But we are not Wilsonites. Where do we stand?

The question is imminent, because the railroads may be unable to get the raise in rates necessary to secure the capital they really need. And in this case railroad authorities now say there is no alternative but Government ownership. The Government may not grant these higher rates because it cannot do so in a time of industrial depression and falling prices. The greatest government ownership movement of history would then be on.

A Historical Book

It is seldom that a book does much to make history. But Professor Charles A. Beard's "An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States" (The Macmillan Co., New York, $2.25) is recognized by ex-President Taft as a work of this character. The present movement to make over the American Constitution and our whole political system needed a work that would destroy our traditional worship of the founders of the nation. And Professor Beard has supplied the book.

The following summary is taken from a wholly favorable review in the New York *Times:*

Manufactures, trade, shipping, financial interests had suffered, and these four groups combined to advance their own interests. No vote was taken, and there was no popular mandate for calling the convention which draughted the Constitution. Therefore the propertyless masses were unrepresented. On the other hand the members of the Convention were, with few exceptions, "personally interested in, and derived economic advantages from, the establishment of the new system." Essentially the Constitution is an economic document based upon the concept that the fundamental private rights of property are anterior to government, and morally beyond the reach of majorities. The records show that the majority of the Convention recognized the claim of property to a special position of favor under the Constitution, and not more than one-sixth of the electorate had even an indirect opportunity to express themselves upon the form of government under which they and we have lived for a century.

Professor Beard's book is so thoroughly documented and so thoroughly modern in its methods and philosophy, that it has been favorably reviewed also by the conservative scientific quarterlies.

Professor Satané writes in the *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science:

The economic interpretation of history in the broader sense is being accepted generally by the historians of to-day, certainly by the younger set. For instance, sectionalism in this country was primarily economic, secondarily political. Members of congress and of other political bodies have always been influenced, sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously, by the economic interests of their constituents.

But Professor Satané wishes to protect *the past* from this economic interpretation (just as other political scientists accept the class-struggle for the past, but *not* for the present):

The tendency of Dr. Beard's economic interpretation is to reduce everything to a sordid basis of personal interest. Gustavus Meyers has undertaken to apply the same theory in his "History of the Supreme Court of the United States." Are we not in danger of reading into the past conceptions which are especially characteristic of the present? The problems that the founders of the government faced were essentially problems of political organization, while the problems that we have to face to-day are essentially problems of industrial organization. At any rate it will require more convincing evidence than Dr. Beard has so far presented to upset the traditional view that the members of the Federal convention were patriotic men earnestly striving to arrive at the best political solution of the dangers that threatened the republic which was still in the experimental stage.

Professor Satané objects to Beard's economic interpretation of the Constitution, yet makes an admission in this very review that is enocomic interpretation enough. Beard's newest contribution is his original research into the property-interests of the Constitution makers. To this Satané says:

> The mere fact that large amounts of securities were held by members of the convention needs no further explanation than the reminder that the suffrage was strictly limited at that time, that as a general result only men of means were elected to public assemblies.

Beard would doubtless admit this last-named fact—which indeed, he discusses at length—as being the deeper explanation.

But the strongest recognition of the value of Beard's work is in the speech of that ardent and conscientious stand-patter, ex-President Taft (December 13, 1913):

> We have been in the habit of regarding the United States as fortunate in its birth. We have supposed that there was no other Government in the world that had such a galaxy of patriotic statesmen to preside over its birth as this American Republic of ours. But it was reserved for what John Muir calls "these God-forgetting Progressive days" to prompt in an Associate Professor of Columbia University, a muck-raking investigation into the motives of those whom we have been wont to revere as the founders of this Government, and to demonstrate that the Constitutional Convention, whose work was said by Gladstone, and by others indeed whose judgment is even more favorable than his, in that it is more judicial and calmer and more based on an intimate knowledge of history, to be the greatest single governmental instrument ever struck from the brain of man.
>
> But we are advised by this sapient investigator, who evidently began with the conviction and the desire to establish the sinister reactionary nature of the Constitution, that the members of the convention were owners of Government bonds, and possibly of the financial obligations of some of the colonies, and owned real estate and farms, and even were wicked enough to hold farm mortgages, and the quod erat demonstrandum is that the Constitution is a one-sided and unjust instrument because the bankrupts and the debtors, and, by natural inference, the ignorant and the unsuccessful did not have representatives in the convention, and that thus the whole plan organized by these plotters against society and social justice was based on the wicked principle that governments and men should be made to pay their debts.

So Taft impudently classes those who were not allowed to vote on the Constitution (in President Wilson's estimate five-sixths of the white population) as "bankrupts and debtors, the ignorant and the unsuccessful"! Could a cynical European monarch go farther?

MARCH 1914 **Ten Cents**

The New Review

A-MONTHLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

150 Nassau Street **New York**