

June, 1916

15 Cents

New Review

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

VILLA:

A Modern Robin Hood

JAMES CONNOLLY

On "Ireland's Hope"

A Progressive God

New Review

Contents, June, 1916

	PAGE
CURRENT AFFAIRS:	
Leaders	171
The Irish Tragedy; "Laborism" and Imperialism in Australia; Franchise Conditions; A Disgraceful Episode.	
Notes	175
THE MODERN ROBIN HOOD.....	177
William C. Owen	
THE TOILER'S PLAINT	178
J. Elmer Pfriend	
THE WAR AND THE WORKERS IN CANADA	179
W. E. Hardenburg	
A PROGRESSIVE GOD	181
Elsie Clews Parsons	
HYPHENISM	182
Edward G. Cox	
THE ISSUE IN SCHENECTADY: A Socialist View	185
L. B. Boudin	
THE COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	189
Dante Barton	
FANTINE IN OUR DAY.....	190
Eugene V. Debs	
ERIN'S HOPE	192
James Connolly	

A Satirical Masterpiece

Smith on Preparedness

By Simeon Strunsky

Mr. Strunsky has a real genius for effective and unique comment on current events. His satire on Roosevelt, *Through the Outlooking Glass*, was not only effective propaganda but literature of a high order.

SMITH ON PREPAREDNESS will make you laugh, laugh heartily—and think. It's a tonic. Read it!

Price, 10c.

Send for half a dozen copies and pass them around.

NEW REVIEW BOOK SERVICE

To Our Readers

BEGINNING with the next issue, the NEW REVIEW passes into the hands of Floyd Dell, Max Eastman, Arturo Giovanitti and Helen Marot.

While the character of this publication will be maintained and its economic policy will be unaltered, the scope of the NEW REVIEW will be increased.

Under the direction of the new owners, who are also the editors, the revolutionary movement will be interpreted and reported from the field of science and literature as well as from the militant expressions of the movement in the political and economic world. It promises to be the most complete journal of revolutionary thought and action in the country.

ORATORY: Its Requirements and Rewards

By John P. Altgeld

This is one of the best books for the promotion of good citizenship—effective good citizenship, I mean—that I know of. It fills one full to overflowing with civic spirit and shows him how to inspire others.—Louis F. Post. Cloth, 50c, Postpaid

TRUSTS: Good and Bad

By Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of Labor

An Analysis of Trusts. Stiff paper covers, 15c., postpaid.

THE PUBLIC

Book Dept.
Ellsworth Bldg.

CHICAGO

New Review

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

VOL. IV.

15c. a copy

June, 1916

\$1.50 a year

No. 6

Current Affairs

The Irish Tragedy

ONE of the most tragical things about the Sinn Fein outbreak and its ruthless suppression is the fact that its victims hardly get any sympathy from the world at large; a sympathy which they would undoubtedly have gotten under ordinary circumstances. As it is, the only sympathy they get is from a part of the Irish people. The hypocritical sympathy of the German reptile press does not count, of course. The "neutral" world—that is, the world which is neutral in the quarrel between England and Ireland—the great wide world which usually sympathizes with oppressed nations in revolt, received the news of the Irish outbreak with cold indifference, if not with actual hostility. And its ruthless suppression has evoked no popular indignation; nor even any great outburst of genuine, warm sympathy for its innocent victims. Not even among the Socialists who are ever ready to respond to the appeal of the down-trodden and oppressed of every race and nation.

Why this discrimination against the Irish? The heroism of the Irish rebels should have made a particular appeal to the popular fancy; and, joined to the justice of their cause, should have evoked a wave of genuine sympathy for their movement, expressing itself in fervent hope for its success while success seemed possible, and indignation against the oppressor when its last hope was quenched in blood. But instead of that, a cold, indifferent, even hostile world.

The professional Irish, following the lead of the reptile German press, will, of course, talk of the corrupting influence of "British gold" which poisons the wells of public information. But this same British gold utterly failed to stem the tide of public sympathy in favor of the Boers, although their case did not possess half the elements making for popular appeal that the Irish case possesses.

The explanation must therefore be sought elsewhere. And it isn't very far to seek. It may be expressed in one word: *Germany*.

Somewhere deep in the popular consciousness

there is rooted the conviction that this was not a real Irish Rebellion, although its victims were Irish men and women. When Sir Roger Casement landed from a German submarine accompanied by a German cruiser attempting to land arms and ammunition for the prospective Irish rebels, the doom of the Irish uprising, as far as the sympathy of the world was concerned, was sealed, before the uprising itself had half begun. And the timing of the German naval raid on Lowestoft to coincide with the outbreak in Dublin did not tend to make matters better. It was felt to be a German intrigue instead of a real movement of the Irish people—an intrigue engineered by Germany for her own interests, perfidiously making use of the heroic and imaginative Irish young men of revolutionary tendencies. And the fact that Germany had nothing to lose and considerable to gain, while the Irish people had nothing—in sight—to gain and very much to lose, only deepened the resentment of the outside world against those who engineered the affair, including the heroic leaders of the revolt itself.

Sir Roger Casement is looked upon as a German hireling, instead of an Irish patriot. And the leaders of the rebellion itself as Germany's dupes—the German taint following them even unto their graves. And so the Irish martyrs go to their graves unsung and unmourned by the world, notwithstanding all the romantic glamor which attended their heroic deeds, and the brutality displayed by their relentless foe.

The sacrifice entailed was utterly futile. Not only because it did not achieve its immediate object, but because it can in no wise help the cause for which it was made. Revolutionary movements, like true faith, thrive on the blood of martyrs. But in order to have that effect no suspicion of its having been spilt in the service of Baal must attach to it. Like the blood of the sacrificial lamb it must be pure, and innocent of all contaminating influence.

The real, the surpassing tragedy of the recent Irish revolt lies in the fact that its great sacrifices were not made on the altar of Irish Freedom—that is, not in a manner that could now or hereafter rebound to the advancement of that cause. The guilt of the Unholy Alliance with German Militarism and Imperialism will rest upon it forever, and prevent the blood of its martyrs from ever bearing the holy fruit of Freedom.—L. B. B.

“Laborism” and Imperialism in Australia

THE newspapers are full of the exploits of the Australian troops at the front, and this self-governing dominion of the British Empire is receiving for its loyalty the full meed of praise from the oracles of Imperialism in England. All this would not be so extraordinarily significant to the Socialist movement—no more significant than the attitude of Canada, for instance—were it not for the circumstance that the Labor Party controls the government of Australia, and has been in power for many years.

Australia is sending contingent after contingent of troops to “fight for liberty” in Europe; and one of the earliest of these contingents is being used to “fight for liberty” by maintaining British rule in Egypt. With but half the population, Australia is providing nearly as many troops as Canada. The militarist, imperialist, and protectionist interests are in the ascendant; and the Sydney *Bulletin* expresses Australian aspirations thus: “Having put in the field an army as big as the whole Empire accomplished up to twenty years ago, the Commonwealth may well have a right to a say in the peace terms and in the sharing of the plunder.”

The officials of the Labor Party in power, and with almost complete control of the federal and local government, have given their heartiest support and encouragement to recruiting and British Imperialism. They have, in this respect, proven much more zealous than the ordinary bourgeois government of Canada.

The Australian Labor Government recently sent over its Labor Prime Minister to England to represent its interests and as another pledge of loyalty to the Empire. The utterances of “Labor Premier” William Morris Hughes, who started his career as a particularly “revolutionary” labor leader, have met with delighted applause from the imperialistic British press, which is featuring his utterances on “organizing the Empire.” Mr. Hughes was active in the Paris Trade Conference of the Allies, which met to determine ways and means of an economic war against Germany after the military war is over. He expressed himself as favoring: “A joint tariff system which will establish minimum rates among the Allies and their colonies, reasonable rates for neutrals, and strong discrimination against all dealings with hostile countries.” A federated Empire, with a centralized war department, aggressive militarism and imperialism, are other “British aims” formulated by Mr. Hughes.

This newer nationalism and Imperialism of the Australian “Labor” Prime Minister meets with the disapproval of even ordinary bourgeois radicals in England. It remained for a man who waged his

electoral campaigns on the issue of the class struggle against capitalism, to bestow his approval upon the most reactionary forces of this very Capitalism.

There was, even prior to the war, an audible discontent among the workers against the Labor Party, expressed particularly by the unskilled whose strikes were ruthlessly suppressed by the “Labor” government. Today, the leading Labor papers in Australia repudiate Mr. Hughes’ attitude, although not going far enough in opposition to the Labor-imperialist regime; and only recently the government lost every by-election.

What is the meaning of this Labor-Imperialist alliance?

The *Socialist Review*, organ of the British Independent Labor Party, in its April-June issue, sighs over its shattered great expectations; it formerly hailed the triumphs of the Australian Labor Party and its bold legislative projects as “the example” that “would stimulate the advance of social-democracy throughout the world,” but now recants:

“Australia, notwithstanding the headlong pace of her Labor victories, is not, we fear, so much nearer in heart to Socialism than the Mother Country and the older States. There, as in our own country, now that the Labor Party in Parliament has spent its first breath, we find the majority of the members drifting into all the old accustomed ways of bourgeois politicians.”

It would appear, however, that the responsibility for the mistaken impression lies not with the Labor Party, but with the diagnosis and optimism of the *Socialist Review*. Socialists—*real* Socialists—never expected anything particularly revolutionary from the Labor Party.

But is there any real difference between Australian Laborism and English Laborism? Superficially, yes; actually, no. The apparent differences flow from the circumstance that Laborism is in power in Australia, and is a negligible governmental force in England. Laborism, whether in Australia or in England, starts from the same premise: working within the bounds of the national organization, and maintaining the unity of the Empire. It may be remembered that Keir Hardie repudiated granting independence to India. At the Glasgow Trade Union Congress, some of the delegates protested against allowing Mr. Hughes to speak; but when he did speak, the following statement was greeted with tumultuous applause: “There is no great achievement that stands to the credit of trade unionism here or in Australia but will crumble to its fall if the issue of the war is decided against us.”

Socialism, Laborism and Syndicalism, in spite of their great theoretical and emotional divergencies, broke down in the great crisis from a similar cause—Nationalism. Work within the nation exclusively, fight shy of the fundamental industrial and inter-

national organization of the working class, and collapse is inevitable when the test comes—as much in peace as in war.

But in the case of Laborism there are aggravated features. Socialism and Syndicalism avowedly seek the overthrow of the capitalist state, while Laborism seeks merely to become a part of the governing system of the state. Having become a part of the governing system, as in Australia, Laborism necessarily pursues a nationalist, an imperialist policy. This is the fact of prime importance; other facts are incidental, and but one requires particularizing. Trade union officials, as a class, are petty bourgeois in character and outlook. They are conservative, reactionary, an official caste acting as a drag upon the progress of the labor movement. This is particularly true in the English-speaking countries and in Germany.

But in Australia, as in the other belligerent countries, reaction is producing revolt. The Labor Party has repudiated the excesses of its Prime Minister, and the revolutionary portion of the working class is recognizing the futility and insufficiency of Laborism. This iconoclastic war has smashed another idol with feet of clay.—*L. C. F.*

Franchise Conditions

THE Socialist Party is committed to political action. If this means anything, it should mean that year in and year out we should endeavor to gain more political power for the working class. The cold facts are, however, that here in America we are contented to live in a fool's paradise, to go the same old rounds over and over again without any regard to the actual conditions which face the workers in the political arena.

The rank and file is amazingly ignorant as to the laws governing the voting power, confused as to citizenship requirements, still more confused as to the power of the states to confer or to withhold the franchise; and nothing is being done by our official leadership to rouse our membership to efficient and sustained work in the struggle for real universal suffrage.

For the benefit of those that follow blind leaders of the blind, some elementary facts may be restated:

Citizenship and the right to vote are not necessarily interdependent. The laws as to citizenship and naturalization are a federal matter exclusively, while the right to vote is a matter which the states regulate practically according to their will and whim. Hence we have a most remarkable variety of state requirements concerning the franchise. In a number of states women vote just like men. In some states poll taxes are established; in others,

registration fees virtually shut out minority parties. There are also states where the franchise depends upon educational qualifications, particularly in the South, to keep Negroes away from the ballot box. The system as a whole is a regular crazy quilt.

What interests us in particular is the fact, unknown to most Socialists, that in eight states aliens may vote like full fledged citizens. Here is where and how:

Alabama—Citizen of the United States or alien who has declared intention. Must have resided in state two years, county one year, precinct three months.

Arkansas—Citizen of the United States, or alien who has declared intention. Must have resided in the state one year, in county ninety days, in precinct thirty days.

Indiana—Citizen of the United States, or alien who has declared intention. Alien must have had one year's residence in the United States prior to election. Must have lived in the state six months, precinct thirty days.

Kansas—Citizen of the United States, male or female, or alien who has declared intention. Must have lived in the state six months, county thirty days, precinct ten days.

Missouri—Citizen of the United States, or alien who has declared intention. Must have lived in state one year, county sixty days, and precinct sixty days.

Nebraska—Citizen of the United States, or alien who has declared intention. (Women can vote in school elections.) Must have lived in state six months, county six months and precinct six months.

Oregon—Citizen of the United States, male or female, or alien who has declared intention more than one year prior to the election. Must have lived in the state six months (if an alien one year and six months), in county thirty days, precinct thirty days.

South Dakota—Citizen of the United States, or alien who has declared intention. Must have lived in the state six months, county thirty days and precinct ten days.

Texas—Citizen of the United States, or alien who has declared intention. Must have lived in the state one year and county six months.

In the great and populous state of New York only citizens may vote. They must have been citizens for ninety days prior to election, a condition imposed in no other state except California. Must have lived in the state one year, county four months, precinct thirty days.

Aside from some Southern states, New York has the most restrictive franchise provisions. And yet the Socialist Party is not making any effective fight toward securing voting power for the working masses of both sexes. Neither in our party press

nor in any other manner is this problem taken up, although the census of 1910 showed in Greater New York alone more than half a million men of voting age, politically alien and hence voteless.

At the last state convention a proposition to demand the franchise for adult aliens who had declared their intention and lived in the United States one year was voted down by the majority of the delegates, urged to do so by some of our leading lights who were afraid that that was "going too far."

There was a time when the New York Socialists were the progressive and aggressive vanguard of our movement. That time is now past. We have become too respectable, too law-abiding for such a position. We are contented in the matter of voting power with less than the laws have granted in the states above named. And we keep up our farcical talk about political power for the workers.

We shall soon have another state convention. Will our delegates wake up to their plain duty?

If we remain self-satisfied, drudging to the voting booths in the same old way, counting our minorities year after year, the number of votes now rising, now falling—where are we to land?

Can we really blame the syndicalists for sneering at our way of playing politics? If we believe in political action, then, in the name of common sense, let us play the game like men in dead earnest, not like children toying with tin soldiers.—*M. O.*

A Disgraceful Episode

ON Friday, May 5, 1916, there occurred in the United States House of Representatives an incident which is well calculated to fill us with a sense of shame, and must redound to the discredit of all concerned.

The House had under consideration the Porto Rico bill containing a provision for the disfranchisement of about three-fourths of its male population of voting age. In speaking against this provision of the bill Congressman London threw the House into a tumult of excitement by saying:

"I say you assassinate the rights of these Porto Ricans by depriving three-fourths of those people of the right of franchise, and I will tell you what you are accomplishing. *You will be the cause of organized insurrection in Porto Rico. Three-fourths of the working people who will be disfranchised will have the right to use the revolver and will have the right to use violence and will have the right to kill governors.* Do you deny a man the right to press his views through civilized methods, through the medium of the ballot? *He has the right to use every weapon at his command and every protection. The man whose vote you take away will have the right to put the knife of an assassin into the heart of any*

man who attempts to govern him against his will."

The debate on the Porto Rico bill was suspended, and the House entered upon an excited discussion as to what to do with the recreant Congressman, whose utterances were characterized by Mr. Austin of Tennessee, a Democrat of light and leading, as "a disgrace to the American Congress." This characterization was undoubtedly correct. But only in the sense that it was a disgrace to the American Congress to have to be reminded that according to the American theory of government the sanction of governmental power rests in the consent of the governed, and that where that sanction is wanting the "governed" have the right to use all means at their command in order to overthrow the iniquitous government. But Mr. Austin did not mean it exactly that way. What he meant to say was that the affirmation of this doctrine—which is the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence—by one of its members was a disgrace to the American Congress. He therefore expressed the very laudable wish to be able to move the expulsion of London from the House. And in default of such power he desired to have London made to apologize for thus "insulting" the House, in which desire many of Mr. Austin's colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, heartily and vociferously joined. Which was surely disgrace enough.

But here something even more disgraceful happened—disgraceful not only to the American Congress, but also to the American Socialist movement. The Socialist Congressman, instead of insisting on his rights, and making the most of his opportunity to confound the Bourbons of the House by teaching them a lesson in American history and American governmental theory, actually apologized. And not only that, he actually went back on himself, denying that he ever uttered the words in which he should have gloried. And all this, in such a miserably abject way, that the reading of the printed record of this scene is sickening and disheartening beyond measure.

What has happened to London? This is a riddle which will puzzle all those who know him, and who have watched his hitherto manful course in the House of Representatives. Whatever we may think of London's views on certain subjects, surely London is no coward. Why, then, this abject *pater peccavi*?

Perhaps we may find the key to this riddle in the attitude of the Socialist press towards this incident. Not merely the reptile socialist press, but the socialist press that counts. In speaking of the incident, the New York *Volkszeitung* said, editorially, that London *could not* have said the words which we italicized above, *for had he actually have said them he would have been no Socialist.*

This sounds amazing, incredible. But it is st

writ black on white in the editorial columns of the *Volkszeitung* of May 9, A. D. 1916. And there is no doubt that the *Volkszeitung* states what might be considered the official American Socialist opinion on this subject. It seems that the cancer of legalism has so eaten into the marrow of our bones that we have left even "Section Six" behind. That section referred only to the United States, where we have manhood suffrage. The right to use "illegal" means against their oppressors was still, tacitly at least, reserved to those who are deprived of the right to vote. But in the meantime our legalistic doctrine has evidently received an important extension: The right to use "illegal" means is forbidden—according to this improved "Socialist" Code—even to those who have no other means at their disposal, those who cannot use "political action" because they have no political rights.

It seems that it was this official socialist doctrine of legalism that made London eat his words so abjectly. At first London thoughtlessly followed his socialist and revolutionary instinct and courageously reminded the House of what used to be good democratic doctrine and should still be good socialistic doctrine. But Mr. Austin of Tennessee reminded him that what was good democratic doctrine once was so no longer, that it was in fact a "disgrace" to an alleged democratic Congress to have it uttered within its sacred precincts. Whereupon London evidently recalled that the Bourbon member of Tennessee was in possession not only of the true modern Democratic doctrine but also of the true modern Socialist, or at least American Socialist, doctrine, and he hastened to eat his words.

We have enough confidence in Congressman London's courage to believe that he would have defied the Bourbons of the House and taken the consequences. But he evidently did not have the courage to defy the Bourbons of his own party. What cowed him was undoubtedly the thought that he might be expressing doctrines which were irregular, heterodox, "revolutionary," from the official socialist point of view.

This makes the episode perhaps less disgraceful for Congressman London, but so much more so for the socialist movement of this country.—L. B. B.

Schenectady: Its Cause and Cure

THE issues involved in the Schenectady situation, both the narrow issues arising from the local situation as well as the wider issues of principle involved in the controversy, have now been treated at some length in this magazine. The Socialist Party point of view is presented in another part of this issue, where the general conclusion is reached that the Socialist Party was right in striving to control the acts of its elected officials and in expelling Dr. Lunn for refusing to be controlled.

But there is another aspect of the Schenectady case worth while looking into: the *reason* for Schenectady, and the way of avoiding its repetition. Why did Lunn act as he did, and what must be done, what *can* be done, in order to prevent other Lunn from doing the same thing in the future. The notion that it was just Lunn's "cussedness" that has put the party in a hole, and that the matter will settle itself if we are careful in the future to nominate better men, or "better Socialists" as some would say, is a very dangerous one to entertain. The fact is that what happened in Schenectady was bound to happen, and will happen again wherever the situation shall be duplicated, quite irrespective of the men involved.

What *was* the crux of the Schenectady situation, which was bound to cause the trouble? Why, simply this: the fact that the Socialist Party attempted to elect a Mayor at a time when there were not enough socialist votes to elect one with. Not having been elected by socialist votes Lunn could not be a socialist mayor. Of course, Lunn could not frankly take this position and still insist on his right of being regarded as a socialist mayor. But that was the real meaning of the allusion in one of his statements to the fact that *he* was elected while the rest of the ticket went down to defeat.

Lunn may be a poor Socialist, as he undoubtedly is; but he is a keen political logician. He knows the value and meaning of political facts. And the meaning of the fact thus alluded to by him is this: A party that does not itself and *unaided* possess the power to elect its candidates should not—it certainly *cannot*—control these candidates when elected. The Socialist Party did not have the power to elect a mayor of Schenectady, which is proven by the fact that it did not elect its other candidates. A large portion of those who voted for Lunn voted for *him* only and not for the Socialist Party. Lunn was in effect a "coalition" candidate, elected by a coalition of socialist and non-socialist votes. He therefore had the right, and, what is more, was under the *political necessity* of giving a coalition administration, which means a non-socialist administration, and Socialist Party control therefore became an absurdity.

Socialist Party control of its elected officials follows logically from the theory of socialist electoral campaigning. But it becomes illogical when that theory is not adhered to: When we lure non-socialists into voting for our candidate by presenting non-socialist issues or by making a non-socialist appeal for votes because our candidate is a "good man," it is unjust for the Socialist Party to demand, and absurd for it to expect, the control of the candidate elected by the aid of these votes. It can no more expect that than it could expect to control a "fusion" candidate. Lunn was in effect, though not in form, a "fusion" candidate. The campaign he

made was not a socialist campaign. And when he was elected he had the right to formally seal the non-socialist character of his candidacy and election by refusing to submit to that Socialist Party control which follows logically from the *socialist* kind of political action.

And the only way to avoid a repetition of the Schenectady incident is to avoid electing officials on Schenectady terms. If we cannot elect our candidates by our own strength it is not only unsocialistic, it is impolitic, and worse than useless to elect them. Instead of being a source of strength such premature "victories" are a source of weakness and disorganization.—L. B. B.

Popular Discontent in Germany

THE unity of *all* the German people in support of the war and the government is a very popular lie indulged in by pro-Germans who do not mind making free with the truth. This is a libel upon the German people; and the government of the Kaiser is doing its best to prove it to be a libel.

Item: Thirty-five German soldiers, including two officers, are alleged to have *been shot at the front* as a punishment for distributing among the troops a manifesto issued by the International Socialist Commission at Berne.

Item: The government arrested Karl Liebknecht for leading a May Day demonstration in Berlin—the charge "sedition." The Reichstag refused to release Liebknecht or to postpone his trial.

Item: The military in Mannheim used machine guns to quell "food rioters," killing and wounding 300 persons. Simultaneously with this report comes the resignation of Dr. Clemens Delbrueck, Minister of the Interior, who is being made the scapegoat for the food shortage in Germany, which is weighing terribly upon the working people.

We do not cite these items in proof of the barbarity of the German government or as the comment of events upon the war of "liberation and defense of our freedom"—this would be entirely superfluous. But we do cite these happenings as symptoms of discontent in Germany, proof of the awakening of the people, the augury of the revolt that may yet assume the dimensions of a revolution.—L. C. F.

Another Crime of A. F. of L. Bureaucracy

TWO thousand carpenters being on strike in New York City, William L. Hutchinson, International President of the Brotherhood of Carpenters, orders the strikers back to work. Hutchinson made an *oral* compromise with the employers, *without consulting the leaders of the strike*. When the strikers refused to return to work, Hutchinson sent a telegram to the Greater New York District Coun-

cil threatening suspension of all locals refusing to obey his orders. At first the district council remained neutral in the controversy, until compelled by the membership to act in the interests of the strikers.

The betrayal of strikes by craft union officials is not unusual in the American Labor movement. This is one of the greatest evils of craft unionism, and works unlimited injury to the interests of the working class generally. It is another illustration of the inadequacy of craft union organization and ideals to represent the interests of the workers.

It is interesting to observe that the New York *Call* publishes the facts of the controversy, but makes no editorial comment. But, then, it is well known that the *Call* has for some time past been edited primarily in the interests of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy, and only incidentally in the interests of Socialism and the working class.—L. C. F.

Stray Notes

Speaking to a committee of anti-militarists the other day, President Wilson said, in referring to compulsory military service, that his mind was "to let" on the subject. This was nothing new to those who have followed Mr. Wilson's career closely. There is hardly a subject on which his mind isn't "to let," or, at least, wasn't until recently. It would, however, be of great interest to find out what is the "rent reserved" on this particular subject.

Judge Peter A. O'Boyle, sitting in the naturalization court at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., announced that members of the Industrial Workers of the World *cannot obtain citizenship papers in his county*. This may sound strange to those who imagine that the naturalization laws are the same in Judge O'Boyle's county as in the rest of the United States. But Judge O'Boyle knows his rights. Our naturalization law makes every naturalization judge a petty czar in his own bailiwick, who may grant or withhold American citizenship at his own sweet will.

If some of our "leading socialists" had been half as ready to go to jail in the cause of the working class as they seem to be in the interest of birth control, the socialist movement in this country might have been less respectable but considerably more advanced than it is.

Mr. Gompers' candidacy for the bench seems to have had its effect upon his following. The editor of the New York *Call* suggests an application to the courts for relief as a possible means of combating the military laws recently passed by the New York Legislature. The judiciary must feel highly elated at this mark of confidence on the part of the principal organ of Socialism in the U. S. east of Milwaukee.

The Modern Robin Hood

By William C. Owen

William C. Owen is the English collaborator of the brothers Magon, editors of *El Regeneracion*, a paper published in the Spanish language in Los Angeles, California. The Magon brothers are in jail and Owen is under indictment. The charge against these three men is "using the mails to incite murder, arson and treason." One of the utterances cited in the indictments is as follows: "Enough of reforms. What we hungry people want is entire liberty based on our economic independence. Down with the so-called rights of private property; and, as long as this evil right continues to exist we shall remain under arms. Enough of mockery."

IT will be five years next October since I wrote, as editor of the English section of *Regeneracion*, a criticism of a leading article in the Los Angeles *Times*, which congratulated that city on "the sudden influx of members of the oldest and proudest families of Mexico;" families that, as the article remarked, "ranked right along with that of Diaz in the olden days." Having some local knowledge I analyzed that much-belauded influx and showed, for example, that its membership included a former governor of Guerrero who was then engaged in hawking Mexican properties for which he asked the trifle of \$50,000,000; another notorious land monopolist who had just sold one of his numerous estates for \$3,000,000, and dozens of other millionaire operators, all anxious to unload on the American public.

The *Times's* idea was that these millionaires would "in the future direct the development of their vast properties from Los Angeles, bringing here a wealth that cannot be estimated." I myself countered with the declaration that Los Angeles had been invaded, in reality, by a horde of pirates, whose one idea was that they would be able to live in luxurious security off the labor of their fellow countrymen, and that the United States government would help them to do it.

Nearly five years have passed and now I am invited to explain the phenomenon of "Pancho" Villa, and give my guess as to what will develop out of the punitive expedition sent in pursuit of that elusive gentleman. I refer with hesitation to my own writings, but it is impossible for me to put my views more forcibly than by stating that on almost every page of my book, "The Mexican Revolution," published in January, 1912, I iterated and reiterated my conviction that our government's sole and sovereign aim was the protection of the enormous properties Americans had acquired in Mexico; and that, however we might twist and compromise and spar for time, toward that one goal we should invariably head.

Time has but strengthened that conviction. During the past five years our policy has been always that of backing what looked, for the moment, like the winning horse. Among those who enjoyed a brief spell of patronage and material assistance at our hands, only to be tossed aside contemptuously when a rival, Carranza, appeared to have the

stronger hand, was Villa. Our government horsed him and our government unhorsed him. He has been strong enough to retaliate and make war on us.

Villa is, and has been for many years, a bandit. Mexico is full of bandits, as are the United States, England, Germany, and all civilized countries. But Villa has been a bandit of the mediaeval, Robin Hood type; a proletarian bandit, who made it his specialty to levy on the rich and divvy with the poor. Robin Hoods have always been popular with the masses, but modern civilization has shoved them to one side and given us in their stead the subtler gentry who rob under cover of the law. Mexico, on the other hand, has managed to preserve the state of things that prevailed in California during its much-lamented golden days, and it goes without saying that the last five years have been specially favorable for the manufacture of Villistas.

Unquestionably Villa is cruel toward his enemies; but a proletariat, when deeply stirred, is not easily shocked by that, as witness the human butchers whom the French Revolution worshipped. On the other hand, Villa is unquestionably courageous, and courage is what a proletariat in arms most needs, and, therefore, honors. Zapata is a leader of a similar type, and it seems to me that both he and Villa have precisely the make-up that insures wide popularity and a devoted following in all countries situated as Mexico now finds herself.

The Mexican is not to be measured by the foot-rule of the American business man, and still less by that of the American worker, drilled to the factory and wedded to mass action along constitutional lines. To understand the Mexicans you must study that obscure, and carefully-obscured, chapter of United States history which deals with the extermination of the North American Indian. It is against his blood-brother beyond the Rio Grande that we are now advancing; against fully ten millions of his brothers. What is really on the tapis is the greatest Indian war on record.

Like our own Indian the Mexican Indian is, first and foremost, an individualist; a man who believes in his own right arm; a man who considers that he must look to his own right arm to preserve his own individual liberty; a man, therefore, who does not fit easily into large combinations but does associate readily and closely with those who, for one reason or another, are his natural affinities; a man who is probably one of the most unreliable of regular soldiers and one of the most naturally-gifted of guerrilla fighters.

All this man's traditions, like those of his exterminated brother of the North, weld him to a most sim-

ple life, in which he works sparingly for himself. All his traditions teach him to hate, with a vehemence it has taken me years to fathom, the idea of toiling for foreign and absentee masters whose very names he does not know. Our own workers have grown accustomed to that and today regard it philosophically as an inevitable part of an eternally-established order. The Mexican has not passed through that thought-evolution, and my own personal opinion is that he should have access to the soil, by which he satisfies his simple wants; that the use of wood, water, and other elements should be free to him. Doubtless our own workers once felt that way, but so long ago that it is today little better than a dream; and I need hardly point out that such a philosophy finds scant favor with the great landlords whose estates are measured by leagues; with the syndicates that have harnessed the streams; with the lumber barons who have fenced in the forests; or with the oil and metal magnates whose empires are beneath our feet.

Various anecdotes now current suggest that Villa got a bad attack of swollen head. Perhaps. Why not? This simple bandit-peon suddenly found himself a hero; a power whom financiers courted; a military leader whom the direct representative of our own government, Gen. Scott, showered with gifts, as the old fur traders spread their offerings before the Indian chiefs whose good-will they desired to purchase. I have no doubt that Villa indulged himself in many grotesque extravagances, for he was noted as a free-handed spender. I should never expect that such a man's accounts would stand investigation.

But these are only passing follies, and the permanent character is the thing we must get at if we are to form a just estimate of Villa. That character, I am convinced—and I have talked with men who know him well—is basically proletarian, and nothing else; I. W. W., if you like to look at it that way; in closely-sympathetic touch with men in the rough, with the primarily virile instincts, with all that smug respectability abhors, with the very things to which such a government as that of the United States is constitutionally opposed. Madero sincerely admired us and our institutions, and events proved that he had no hold on the masses. Villa and Zapata instinctively hate us, and I, for my part, believe that their hold on the masses is proportionately great by reason of that very fact. I could fill this review with extracts from reliable authors all pointing to the same conclusion, but I notice that Lincoln Steffens, in "Everybody's," has expressed himself most vigorously to the same effect. And Blythe, in "The Saturday Evening Post," tells us that the Mexicans understand us even less than we understand them, which surely is saying much.

However, I question if that is correct. During

the last five years I have been meeting Mexicans from all parts of the country, and I have found them universally convinced that what suits us does not suit them, and that where we obtain a foothold they are thrust out into the cold. That seems to me a conviction worth nothing. That seems to me to settle the discussion on the possibilities of peaceable assimilation. Not, mind you, that the Mexicans would not gladly absorb all the labor-saving devices to which we may care to introduce them, for they are a people who have no hankering after work for work's own sake. But that they do have a most decided objection to our absorption of their country, and to our imposing on them a civilization by no means to their taste. Curiously enough I sympathize with them in this. Curiously enough I consider that we have rather overdone this business of looking on money-making as life's most sacred duty.

Shall we get out of Mexico? I think not, unless the Mexicans should show themselves the stronger and kick us out. Of course I understand the horror of what will be, of necessity, a war of extermination. Of course, also, I understand that thousands of peace-loving Americans will protest when they see clearly whither we are heading. But millions of similar humanitarians did not prevent the European war, and, picking up my latest copy of the "Los Angeles Times," I find the following editorial remark:

"As a matter of fact the present indications are that we shall remain in Mexico much longer than was originally intended. Gen. Scott has put his approval on a redistribution of troops that not only calls for more men than are now engaged in the campaign, but a redistribution that has an appearance of performance."

That, as it seems to me, is the program that will be put through, for the one thing that can stop it is a revolutionary United States, sick to death of the existing system and eager for its extirpation, root and branch. Such a United States does not exist, as yet.

The Toiler's Plaint

By J. Elmer Pfriem

TO toil incessantly while idlers sleep;
To sow the fields that other hands shall reap;
To make the wealth that unto wealth
shall go;

To fashion pleasures other men shall know;
To live and play the beggar's rôle in life,
The nether dog in man's ignoble strife,—
Such is my lot, compelled by Fate to be
A slave of wage until Eternity.

War and the Workers in Canada

By W. E. Hardenburg

JUST what a good sized war would mean to the working class organizations in the United States may be fairly well conjectured from what it has meant, so far, to similar organizations in Canada. The war has endured now something over twenty months, so that one has had, by this time, a fair opportunity to get a proper perspective of the reaction it has had.

The boom period had already passed and the corresponding depression had made its appearance about a year previously to August, 1914. The hard times had even then, to some degree, disintegrated many of the mushroom-like and sporadic locals formed at various points throughout the Dominion by both the Socialist and Social-Democratic parties. The labor unions, too, had begun to lose many members by emigration to the United States and other countries, due to the general slackness of employment, and things generally were not going any too well with the workers when the European war broke out.

The first effect of the war was, of course, to check still further the customary development work, which for several years previously had formed the chief source of employment in the west. Cities and municipalities generally halted their construction programs and unemployment soon became accentuated, despite the rush of enlistment and the internment of quite a number of Austrians and Germans.

The effect of this, of course, was still further to weaken the unions and Socialist branches. Many workers made their way to the United States about this time, while others who did not have the fare, were faced with the alternative of enlisting or else having recourse to charitable associations, which, naturally, were not very eager to help any able-bodied men fit for military service.

A strong inducement with many for enlisting was the comparatively generous financial arrangements. The Canadian soldier receives \$1.10 per day, and, if he has any dependents, these receive, in addition to an assignment of part of the soldier's pay, a substantial benefit from the national patriotic fund, so that it frequently happened that a soldier and his family received a considerably greater income if he enlisted than if he remained at work, providing he were fortunate enough to have a job.

At the present time, due largely to the heavy enlistment and also to the fairly heavy emigration, the unemployment question is not nearly so serious as, say, a year ago. Indeed, in some lines, it is stated that workers are comparatively scarce, this applying

more particularly to trades connected with the manufacture of war materials and to farm laborers.

On the whole, however, it cannot be said that there is as yet anything like a general shortage of labor. That this is so is shown by the fact that wages are still very far below what they were two or three years ago in nearly all trades. Most of the building trades are now working at a figure considerably below the regular scale, and there seems to be no doubt that this is generally the case.

Hard as the war has hit organized labor, the blow to unorganized labor has been even more severe. Employers nearly everywhere at once took advantage of the stagnation that followed the war to lower wages in all departments, and in but very few cases have they been raised since, the unorganized workers having no means of compelling the employers to restore them, even now.

A very noticeable tendency has manifested itself lately, in many occupations, to employ women in preference to men. Thus, for example, women reporters are being used to quite a large extent to replace men who have quit. This is, no doubt, being done for pecuniary as well as for patriotic reasons.

Conditions seem to be mending rather more rapidly in the East than in the West. This is due, doubtless, to the fact that there is as yet little industrial development work in the West, the chief resource of labor there in the past having been construction work, of which there was a great deal during the boom period. New cities were being built yearly, new railways were constantly being constructed and development of a similar nature was taking place everywhere. Now all this has ceased. In the East, on the other hand, where a large quantity of war material of various sorts is being produced, the general impression seems to be that things are steadily improving.

One of the most interesting phases of war developments in Canada is to be seen in the phenomenal rise in the cost of living. According to the March report of the Department of Labor, the index number of wholesale prices for that month stood at 176.4, as compared with 137.0 for March, 1914. At the end of the same month, the cost of an average weekly food budget was estimated at \$8.36, as compared with \$7.88 in March, 1915, and \$7.74 for the preceding year.

When it is considered that wages in most occupations are still at about the same figure as they were placed at soon after the war started, it will readily be understood that a very perceptible decrease in the

general standard of living has taken place. Many luxuries and, perhaps, in many cases, some necessities have been cut out.

Whether Socialism is to be classed with luxuries or not is a debatable question, depending, of course, upon the point of view. In any case, it is certain that Socialism has to some extent been cut out also. In other words, agitation has been largely suspended and the Socialist and union papers have had an exceedingly hard time. Many have suspended, while others have grown so attenuated that their strongest "boosters" hardly recognize them. A large number of propagandists have left the country.

Shortly after war was declared the sedition statutes, long more or less of a dead letter, began to be applied, as a result of the foolish utterances of occasional German sympathizers. Socialist organizers were still, however, allowed a reasonable freedom of utterance until the *Lusitania* was torpedoed, when public resentment against anything even remotely smacking of disrespect to the flag became acute. Wilfred Gribble, a well known agitator, was given two months at St. John, N. B., for averring that "The King is a puppet," and a few similar remarks. He was later released on representations made to the Minister of Justice by the Dominion Trades and Labor Congress. John Reid was sentenced to fifteen months at Red Deer, Alberta, for having made statements said to have been false regarding the South African war. It must be remarked, however, that in some cases, at least, of prosecution of Socialists for sedition, the speakers seemed to be more or less looking for trouble.

However, not all the Socialist speakers are in jail. A few organizers are still on the job, and that the organizations are not entirely dead is shown by the generous fund raised to defend Reid. The *Western Clarion*, official organ of the Socialist party, still appears regularly each month, although the *Canadian Forward*, the Social-Democratic organ, has not appeared for the last few weeks.

There is no doubt, however, that the membership of both parties has greatly decreased. While the writer has no knowledge of the exact figures, he would not be surprised if the membership of both parties today were only half that of three or four years ago. Quite a sprinkling of former members of both have donned the khaki, others have left the country, and still others, their locals being broken up, have ceased to pay dues.

Conditions among the unions are very similar. So far as is known, there have been no regular figures kept as to the number of trade union members who have enlisted. The number, however, must be considerable. In the city of Calgary, the largest city of Alberta, the total trade union membership prior to the war was something over 3,000. It is estimated now by union officials that considerably over 500

have enlisted so far, and the real number is, doubtless, rather in excess of this figure. The enrollment in other sections of the Dominion would probably parallel this, so that, as the total trade union membership in Canada is somewhere around 100,000, a conservative estimate of unionists that have enlisted would be, say, 20,000.

That the working class, as a whole, responded readily to the call for soldiers is evidenced by the fact that up to the end of March, according to official reports, no fewer than 300,000 men had been enrolled, exclusive of the French, British, Italian and other reservists called home by their respective governments. The average Canadian worker is today deeply imbued with patriotic feelings, so much so, in fact, that strike proposals have on some occasions been voted down by the unionists themselves on the ground that there should be no internal strife during the war. This has not, of course, been the case everywhere and a few minor strikes have taken place, but, on the whole, unfavorable economic conditions and the patriotic spirit mentioned have greatly reduced these manifestations of the class struggle, or as some term it, the commodity struggle.

There is no doubt that the war is bringing in millions to all employers in any way connected with the manufacture of war supplies. Recent parliamentary exposures have revealed the fact that, at any rate, in the first stages of the war, a lot of faulty material was turned over to the troops. Whether this is still going on or not, it is hard to say, but it is certain that many Eastern concerns are making enormous profits out of the struggle.

One phase of the war developments that bodes evil for the future of the country is the probable growth of an armament ring after the conflict. The manufacture of munitions has so absorbed many manufacturers in the East that powerful vested interests have been created that will in future insist upon more contracts, in the same way as the armament ring in Europe and the United States. Thus the seeds of future militarism in Canada are being sown.

The only thing that will halt such a development after the war will be a strong working class movement. While conditions at present do not look very encouraging from a Socialist standpoint, it is believed, however, that things are more hopeful than they appear outwardly. It seems probable that while immigration, the secret of the boom a few years ago, will be resumed to some extent, it will be several years before economic conditions in Canada get back to normal. In the meantime, the 300,000 soldiers returning from the front will, when they face once more, after their experiences in the war, the stern conditions of wage servitude, do so with a frame of mind considerably more receptive toward the doctrine of the class war.

A Progressive God

By Elsie Clews Parsons

IN this century and in this country we appear to consider supernaturalism but little. We are a practical people, perhaps we say, or, more capriciously disposed, a material people. At any rate we rarely depend upon the gods. We do not deny them but we pay little or no attention to them. Their police function they in part retain. Except for the disciplining of children and of other dependent or subject classes, however, they have gone out of our life.

There are many reasons for this disuse of the gods, but one of the foremost is, I think, their failure to change, to keep pace with the changes that have occurred in our culture. It is far more difficult, of course, for a god to change his nature than for the proverbial leopard to change his spots. One of the divine attributes in fact is unchangeableness. An important function of the Deity is to give his worshippers a sense of stability, an assurance against the dynamics of nature or society. The steadfastness and everlastingness of the immortals gives of itself this assurance to mortals.

In his terror of facing change early man went great lengths; he submitted himself to all kinds of tyrannies, secular and sacred. In return he asked of his administrators, particularly of his sacred administrators, great conservatism. They had to lend a supernatural sanction to custom; against its violators divine wrath and vengeance had to be wreaked. Up to their worshippers' demand to keep things as they were the gods had to live. Would they stay in their heaven they had to hold that all's right with the world.

Now in modern culture man's attitude towards change has altered. We are less fearful of the novel or unforeseen. Consequently we require less conservatism of others, including the gods. As far as we are concerned they need not be merely backers of things as they are. We are not. In order to remain in our image, they must become backers of things as things will be. In brief, to recover their normal anthropomorphic relationship to men the gods must develop, they must slough off their old conservative functions and take on new,—new functions of radicalism and progress. Such re-made gods, gods of things as they are about to be, futurist gods, so to speak, would readily find a place in modern society.

For the gods lost their place not because men became less credulous of divinity, but because men are ever such pragmatists. When the gods could not prove their worth, they had to sink into obscurity or depart into remoteness. Let them once again show what is in them and they will be reinstated in their

ancient positions of dignity and honor. Servants of man though they be, man will again call himself their servant. "Not as I will, but as God wills," he is sure to say. "With God's help I will accomplish the impossible, with God's help I will win, I will conquer." Once he feels that his will is re-enforced by God's will, you may be sure he will not hold Deity in light esteem. Modern man is still willing to believe what he wishes to believe, what it does him good to believe. Very readily will he produce a new theology to explain and strengthen his renewed partnership with God.

In the old theology the overthrow of the doctrine of predestination should have been a signal to the gods or their representatives that the ancient partnership was breaking, that men were becoming dissatisfied with their divine servants. The rebellion meant that worshippers no longer took comfort in the feeling that what was to be had to be. Such complete shifting to others of responsibility for the future men no longer welcomed. Their will to power over change was aroused. They sought to be masters of their fate.

If at this time theologians had appreciated the magnitude of the change in attitude, they would have been prompt to declare that the future was indeed not altogether in God's hands. It depended on men, too, on men's co-operation with God, God being willing enough to share responsibility.

Reluctantly, tardily the theologians did indeed make this concession to the masterful new spirits, but the concession was made too late to recover lost dominion. What had happened? In the scientific world the doctrine of evolution had been formulated and this doctrine or dogma rapidly began to secure to itself the devotion once given God.

The emotional successes of evolutionary theory were not surprising. Its very kinship to the determinism of predestination made it a formidable rival. It required only a slight adaptation of men's minds. It was quite as teleological as the old system of divinity, substituting merely an impersonal for a personal purpose or will. Although it recognized change, its recognition was highly restricted, for it recognized only well-ordered change. The change it acknowledged was progress, change in desirable direction. Waywardness or deterioration was an anathema to the ardent evolutionist convert as to the old-time religionist.

Again the theologians were dull. Instead of appropriating the doctrine of evolution, they damned it, they set up an antagonism between it and supernaturalism, an antagonism that in subsequent years

was to appear to theology itself quite uncalled for. All that was necessary to reconcile "science" and religion was to call evolution a divine method—one of God's instruments. But again when the reconciliation came it came too late. People had got on too long and too satisfactorily as godless evolutionists to feel the need of reintroducing God into their universe.

Of recent years the dogma of evolution has been called into question. As applied to the human mind at least, it has been somewhat discredited. Many anthropologists hold that the human mind has not evolved—at least since its achievements have been put on record. This conclusion is necessarily a blow to educator and to social reformer. Their faith will

be at a low ebb once this non-evolutionary tenet is popularized. In self-protection they will seek new sources of inspiration. Then will be the psychological moment for the making of the new god, the god of progress, the god who will accept change and sanction it, the god who will make life pleasanter for radicals and reformers, who will intensify their faith and confirm their devotion.

Already the metaphysic of ethnology is ripe for this divine appearance. Mind evolves not, but culture does evolve, certain ethnologists are declaring. Culture is an entity, I heard one of them not long since asserting; culture is a self-determining entity—"call it God if you like."

Hyphenism

By Edward G. Cox

HOW large a part is played in our mental processes by metaphors we are little aware until we begin to question the motives behind public utterances. And until we begin to test the adequacy of the application and to see how far the term covers the field we likewise remain unconscious of the distorting quality of such a medium.

So it is with one of the late additions to our list of political shibboleths—Hyphenated-Americans. The thing is old, for we have long had them with us, but the word is new. The precise content of the term, however, is seldom analyzed by those who bandy it about, partly because they are satisfied to rely upon the hypnotic power of figurative language, partly because, being of the bourgeois temper of mind, they are accustomed to take their cue from others, and partly because they are ignorant of the workings of social forces.

That these people have not the slightest inkling of the manifold implications wrapped up in the meaning of the word and in the making of the product is evident from the ease with which they judge and denounce their fellow men. But if it were generally agreed that he who stigmatized another as a Hyphenated-American should be compelled to lay bare his conceptions of true Americanism and to show wherein the other fell short, we could rest assured that the charge would not often be made.

For few there are who are bold and earnest enough to venture into the labyrinthian intricacy of the concept Americanism. That the average definition would be incomplete could be reasonably expected, since the best of us contact with but a small portion of the whole sum of national factors. The social mind of a great nation, the total mass of common beliefs, sentiments, standards, and institutions, is so enormous that only a tiny part can be in an individual consciousness at a given moment."

The set of ideas that are at the top vary with the hour, the section of the country, and the mode of getting one's living. Moreover Americanism must be differentiated from Britishism, Gallicism, Germanism; otherwise the result would be merely nationalism, which is radically an instinctive feeling for group loyalty found in all peoples.

Obviously then, if there be such a quality or mode of action as Americanism, it must be that which both allows the existence of, and persists after the removal of, the divisions that separate us into North and South, East and West, political parties and social strata, and what not. And even more difficult of determination, and yet as important, is averaging up the contribution to the ideals, manners, morals, institutions, and conduct informing the native population made by the total sum of culture brought us by the foreigner.

Evidently the man who would define the essential character of our national being must be very alert to the constant shifting going on in the complexus of society. The majority of people, however, make the mistake of failing to realize that our national being is as dynamic as life itself. In addition to the changes working away in ideals and *mores* as they obey the influences exerted by modifying economic and ideologic activities, there are the variations introduced by the ceaseless influx of newcomers with their differential viewpoints of class and race. And these last may so preponderate that they will swing us away to an ideal but faintly resembling that which we cherish today. Hence it is imperative to realize that, as new leaven is constantly being kneaded into the lump, all definitions may at any moment undergo re-defining.

Yet beneath the charges implied in the term Hyphenated-Americans is a large, chaotic mass of facts standing in an undigested relationship to social laws.

It is undeniable that we have a large body of unassimilated foreigners. But what is not so readily recognized is that we, not they, are to blame; for we, more than they, control the workings of our social and economic laws. Again the man in the street neglects to consider the fact that the problem of assimilation cannot be profitably discussed apart from its concrete relations to modes of earning a living. This, I fancy, does not present itself to the mind of the average editor who declaims against the refusal of the foreigner to become Americanized. Nor is it likely to be included in the program of that society formed recently for de-hyphenating this same class.

I need scarcely ask does Dr. Jordan intend to take an unassimilated foreigner into his house, or set him amid surroundings calculated to inspire him to his noblest, or to connect him up with all the social amenities of refined American life. He will more probably lecture him on the abstract duties of American citizenship, and then allow him to go back to his work, if he is fortunate enough to have any, in the mine, on the railroad, or in the lumber camp, where he will find these same duties notably violated.

No, our failure to assimilate rapidly and thoroughly the incoming masses is not to be mended by lectures and night schools in citizenship. Nor does the crux lie in mere numbers or mere quality. And when we consider the alarming increase of native intelligent Americans shut out of employment and debarred by property qualifications from voting, serving on juries, and performing other duties supposedly the heritage of citizenship, then we can scarcely hope to see the literacy test of the new immigration bill relieve us of further worry. What we need above all is to understand the situation as it is and how it has become what it is. One means to this end is a study of the changes in attitude and in conditions of living, and a knowledge of social psychology.

In 1790, when this nation numbered some 4,000,000 people, it was unthinkable that the incoming tide would ever assume a volume capable of threatening our integrity as a nation. But in 1910, the date of the last census, the presence of over 13,000,000 foreign-born people, equal to one-seventh of our total population at that time, made us realize as never before that we now have a racial movement freighted with the gravest social concern.

It is now past thinking, whether for good or ill, that we as a nation will ever be a racial unit. So long as we had plenty of free land we had little difficulty in making over the new arrivals into something conformable with the American type. And out of faith in our ability to handle any number and to subdue the most refractory, along with a commendable sympathy for peoples fleeing from persecution, arose a policy of holding the doors open wide for all

comers. As a magazine of the ante-bellum days put it: Let the filth and the scum of the earth come over; we can take care of them.

Had immigration remained a natural movement, free from the artificial stimulus of greed and selfishness operative in industrial and transportation companies, the difficulties could have been met more successfully. As Fairchild has pointed out in his book on Immigration, with the population growing far in excess of the amount of land left unclaimed and unoccupied, the issues of the contact of races are daily growing more manifold and involved.

A mere glance at the last census figures of the predominant races now resident in the country will reveal the size of our melting pot and the startling need of some mighty powerful solvents in the way of social and economic legislation and reconstruction. Austria with its polyglot peoples has representatives numbering over 1,000,000 individuals, Germany over 2,500,000, Italy over 1,340,000, Poland over 1,000,000, Russia over 1,600,000, Ireland over 1,350,000, England over 800,000, Sweden over 665,000, Norway over 403,000, and so on. Not only is the size and diversity of the foreign element entering the country increasing, but also, as we are frequently warned, the bulk of this element is coming from the backward civilizations of Europe.

Now let us see how the United States appreciates its fearful responsibility toward humanity by so disposing of this vast number of aliens, the dispossessed of the earth, as to secure a product that will be properly stamped at least with the impress of American citizenship. If we were sufficiently alive to our duty we would contrive that they got started right by insisting on transportation conditions which, instead of destroying the beckoning vision of their future home, would leave them confirmed in their best hopes. Then after they had landed, we would exercise a paternal care over them, distributing them to places best calculated to serve our mutual needs, instead of abandoning them to the mercy of the first directing agency they meet, which is usually tied up with robbery and exploitation.

These preliminary steps, however, I fear we are taking very haltingly, preferring to leave to private philanthropy what should be a governmental work. We allow them to follow their natural bent of seeking out their own kind, to collect in compact colonies where they can dispense with a knowledge of English, and to perpetuate the customs and standards of living that continually remind them of their racial isolation. Thus is generated that "false temporizing atmosphere" that Broughton Brandenburg speaks of. To quote further from his work "Imported Americans":

"Just when we thought ourselves in the genuine atmosphere of the life of the Italian immigrant in the New World, we found we were merely in that

false temporizing atmosphere which he creates for himself and fellows, and from which he emerges only when he has become Americanized. In a few minutes we understood that the greater portion of the conditions, habits, and operations which we had observed while living with them in the tenement district of New York City grew out of a feeling among them that they were merely temporizing here; that they had come to America to make a few hundred dollars to send or to take back to Italy; and that it did not make much difference what they ate, wore, or did, just so long as they got the money and got back. We could plainly see why it was that they had not risen above that state until they had been attracted and drawn into the real American life about them and had decided to remain." (P. 32.)

Furthermore the deadly poison of slum life is allowed to eat into their existence, vitiating all their endeavors to be honest, clean, and thrifty, and impressing them with the hard, seamy phases of American life. Manifestly to expect good types of citizenship to flourish in the slums is to look for grapes from thorns, for no one can rise higher than his ideals.

The second generation accordingly is started out hopelessly handicapped. The children grow up during their most impressionable period in a home life that is distinctly un-American. They have few or no playmates among the native children, for the latter, following the example of their elders, look down upon the foreigner. And finally they are denied participation in one of the most energizing of American influences, i. e., the playgrounds of our public schools, in that they attend schools which are largely composed of aliens like themselves. Generally, too, this period of schooling is short, because they are put out to work as early as possible to help eke out the family income.

Another influential factor preventing the foreigner from merging his life interests with ours is the want of a home life. Under the present terms of bourgeois society, which subordinates the man to the product and to profits, the vast majority of unskilled immigrants do not receive high enough wages to enable men, if married, to bring their families in, and if single, to marry. Consequently in mining and manufacturing towns the social instinct and the need of economy leads to accommodations of large numbers in "bacheling quarters" or in boarding houses run by a man and wife of the same nationality. From such an arrangement encouragement to take root is absent. All their interests—their conversations, amusements, christenings, weddings, naturally hark back to their home land. The same situation, only more aggravated, obtains among the migratory and seasonal laborers in construction and lumber camps.

With everything making against free social intercourse between the native and the foreign population, with municipalities neglecting to provide suitable outlets for the recreative instincts, with industrialism casting out to the scrap-heap the worn-out material it has gathered from all parts of the world, how can we logically indict the immigrant for failing to be "attracted and drawn in to the real American life about him"? Little wonder we complain of indigestion in our national being.

Mere residence in the United States has not the potency fondly imagined by the unthinking man to transform in the course of a lifetime the social heredity of countless generations, especially when all the environing influences at work are hostile to the desired transformation. It is the height of ignorance to expect the mental habits and national customs, the results of long, deep-seated inheritance, to disappear the moment a man sets foot upon our soil, or to alter themselves in a generation or two even under the most favorable circumstances. Here it is that the general ignorance of social psychology works its havoc.

The American bourgeois is born into institutions with well-established habits. Even though he should change from one occupation to another or pass from one class to another, he never feels that he is disconnected from the phenomenon of group life.

What it really means to an immigrant accustomed to an agricultural economy, for instance, to find himself transplanted into a manufacturing existence, or to turn his back upon a mode of living bright with outdoor sociability for one deadly monotonous and repressed, or to find that social honors in his native land count for nothing here, he alone knows best. But this we should know. There cannot help but result a certain loss of direction, a certain amount of drifting upon letting go of the guidance of tradition, systems of thought, and familiar objectives. These loose ends we must catch hold of and tie up with the purposes controlling the social and economic activities of their new home, if we would avoid the terrible waste of energy and spirit prevailing in the present system.

Assimilation must be taken to mean then, not an external conformity to a conventional type of conduct or expression created by popular prejudice, but an absorption into the body politic comparable to that of food into the body physical. And if our national being is in a good state of health, it will prove able to digest an enormous amount and variety of cultural matter and, according to the nature of things, it will utilize only that which it needs for its upbuilding. What really matters is not that the status quo be preserved, but that the resulting tissue, bone, and blood be sound and healthy. But I fear that the surgeon's knife is needed first.

The Issue in Schenectady:

A Socialist View

By L. B. Boudin

IT is a great pity that Dr. Hourwich should have deliberately thrown away the opportunity of discussing the really important subject announced in the heading of his article in the last issue of the *NEW REVIEW: The Issue in Schenectady*, and should, instead, have made a rather cheap attack upon the Socialist Party. This is doubly to be deplored. In the first place, because this unfortunate start is bound to affect unfavorably the progress of the further discussion, as such discussions very seldom rise above the level of their source; and, secondly, because it leaves the discussion *upon the merits*, if one is to be had, entirely one-sided. I feel that something *could* be said on Dr. Hourwich's side of the question, if that side were represented by somebody who really wanted to discuss the subject on its merits, instead of merely "rubbing it in" to the Socialist Party.

Notwithstanding this handicap, I shall attempt to present the real issues involved in this controversy and point out the lesson to be drawn from this unfortunate affair.

But first of all let me state the facts. This is particularly necessary in view of the well, let us say, *careless* manner in which Dr. Hourwich has handled the facts in the case.

During Dr. Lunn's first term of office as Mayor of Schenectady the party was confronted with a situation with which it is almost certain to be confronted whenever it attempts to play "practical politics" and nominate some popular "man of the hour" who is willing to call himself a Socialist and run on its ticket, in the hope of thus achieving the practical successes so ardently desired by our "practical men." The underlying "strategy" of such politics is the fact that the man nominated is expected to draw the votes of many non-socialists. This "strategy" requires certain "tactics" during the campaign as well as after election. During the campaign we must shelve our socialist principles and side-track purely working-class issues in favor of such general "reform" issues as "decency," "anti-graft," etc., etc. And the character of the "socialist" administration which follows a successful electoral campaign upon such issues must be in keeping with them.

One of the by-products of the Lunn candidacy and of the Lunn campaign was a plentiful crop of non-socialist officials appointed by the socialist Mayor. This scandalized the "old-fashioned" socialists who abided in the old-fashioned belief that a socialist Mayor must give a socialist administration and that a socialist administration could only be given by

Socialists. It may also have disappointed some of the more "practical" of Lunn's own following to whom political victory without office may have looked too much like pure "theory." There was, therefore, general dissatisfaction.

It was said that the many appointments of non-socialists to office was due to pre-election "commitments" on the part of the candidate, and also to his desire to build up a political "machine" of his own, or at least to a desire on his part to "mend his fences" with a view to re-election. It is not necessary, however, to enter upon a discussion of this personal aspect of the situation. We may give Dr. Lunn the benefit of the doubt and assume that he has acted throughout in the most unselfish manner. But a man may be entirely unselfish and yet have peculiar views as to the functions of a socialist city administration. A man may be the very embodiment of unselfishness and yet have an eye for the exigencies of the next electoral campaign. Not his own re-election, mind you,—or, at least, not his own re-election for *his* own sake,—but the continued holding by his party of the "political vantage ground" once obtained, etc. And it was quite evident that Dr. Lunn *had* peculiar views as to the functions of a socialist municipal administration, and a rather keen eye for the exigencies of the next electoral campaign.

The situation was a nasty one. But there was nothing that the party organization in the State could do to remedy it. Lunn still apparently had behind him the majority of the local organization, so that any attempt to discipline him would have meant the disruption of the local movement under circumstances which would have alienated from the party what seemed at least to be the majority of the Socialists in Schenectady. But, above all, there were the cries of "efficiency," "democracy," "home rule," and the other pretty names that could be invented to cover up the rotten business. Had the state organization attempted to do something in Schenectady contrary to the Lunn current, it would have brought upon itself the wrath not only of all the "practical men" in the party, in this State and throughout the Union, but also the denunciation of such "radicals" as Dr. Hourwich.

Fortunately, the Mayor's term in Schenectady lasts only two years, and at the next election Dr. Lunn was not re-elected. And Dr. Lunn out of office is quite a different proposition from Dr. Lunn in office. The following "rules and regulations" covering the question of appointments was thereupon

formulated, not only with the consent, but the active co-operation of Dr. Lunn, and made part of the State Constitution of the Socialist Party of the State of New York:

(Article 8, Section 4, Subdivision a.)

"Elected socialist officials shall submit the names of the proposed or contemplated appointments for heads of departments, members of mayor's cabinet, commissioners, deputies and members of commissions or any other appointees to positions of administrative or executive character for the approval of the local or county organization. If said local or county organization shall disapprove of any proposed appointments, it may submit its choice of appointment to the said elected official. In case of further disagreement, the local or county organization and the elected officials have the right to appeal to the State Executive Committee.

(Subdivision b.)

"No public official elected on the socialist ticket shall have the right to appoint without the approval of the State Executive Committee a person who is not a dues paying member of the Socialist Party for at least two years to a non-competitive position under his jurisdiction."

Such was the declared policy and organic law of the Socialist Party of this State at the time Dr. Lunn accepted his third nomination from that party, which resulted in his election as Mayor of Schenectady for the second time. A policy and law declared and adopted after long discussions by the entire membership, and, as already stated, with the active co-operation of Dr. Lunn himself.

Dr. Hourwich, in touching upon this point, says:

"Dr. Lunn claims, however, to have told the local in open meeting that he would accept the mayoralty nomination upon the express condition only that he should not be bound by that rule. This claim has not been denied by his accusers."

I do not know whether this claim, if made by Dr. Lunn, has been denied "by his accusers." I do know, however, that if the claim were based on fact, this would furnish the best possible reason for reorganizing Local Schenectady. The State Constitution is adopted by the membership of the entire State, and it is as binding on Local Schenectady as it is on Dr. Lunn. Dr. Lunn could no more make an arrangement with Local Schenectady to "suspend" the Constitution in this particular than, say, Congressman London could make an arrangement with his Congressional District organization to suspend that part of the National Constitution of the Socialist Party forbidding socialist officials to vote any funds for military purposes. Imagine Congressman London voting for the preparedness bill and pleading in extenuation an absolution from his "local organization!"

That Dr. Lunn himself did not consider this ar-

rangement,—if it ever was entered into,—of any moment whatever is shown by his subsequent course.

On December 27, 1915, Dr. Lunn, recognizing the binding effect upon him of the provisions of the State Constitution with respect to appointments to office, wrote to the State Executive Committee asking their consent to the appointment of the following non-socialists to office:

W. Thomas Wooley, for City Engineer.

Frank Cooper, for Corporation Counsel.

Robert T. Hill, for Commissioner of Charities.

C. C. McWilliams, for Superintendent of Water.

Robert Bedford, for Track Inspector.

The reason given for the appointment in each instance but one was that of "efficiency."

The one exception was in the last-named appointment. The office is the least important of the five, carrying the smallest salary and requiring no expert knowledge. It would have looked rather absurd to claim that no party member could be found who could adequately fill the office. The reason assigned was therefore one of "state" instead of "efficiency," and I shall reproduce it *verbatim* from Dr. Lunn's communication to the State Executive Committee, as it is very interesting in view of the claims subsequently made by Dr. Lunn and his defenders.

"For Track Inspector,—says Dr. Lunn in that communication,—*we* have selected an enrolled Socialist and the conclusion to appoint him was arrived at after a committee of the railway men's union composed of the president and other officials urged his appointment. They did not urge it as officials, for, as you know, the union does not enter into politics, so-called. I believe that his appointment would be carrying out the desire to bring into closer relationship the unions and the party."

Bedford was, therefore, concededly appointed for "political" reasons, and not because of any considerations of "efficiency."

When this communication reached the State Executive Committee there was no time to make any inquiries as to the fitness of the men appointed, nor as to the condition of affairs with respect to the "availability" of party members for any of these offices. Nor did the Committee know whether or not Local Schenectady had been consulted in the matter, as required by the Constitution, although the "*we* have selected" was calculated to create the impression that Local Schenectady approved of these appointments. The State Executive Committee therefore gave its consent to all of the appointments, in so far as the question of their being non-socialists were concerned (under subdivision (b) above quoted), but expressly reserved to itself the right to pass on their fitness, if Local Schenectady should object, under the provisions of subdivision (a) of the Section of the Constitution quoted above.

At about the same time that Lunn asked for the consent of the State Executive Committee to these appointments on account of their being non-socialists, he also submitted them for *approval* to Local Schenectady under the general provisions of the constitution for the control of appointments. Local Schenectady approved the first two appointments, and disapproved of the other three; and, under the provision of the Constitution, made its own nominations for these three offices. The matter thus came back to the Executive Committee for decision on the three appointments in question. In the course of the hearings had by the State Executive Committee on the subject,—both sides being represented,—it appeared that Mr. Bedford was not merely a non-socialist, but that he was active in the campaign against our candidate for Assembly, Comrade Merrill. Also, that instead of his appointment being desired by organized labor, so that his appointment “would be carrying out the desire to bring into closer relationship the unions and the party” the very reverse was the fact. The trade-unionists of Schenectady, or at least the vast majority of them, were actually opposed to his appointment. There certainly seemed no earthly reason why this man should be honored by an appointment at the hands of a socialist Mayor,—except the reason suggested by Lunn’s opponents, that Lunn was discharging a pre-election “commitment.”

On this state of facts the State Executive Committee refused to interfere with Lunn in *the two important appointments*,—those of Commissioner of Charities and Water Inspector,—in which “efficiency” and “good government” reasons were urged by him. But it asked him to remove the man selected for the unimportant office of Track Inspector, where the only reasons urged by him were concededly “political,” and therefore highly reprehensible from his own as well as from Dr. Hourwich’s point of view. This decision was approved by the whole State Committee. The State organization decided that it wouldn’t play “politics” with this appointment, at least not Lunn politics.

Lunn then defied the State organization and refused to carry out its decision. Charges were thereupon preferred against him for violating the State Constitution, and he was *found guilty* as charged after a trial by his own Local. A motion was then made to expel him, and this motion was *carried* by a majority vote. He was not expelled, however, because it was claimed in his behalf that under the rules of Local Schenectady a vote of expulsion requires a *two-thirds* majority, which the vote to expel him did not receive. Thereupon the State Committee revoked the charter of Local Schenectady and reorganized it with only those members who expressed their willingness to abide by the provisions of the Constitution.

Dr. Hourwich does not like this procedure, and

says that this was “circumventing” the Constitution, and he conjures up the shade of De Leon to frighten us away from such a proceeding. Dr. Hourwich may be familiar with some socialist history in this country, but he is surely unacquainted with the Constitution of which he speaks, and his sense of the fitness of things in a socialist party is evidently not overdeveloped. Far from being a circumvention of the State Constitution, the action of the State Committee was in accordance with the express provisions of that Constitution. For that Constitution expressly provides for the revocation of the charter and the reorganization of any Local which fails to punish a member who has violated any provisions of the Constitution. A provision intended to cover just such a situation as has arisen in Schenectady.

The State Committee therefore clearly acted within the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. And the provisions of the Constitution which it carried out is clearly a salutary one. For, otherwise, how could the Constitution be enforced against the wishes of any Local? Supposing that Lunn had accepted an endorsement or nomination from one of the old parties, when he was up for election, and Local Schenectady had refused to expel him, should the State organization be helpless in the matter and shouldn’t it be able to rid itself of such an undesirable citizen?

This disposes of the *Lunn* case. But it does not dispose of the questions of principle and policy involved: Who *should* have the determining voice in the matter of appointment in a socialist administration, and why? Forgetting about Mr. Lunn and the N. Y. State Constitution,—if we were to start out with a “clean slate” to prescribe “rules and regulations” covering the subject, what *ought* we to do? Should we leave the matter to the Mayor, or whatever the executive official in question may be,—or should the party have a voice in the matter, and if so, through what agency?

The question, when carefully analyzed, comes back to the old problem of autocracy versus democracy. Not, of course, in the old form of an absolute king versus the rule of the people, but in its modern form of “The Good Man versus The Party.” It is useless to enter here upon a discussion of the “pros” and “cons” of this ancient controversy,—we are committed to democracy. Not because we believe democracies to be perfect. On the contrary, we freely admit that they are often stupid and at times corrupt. We may even concede, for the sake of the argument, that benevolent despotism is the best form of government conceivable. But since there is no guarantee of a despot’s “benevolence,” we prefer to take our chance on the other side. And not only as to a hereditary ruler, but also as to an elected one. It used to be said that an Englishman is a king on election day and a slave the rest of the time. Modern democracies want the electorate to be king all the

time. Hence, such devices as the initiative, referendum, and recall,—the purpose of which is to transform the elected official from an absolute monarch into a constitutional ruler. It is true that most Mugwumps believe in “large powers and great responsibility” for elected officials,—to be elected for as long terms as possible, but then,—Socialists are not Mugwumps, nor have Mugwumps ever been considered models of democracy.

“Good Man” government may be the ideal form of government. But there is no more guarantee of men being “good” than of despots being benevolent. We must therefore have “constitutional” guarantees,—that is, we must control our “men” while in office, and while exercising their function of office, as far as possible.

But,—says Dr. Hourwich,—why should a man elected by “the people” be controlled by a party?

It is a sufficient answer to this objection to say that there *is* no other control except party control, at least not in the State of New York; and that as between *no* control and party-control we must choose party control, just as we must choose constitutional monarchy when the only alternative is absolute monarchy.

But I prefer to go further and say that even if it were possible for the voters as such to control the elected official, it would be meet and proper for the Socialist Party to control *its* elected officials, and exercise that control in addition to the control of “the people.”

Of course where a man runs for office as an “independent,” on his own merits and being his own “platform,” it would be the height of injustice to have any number of men, short of all those who voted for him, abridge his freedom of action after election. But when a man runs avowedly as the candidate of a party,—the party formulating a set of principles and a program of action which it pledges itself to carry out,—then it is the height of injustice to that party to have it abdicate the day after election and to have *its* “standard bearer” become its absolute and uncontrolled master in so far as carrying out its promises, and making or marring its future, is concerned.

This is particularly true in the case of the Socialist Party. We have a set of principles which differentiate us fundamentally from all other political parties. In fact from all other men. We pledge ourselves to carry these principles into execution if our candidates are elected and permitted to do so. We do not ask any votes for our *candidates*, but for our *party*. It is *the party* that the electors vote for and not its candidates merely. And it is therefore up to the party to so control the actions of its candidates when elected to make sure that it will bear the re-

sponsibility for performance or non-performance of its pledges and promises.

The question only is how best to do it. And it seems to me that the present provisions of the N. Y. State Constitution comes as near doing it as any workable scheme that could be desired.

The things that must be borne in mind and guarded against when framing such rules and regulations are three in number: (1) The possibility of the executive trying to build up a “machine” of his own. (2) The possibility that office or “job” seekers within the local organization might want to impose themselves on the Executive. (3) The possibility of underhand election “dickers” with outside elements, either by the candidate alone or candidate and local organization, to be repaid in appointments to office.

The last contingency is provided against by provision of the Constitution that no public official elected to office on the Socialist ticket shall have the right to appoint any person who has not been a dues-paying member of the party for at least *two years* to any non-competitive position, without the consent of the State Executive Committee. This gives the State organization control over such appointments, and therefore the power to prevent the carrying out of pre-election bargains, at least in flagrant cases.

The other two contingencies are provided against by vesting the right of ultimate decision, in case of any dispute between the elected official and the local organization in the State organization which is, on the one hand, interested in the carrying into effect of the party principles as well as in the practical success of the socialist administration, and, on the other hand, *not* interested either in the elected official’s personal ambitions and idiosyncracies or in the personal interests of local office seekers.

Under the present provisions of the Constitution, the elected official is entrusted, in the first instance, with the selection of his appointees. Dr. Hourwich’s statement that the elected official is required to make all appointments “from a slate fixed by the organization” is evidently due to his unfamiliarity with the Constitution which he criticises. The “slate” is “fixed” by the elected official. It is then submitted to the “organization,” that is to the *entire membership* of the Local. If the Local by a majority vote rejects any nomination, it may suggest candidates of its own, and the decision as between the two then rests with the State Executive Committee, and, ultimately, with the entire State Committee.

Surely, anything more democratic or anything more fair would be hard to devise.

It is not a question of detailed arrangement, however. It is the question of principle that is important. And the principle is undoubtedly right. The party should, the party must, control its elected officials if it is to remain a Socialist party.

Industrial Relations Committee

By Dante Barton

CRUELTY and incompetence are the distinguishing characteristics of the industrial order that still prevails in the United States as in other countries—that prevails more crudely, more cruelly and more incompetently in the United States than in any other country. This fact was given furthest proof and widest publicity by the investigations, public hearings and published conclusions of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations, of which Frank P. Walsh was chairman.

The Committee on Industrial Relations is a voluntary association of men and women headed by Mr. Walsh and including the three labor members of the official commission who signed with him the main or Manly report—John B. Lennon, James O'Connell and Austin B. Garretson. The other members of the Committee are John P. White, president of the United Mine Workers of America; John Fitzpatrick, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor; Agnes Nestor, of the Chicago Women's Trade Union League; Helen Marot, of New York; the Right Reverend Charles D. Williams, Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Michigan; Frederic C. Howe, of New York; Amos Pinchot, of New York; and Dante Barton, formerly of Kansas City, now of Washington. On the staff of the Committee is George P. West, who wrote for the Commission the report on the Colorado strike.

To hasten the overthrow or collapse of a cruel and incompetent industrial order is the object of the Committee on Industrial Relations.

It has the enmity (passed far beyond the stage of suspicion) of those who think that any group of persons concerned with industrial relations should labor to "allay" unrest—and who believe this because it is to their interest to believe it—or who believe it because real thinking is a painful operation to them.

Is there a common ground on which union labor and workers not organized can stand with other thinkers, with thinkers who have money or who can make unearned money, but who are willing to give up the game by which they got it or can make it? Is there a common activity, called vaguely "fundamental democracy," for all kickers against the pricks, for all who are hurt by or disgusted with a work and credit program which makes the workers debtors and the non-workers creditors?

The result of Mr. Walsh's Commission indicated that there was some way yet for all radicals to travel together before they came to the forks of the roads and had to decide which was the right way

and which was the wrong way for the further journey.

At least, trade unionists and non-unionists, Socialists, Syndicalists, Industrial Workers of the World, Single Taxers and non-conformists in general applauded the Walsh hearings. Labor was encouraged to stand up before all the world and say it was a man, or a woman, or a child. The average working man found that he had more intelligence than Mr. "Jack" Morgan. The bluff that brains controlled industry was smashed for many times more people than knew its falsity before.

Organization of workers and then collective bargaining and political and direct action by workers are the instruments by which power is to pass from the hands of the few into the hands of the many. The Industrial Relations Committee strikes hardest for collective action by workers and union organization. It believes in and hammers for any sort of workers' collective action or unionism that gets there. It believes any sort of united action will grow into the right sort (if it has not started right) through experience and activity.

Mr. Walsh, for the Committee on Industrial Relations, wrote to the National Americanization Committee that its chief men and women—E. H. Gary, Mrs. Vincent Astor, and the like—were "charitable" frauds in proposing to "Americanize the foreign worker" through night schools and "patriotic" drills, while exploiting him and forbidding him the one sure way to Americanize himself and make American standards of work and wages something less shameful. That one sure way, Mr. Walsh said, was to unite in labor unions with his fellow workers.

The Youngstown riot and the Pittsburgh strike were investigated by the Committee. The facts of the first were used to demonstrate that cruelty and incompetence in industrial management, which starved workers, which fatally poisoned babies and undernourished them, which controlled the workers' lives only to damn the workers' lives, were brutally dangerous to all concerned in such an industrial hell. The facts in the Pittsburgh case were published to demonstrate in addition to the Youngstown truth the more hopeful truths of Labor realizing its opportunity and its power, of skilled workers beginning, at least, to recognize, or to establish, solidarity with unskilled workers.

The eight-hour day has had the strong support of the Committee. Addressing a mass meeting of the Railroad Brotherhoods in Pittsburgh on April 30, Mr. Walsh said:

"I hold that the eight-hour day is so incontestably right that the demand for it is not a subject for arbitration. It should be taken as a matter of inalienable right through the economic power of the workers. Not only should no man be compelled to work more than eight hours a day, but no man should be permitted to work more than eight hours a day except with the consent of his fellow workers and under conditions which they impose, by their collective bargaining power, to see that the man does not invade and imperil the rights of his fellows. I hold further that the right of workers to collective bargaining and the right of every worker to be protected by his fellow workers from arbitrary discharge are also the inalienable rights of modern industry and they also are not subjects for arbitration."

"Restitution is not confiscation." The Committee on Industrial Relations believes that legislative and political action and direct action should restore natural wealth to the public, should guard still ungrabbed natural resources for the public, and, in the case where art and science and labor combine with nature in the production of wealth, that those who produce the wealth should receive each the full measure of his production. To give this belief effect the Committee has worked for rightful labor legislation and against legislative acts designed further to injure and restrict the rights of labor. It has fought special privilege grabs—or water power, coal and

oil lands, etc.—and more subtle grabs at privilege such as that to get all rural credits more firmly in the hands of a bankers' trust.

The first work of the Committee, and a prolonged one, successfully ended, was to procure the printing of the final report of the Commission on Industrial Relations and of the full testimony taken by the Commission at its several hearings.

An earnest effort to increase the labor group in Congress has been made and is being made by the Committee. It urges all workers to nominate and vote for their own class representatives in all state and national legislative districts.

The publicity attained by the Committee on Industrial Relations is mainly that afforded by the organized labor and socialist newspapers and the periodicals. Its news letters and reports and articles are furnished by it to more than 1,400 of such publications. Also they are given to the Associated Press, the United Press and all the big daily newspapers, many of which have frequently been forced to print, or have willingly printed, its statements and appeals.

Variety, or individuality, of opinion and of life is maintained by the twelve members of the Committee who are laboring together for a social and industrial democracy in which men and women may lead free, individual lives and have free, individual opinions without oppression and without poverty.

Fantine in Our Day

By Eugene V. Debs

THE reader of *Les Miserables* can never forget the ill-starred Fantine, the mournful heroine of Hugo's immortal classic. The very name of Fantine, the gay, guileless, trusting girl, the innocent, betrayed, self-immolating young mother, the despoiled, bedraggled, hunted and holy martyr to motherhood, to the infinite love of her child, touches to tears and haunts the memory like a melancholy dream.

Jean Valjean, noblest of heroes, was possible only because of Fantine, sublimest of martyrs.

Fantine—child of poverty and starvation—the ruined girl, the abandoned mother, the hounded prostitute, remained to the very hour of her tragic death chaste as a virgin, spotless as a saint in the holy sanctuary of her own pure and undefiled soul. It was of such as Fantine that Heine wrote: "I have seen women on whose cheeks red vice was painted and in whose hearts dwelt heavenly purity."

The brief, bitter, blasted life of Fantine epitomizes the ghastly story of the persecuted, perishing

Fantines of modern society in every land in Christendom. Everywhere they are branded as "prostitutes" and shunned as lepers. Never was the woman born who could sink low enough—even in the upper class—to be called a "prostitute," and the man who calls a woman by that hideous epithet bears it upon his own forehead.

Why are the Fantines of our day charged with having "gone wrong" and with being "fallen women"? Not one in all the numberless ranks of these sisters of ours who are so despised by the soulless society of which they are the offspring has "gone" wrong, and not one has "fallen" to her present debased and unhappy state. If there is on earth a woman who has "fallen" in the sense usually applied to women who mortgage their honor in the battle for bread I have yet to see or hear of her.

There are certain powerful social forces which in the present order of things make for what is known as "prostitution," but it is to be noted that there are no "prostitutes" in the upper classes of society.

The women in the higher strata may be sexually as unchaste as they will, they are never "prostitutes." The well-to-do woman, not driven by these forces to sell her body to feed her child, may yet fall into the grossest sexual immorality through sheer idleness and ennui, but she has not "gone wrong"—no one thinks of her as a "fallen woman," or dreams of branding her as a "prostitute," and unless she is flagrantly indiscreet in the distribution of her favors her social standing is not materially affected by her moral lapses.

But let a poor shop-girl, a seamstress or a domestic servant—in a word, a working girl—commit some slight indiscretion, and that hour her doom is sealed, and she might as well present herself at once to the public authorities and have the scarlet letter seared into her forehead with a branding iron. She may be pure and innocent as a child, but the "benefit of the doubt" never fails to condemn her. She has "gone wrong," is now a "fallen woman," and the word "prostitute," coined exclusively for her, now designates the low estate which is to be her lot the rest of her life.

A rich woman may sink as low as she can—and a woman can sink very low in the moral and spiritual scale without necessarily indulging her carnal appetites—she is never a "prostitute." She does not sell herself from necessity but indulges herself from desire and therefore is not a "prostitute."

"Prostitution" as generally understood has economic as well as moral and sexual significance and application. "Prostitution" is confined to the "lower class" and bears a direct and intimate relation to the exploitation of the "upper class."

The Fantines of modern society, the "prostitutes" of the present day, are wholly of the working class; the segregated area is populated entirely by these unfortunate sisters of ours, and the blasted life and crucified soul of every mother's daughter of them pleads in mute agony for the overthrow of the brutal, blighting, bartering system which has robbed them of their womanhood, shorn them of every virtue, reduced them to the degraded level of merchandise and finally turned them into sirens of retribution to avenge their dishonor and shame.

As these lines are being written the report of the Vice Commission of the State of Maryland appears in the press dispatches to inform the public that investigation of vice recently concluded in the great cities of that state discloses the fact—not at all new or startling to some of us at least—that many of the girls who "go" wrong and recruit the ranks of the "fallen" women have been seduced and ruined by their employers, bosses, and other stripes of "superiors" of one kind or another, *as a condition of their employment*. Countless others, cheated of their childhood, pursued from birth by poverty, were doomed before their baby eyes opened upon a world in which it is a crime to be born, a crime pun-

ishable by cruel torture, by starvation of body and soul, and by being cast for life into a den of filth to glut the lust of its beastly keepers.

The innumerable Fantines of our day, found lurking like scarlet spectres in the shadows wherever capitalism casts its withering blight of exploitation, are typified in the child of the garret described by Hugo, the child of slum and street: "There was in her whole person the stupor of a life ended but never commenced." It is these deflowered daughters of poverty, robbed and degraded, that are forever "dropping fragments of their life upon the public highway."

The story, inexpressibly pathetic, is a commonplace. It has been repeated a thousand times in every tongue. Here it is again as told by a writer of today: "She has been fatherless. She has gone hungry. She has known bitter cold, shame, rags, scorn, neglect, want in all its forms. She has needed dolls, flowers, play, songs, brightness, sympathy, care, love, and has been given the stone of hard labor instead. Of all the blessings to which childhood is entitled this child has been robbed. In the brief life of this child there is pathos, endurance, long-deferred hope, experience that scars, denial, self-pity, hunger of the spirit, *starvation of a child's soul for love, home, hope, help.*"

Fantine is the greatest character in fiction and the highest type of social martyrdom. The face of Fantine, in which we behold "the horror of old age in the countenance of a child," is the mirror which reflects society's own sin and shame.

The Fantines have been raped of their virtue, robbed of their womanhood, dishonored, branded, exiled; the ignorance of childhood is with them still, but not its innocence; they have been shamelessly prostituted, but they are not prostitutes. They are girls, women who have walked the path of thorns and briars with bare and bleeding feet; who know the ways of agony and tears, and who move in melancholy procession as capitalist society's sacrificial offering to nameless and dishonored graves.

The very flower of womanhood is crushed in capitalism's mills of prostitution. The girls who yield are the tender, trusting ones, the sympathetic and unsuspecting, who would make the truest of wives and the noblest of mothers. It is not the hard, cold, selfish and suspicious natures that surrender to the insidious forces of prostitution, but the very opposite, and thus is the motherhood of the race dwarfed and deformed and denied its highest functioning and its finest expression.

The system which condemns men to slavery, women to prostitution, children to poverty and ignorance, and all to hopeless, barren, joyless lives must be uprooted and destroyed before men may know the meaning of morality, walk the highlands of humanity, and breathe the vitalizing air of freedom and fellowship.—*International Socialist Review.*

Erin's Hope

By James Connolly

Through the thick veil of the hypocrisy and intentional misrepresentation of the British government we are beginning to get gleams of light as to the actual events of the Irish rebellion. We have learned its extent, the number of the victims, and the fate of the brave leaders. But what the world does not know and, perhaps, will never learn are the inmost thought and ultimate aims of the foremost characters in the Sinn Fein rebellion. Without opportunity to speak, without a chance to justify to the rest of mankind their apparently insane attempt to gain the liberty of the Irish people, they were hustled to their deaths in unseemly haste by the timorous English authorities, who thought by relentless cruelty to cover their own weakness.

One of the signatories of the manifesto proclaiming the Irish Republic and a martyr to English fear was James Connolly. In 1909 he paid a visit to the United States and conducted a series of lectures all over the country. He also published a pamphlet written by himself, entitled *Erin's Hope*. While this is, of course, largely a personal expression of views and cannot be taken to represent the views of all his associates, yet it gives us an insight into the aims and aspirations of at least one of the Irish martyrs. For this reason we here reproduce portions of the pamphlet, few copies of which we believe are in existence.—THE EDITORS.

A REVOLUTION can only succeed in any country when it has the moral sanction of the people. It is so, even in an independent country; it is doubly so in a country subject like Ireland, to the rule of another. Within this century, no Irish revolutionist had obtained this sanction before he took the field. In 1848 the majority of the Irish people pinned their faith to the Repeal Association, which had disavowed even the right to resist oppression, and the Young Irelanders themselves had made no reasonable effort to prepare the popular mind for revolution, but had rather been precipitated into it against their will. Under such conditions, failure was inevitable. Those who were willing to "rise" had no means of knowing how far their aspirations were shared by their fellow-countrymen elsewhere, and lacking confidence in themselves, with the recognized leaders of public opinion against them, the effort ended in disaster. The history of the Fenian movement was somewhat similar. The number of actually enrolled members formed but an insignificant minority of the population, the vast majority of our countrymen, though perhaps sympathizing with the Fenian ideal, put their trust in politicians who preached tame submission under the name of "prudence" and "caution," and in the critical period of the movement flung the weight of their influence on the side of "law and order."

In both cases the recognized leaders of national thought were on the side of constituted authority, and against every revolutionary effort. The facts are as undeniable as they are lamentable, and they speak in trumpet tones in favor of such a remodelling of Irish revolutionary tactics as shall prevent a recurrence of similar disasters in the future. This, I hold, can be best accomplished by a political party seeking to give public expression to the republican ideal. One point needs to be emphasized in this connection, viz., it is not republicanism, but the counsel of insurrectionary effort to realize republicanism, which gave to previous Irish movements their odor of illegality. A candidate for political honors (?) is as much at liberty to put the attain-

ment of a republic on his programme as he is to pledge himself to Home Rule, or any other scheme of political reconstruction. Were a political party formed in Ireland to educate the people in sound national ideas by pledging every candidate to openly repudiate the authority of the Crown, and work for the realization of republican principles, it would achieve a much needed transformation in Irish politics.

Hitherto every Irish agitation has sought to make its programme as broad and loosely defined as possible, in order to enroll under its banner every section of Irish national opinion—loyal Home Rulers, Conservative Nationalists, Compromising Whigs, and Nationalist Democrats—all alike were welcome. Such a basis is undoubtedly best for the purposes of an "agitation," but it is worse than useless for the purpose of earnest revolutionists seeking a definite end. But such a party as I speak of, with an avowedly republican programme, would, in its very definiteness and coherence, have immense advantage to recommend it to the consideration and support of practical-minded men. It would prevent the emasculation of our young men by the vaporings of "constitutional" patriots; it would effectually expose the sham Nationalists, and, let us hope, drive them from political life; it would at every election in which it took part, afford a plebiscite of the people for or against the republic; it would enlist the sympathy of many earnest patriots whose open natures shrink from secret conspiracy; it would ascertain with mathematical accuracy the moment when the majority of the Irish people were ripe for revolution, and it could not be suppressed while representative government was left in Ireland.

By adhering steadily to the policy of pledging every candidate to its full programme, whether they stood for Parliament or local governing bodies, it would insure that when a majority of the Irish people had at the ballot boxes declared in favor of the revolutionary party every soldier of the cause would know that in the fight he was waging, he was not merely one of a numerically insignificant band of malcontents, but a citizen soldier fighting under orders publicly expressed in face of all the world by a majority of his fellow-countrymen. This, I hold to be an eminently practical method of obtaining our end. It would exclude the possibility of our national principles being betrayed in the moment of danger, or compromised in the hour of success to suit the convenience of interested party politicians; it would inspire confidence in the most timid by its recognition of the fact that to counsel rebellion without first

obtaining the moral sanction of the people would be an act of criminal folly which would only end in disaster. It would make Irish republicanism no longer the "politics of despair," but the Science of Revolution.

It may be urged against such a proposal that the first need of Irish politics is unity, and that such a party would only accentuate the division at present existing. This, however, could only be the case if our present representatives refuse to accept the pledge of loyalty to the free Irish Republic, and to it alone. If they do so refuse, then they are unfit to be representatives of the Irish democracy, and cannot be removed too soon. The objection in itself implies a suspicion of the genuine nature of the patriotism so loudly vaunted by our party politicians. Unity is a good thing, no doubt, but honesty is better, and if unity can only be obtained by the suppression of truth and the toleration of falsehood, then it is not worth the price we are asked to pay for it.

IRELAND BEFORE THE CONQUEST.

Whichever be the true interpretation of Irish history, one fact at least stands out clear and undeniable, viz., that the conflict between the rival systems of land ownership was the pivot around which centered all the struggles and rebellions of which that history has been so prolific. The Irish regarded with inveterate hostility their English rulers, at all times set little store upon promises of incorporation within the pale of the constitution, and rose with enthusiasm under their respective rebel chiefs, because they regarded this as the all-important question, because in their eyes English rule and Dublin parliaments were alike identified as the introducers and upholders of the system of feudalism and private ownership of land, as opposed to the Celtic system of clan and common ownership, which they regarded, and, I think, rightly, as the pledge at once of their political and social liberty.

The English Government was also astute enough to perceive that the political or national subjection of Ireland was entirely valueless to the conquerors while the politically subjected nation remained in possession of economic freedom. Consequently, we find that the first stipulation made to the Irish tribe upon its submission always provided that the lands of the tribe should be regarded as the private property of the chief; that he should therefore accept them as a grant from the crown, from which he should in future hold them; that he should drop his Irish title, which proclaimed him the freely elected chief of a free community, and should instead accept an English title, such as duke or earl, and in all things conform to English ideas of civilization and social order. All these stipulations were in the last degree repugnant to Irish ideas. The chief, as Mill has justly observed, was but the managing member of the tribal association, although in the

stress of constant warfare they usually limited their choice to the members of one of two families; yet the right of election was never abdicated by the tribesmen. Whenever the seductions of English gold overmastered the patriotism of an Irish chief, and succeeded in inducing his acceptance of the alien property system and the alien title (as in the case of Art O'Neil and Nial Garbh O'Donnell, the Queen's O'Reilly and the Queen's Maguire), they immediately elected another chief in his stead; and from that moment the unfortunate renegade became an outlaw from his own people, and could only appear in his native territory under an escort of English spears.

The Irish system was thus on a par with those conceptions of social rights and duties which we find the ruling classes to-day denouncing so fiercely as "Socialistic." It was apparently inspired by the democratic principle that property was intended to serve the people, and not by the principle so universally acted upon at present, viz., that the people have no other function in existing than to be the bondslaves of those who by force or by fraud have managed to possess themselves of property. They did not, indeed, regard all forms of productive property as rightfully belonging to the community; but when we remember that the land alone was at that time of importance, all other forms of property being insignificant by comparison, we see that they were as Socialistic as the industrial development of their time required. The English civilization against which they fought was, on the other hand, thoroughly individualistic; and, as it triumphed, we are reaping the fruits to-day in the industrial disputes, the agricultural depressions, the poorhouses, and other such glorious institutions in Church and State as we are permitted the luxury of enjoying in common with our fellow-subjects in this "integral portion of the British Empire." The results of the change on the national life of Erin are well illustrated in the scornful words in which Aubrey De Vere apostrophises the "new race" of exploiters which then arose:

The chiefs of the Gael were the people embodied;
 The chiefs were the blossoms, the people the root.
 Their conquerors, the Normans, high-souled and
 high-blooded,
 Grew Irish at last from the scalp to the foot.
 And ye, ye are hirelings and satraps, not nobles—
 Your slaves they detest you, your masters, they
 scorn.
 The river lives on, but the sun-painted bubbles
 Pass quickly, to the rapids incessantly borne.

IRELAND UNDER BRITISH RULE.

The break-up of the Kilkenny Confederation in 1649 and the consequent dispersion of the Irish clans was the immediate cause of that confusion of thought and apparent lack of directness in aim which down to our day has characterized all modern

Irish politics. Deprived of any form of political or social organization which might serve as an effective basis for its practical realization, the demand for the common ownership of the land naturally fell into abeyance until such time as the conquest of some form of political freedom should enable the dispossessed Irishry to substitute for the lost tribal association the fuller and broader conception of an Irish nation as the natural repository and guardian of the people's heritage. But when the fusing process of a common subjection had once more welded the heterogeneous elements of Irish society into one compact nationality it was found that in the intervening period a new class had arisen in the land—a class which, while professedly ultra-nationalistic in its political aims, had nevertheless so far compounded with the enemy as to accept the alien social system, with its accompanying manifestation, the legal dispossession and economic dependence of the vast mass of the Irish people, as part of the natural order of society.

The Irish middle class, who then by virtue of their social position and education stepped to the front as Irish patriot leaders, owed their unique status in political life to two entirely distinct and apparently antagonistic causes. Their wealth they derived from the manner in which they had contrived to wedge themselves into a place in the commercial life of the "Saxon enemy," assimilating his ideas and adopting his methods, until they often proved the most ruthless of the two races in pushing to its furthest limits their powers of exploitation. Their political influence they derived from their readiness at all times to do lip service to the cause of Irish nationality, which in their phraseology meant simply the transfer of the seat of government from London to Dublin, and the consequent transfer to their own or their relatives' pockets of some portion of those legislative fees and lawyers' pickings then, as at present, expended among the Cockneys. With such men at the helm it is no wonder that the patriot parties of Ireland have always ended their journey upon the rock of disaster. Beginning by accepting a social system abhorrent to the best traditions of a Celtic people, they next abandoned as impossible the realization of national independence. By the first act they set the seal of their approval upon a system founded upon the robbery of their countrymen, and by the second they bound up the destinies of their country with the fate of an Empire in the humiliation of whose piratical rulers lies the Irish people's only chance of national and social redemption.

As compensation for this gross betrayal the middle-class politicians offer—Home Rule. To exactly analyze what Home Rule would confer on Ireland is a somewhat difficult task, since every one interprets the "thing" in his own way and according to his own peculiar bent. Perhaps the safest way, and at any

rate the one least open to objection, will be to regard as Home Rule the bill introduced by Mr. Gladstone. As this scheme represents the utmost that the statesmanlike prowess of Mr. Parnell, with a solid phalanx of eighty-six members behind him, could wrest from the fear or favor of English Liberalism, it is surely safe enough to assume that no other merely political body from Ireland is ever likely to improve upon this concession by any alliance with either of the great factions who watch over the interests of the English propertied class. Home Rule proposed to establish in Ireland a domestic legislature, that would be carefully divested of all those powers and attributes which by the common consent of civilized peoples are regarded as properly belonging to the sphere and functions of government; that would have no power in controlling diplomacy, post-office, commerce, telegraphs, coinage, customs and excise, weights and measures, copyrights and patents, succession to the Crown, or army, navy, militia or Volunteers.

The only conceivable result of such a state of affairs would have been to create in Ireland a host of place-hunters and government officials who, secure in the enjoyment of a good income themselves, would have always acted as a barrier between the people and their oppressors. As a method whereby the English legislature might have been relieved of some of its duties at home, and thus left more free to pursue its policy of plunder and aggression abroad, it ought to have delighted the heart of the Jingo politicians. That they were too dunder-headed to see their opportunity is a mercy for which farseeing Irish democrats can never be sufficiently thankful.

The second Home Rule Bill was slightly more democratic than the first, therefore the Government made no effort to force it upon the Upper House. The English Liberal Party—the most treacherous political party in Europe—has always had two favorite devices for destroying obnoxious proposals of reform. First, unscrupulous slander and opposition; second, theoretical acceptance of the principle of reform, but indefinite postponement of its practical realization, continued on one pretext or another until the hearts of the reformers are broken and their organization disrupted. The first was defeated by the genius of Parnell, how well the second method has succeeded let the present political chaos of Ireland testify.

Realizing that, taken on its own merits, Home Rule is simply a mockery of Irish national aspirations, our middle-class leaders have industriously instilled into the public mind the belief that the advent of Home Rule would mean the immediate establishment of manufactures and the opening up of mines, etc., in every part of Ireland. This seems to them the highest possible ideal—an Irish society composed of employers making fortunes and workers

grinding out their lives for a weekly wage. But, to say the least, the men who talk in this manner must either be wofully ignorant of the conditions of modern industry, or else, for some private reason of their own, are wilfully deceiving those who believe in them. To establish industry successfully to-day in any country requires at least two things, neither of which Ireland possesses, and one of which she never can possess. The first is the possession of the wherewithal to purchase machinery and raw material for the equipment of her factories, and the second is customers to purchase the goods when they are manufactured. Now, we find that England, who has had the start in manufacturing over every other nation, who has been extending her commerce and perfecting her machinery for a hundred and fifty years at least, who has created a nation of highly skilled artisans, adept in every form of industrial achievement—England, the wealthiest country in the world, has brought her industries to such a degree of mechanical perfection, that her customers cannot keep her going. She can supply goods of every description much quicker than the world is able to purchase and consume them, and as a direct consequence of this vast producing power, she is compelled every few years to either wholly or partially stop her machinery and close her factories, to discharge her artisan subjects, and compel them to walk about in enforced idleness and semi-starvation until such time as the goods they have produced are purchased and consumed by other people—their customers.

IRELAND'S FUTURE

Ere we can forecast the future we must understand the present, and bring a just sense of proportion to our review of the history of the past. What, then, are the conditions which govern life in Ireland to-day, and of what are those conditions the outcome? According to the most eminent authorities who have ever dealt with the subject, the soil of Ireland is capable of sustaining a population many times larger than she has ever borne upon its surface, yet Ireland is in a state of chronic starvation. Every ship that leaves our ports is laden down with harvests for human consumption, while the people whose strong hands have reaped that harvest pine in wretchedness and want, or fly from the shores of this fertile island as from the arid sands of a desert. The landlord class, infatuated with that madness which always precedes destruction, press for their rents, to the uttermost farthing wherever they can wheedle or coerce a too compliant legislature and executive to support them in their exactions. The capitalist farmer, driven to the wall by the stress of competition, seeks in vain to maintain his foothold in life by an unceasing struggle with the lord of the soil on one hand and a ruthless oppression of the laborer on the other; the small farmer, bereft entirely of hope for the future, settles despairingly into

a state of social wretchedness for which no savage land can furnish a parallel; the agricultural laborer, with his fellow in the towns, takes his strength, his brains, his physical and intellectual capabilities to the market, and offers them to his wealthier fellow-creatures, to be exploited in return for a starvation wage. On all sides anarchy and oppression reign supreme, until one could scarcely wonder if even the most orthodox amongst us were tempted to echo the saying of the Spanish Don Juan Aguila after the battle of Kinsale: "Surely Christ never died for this people!"

These are the conditions under which life is endured in Ireland to-day. From what do such conditions spring? There are two things necessary for the maintenance of life in Ireland, as in every other country. They are land and labor. Possessed of these two essentials, the human race has at its command all the factors requisite for the well-being of the species. From the earth labor extracts alike its foods and the mineral wealth with which it contrives to construct and adorn its habitations and prepare its raiment. Therefore the possession of the soil is everywhere the first requisite of life. Granting this as a proposition too self-evident to need any elaborate demonstration, we at once arrive at the conclusion that since the soil is so necessary to our existence the first care of every well-regulated community ought to be to preserve the use of that soil, and the right to freely share in its fruits, to every member of the community, present or prospective, born or unborn.

The moment when the land of a country passes from the care of the community as a public trust, and from being the common property of the entire people becomes the private property of individuals, marks the beginning of slavery for that people and of oppression for that country. With the land held as the property of individuals there are immediately created two antagonistic classes in society—one holding the land and demanding from the other a rent for permission to live upon it, and the other driven by the constant increase of their own numbers to offer larger and larger shares of the produce of their labor as tribute to the first class, who thus become masters of the lives of their fellow-beings. With the land held as the common property of the people an abundant harvest would be eagerly welcomed as an addition to the wealth of the community, guaranteeing against want every one of its members. With the land held as private property the abundant harvest must be sold to satisfy the exactions of the holder of the soil, and as he jingles in his pockets the result of the sale of his tenants' produce the families who reaped it may be perishing of want.

As one crime begets another, so one economic blunder invariably brings in its train a series of blunders, each one more fruitful of disaster than the

first. When the production of food for public use was abandoned in favor of production of agricultural produce for private sale and private profit, it was almost inevitable that the production of almost every other necessary of life should be subjected to the same conditions. Thus we find that food, clothes, houses, and furniture are not produced in order that people may be fed, clad, sheltered or made comfortable, but rather in order that the class who have obtained possession of the land, machinery, workshops, and stores necessary for the production of these essentials should be thereby enabled to make a comfortable living at the expense of their fellow creatures. If the landlord and employing class think they can make a rent or profit by allowing the people to feed, clothe or house themselves then the latter are allowed to do so under the direction of the former—when, where, and how the masters please. If, on the contrary, they imagine it will pay them better to refuse that right (as they do in every eviction, strike, or lock-out), then they do refuse that permission, and their countrymen go forth starving, their children die of want before their eyes, and their wives and mothers pine in wretchedness and misery in what their forefathers were wont to call the "Isle of the Blest."

By the operation of certain historic causes the workers have been deprived of everything by which they can maintain life, and are thus compelled to seek their livelihood by the sale of their capacity for work, their labor power. The worker thus finds that the most essential condition which he must perform in order that he may possess his life is to sell a part of that life into the service and for the profit of another. Whether he sells it by the hour, the day, the week, or the month is immaterial—sell it he must or else starve.

Now, the worker is a human being, with all the powers and capabilities of a human being within him, just as is a landlord, a capitalist, or any other ornament of society. But when he approaches the capitalist in order to complete that bargain, which means the sale of his life piecemeal in order that he may enjoy it as a whole, he finds that he must carefully divest himself of all claims to be considered as a human being, and offer himself upon the market subject to the same law as governs the purchase or sale of any inanimate, soulless commodity, such as a pair of boots, a straw hat or a frock coat. That is to say, the price he will receive for this piecemeal sale of himself will depend upon how many more are compelled by hunger to make the same horrible bargain.

In like manner with the farmer seeking to rent a farm in the open market. Each competitor seeks to outbid the other, until the rent fixed is usually out of all proportion to the price which will in the future be obtained for the produce of the farm bidden for. The agriculturist finds that in years of universal

plenty, when throughout the world the earth brings forth its fruit in teeming profusion, the excess of supply over effective demand operates to lower the price of his farm produce, until it scarcely repays his labor in garnering it, and in times of scarcity, when a good price might be obtained, he has little to sell, his customers have not the wherewithal to buy, and the landlord or the money lender are as relentless as ever in their exactions.

As a remedy for such an array of evils Home Rule stands revealed as a glaring absurdity. The Home Rule parties either ignore the question altogether or else devote their attention to vain attempts to patch up the system with schemes of reform which each day tends to discredit more and more. The tenant who seeks in the Land Court for a judicial valuation of his holding finds that in face of the steady fall in agricultural prices (assisted by preferential railway rates in favor of foreign produce) the "fair" rent of one year becomes the rack-rent of another, and the tenant who avails himself of the purchase clauses of the Land Acts finds that he has only escaped from the personal tyranny of a landlord to have his veins sucked by the impersonal power of the money lender.

Confronted with such facts the earnest Irish worker turns in dismay and joins his voice to that of the uncompromising Nationalist in seeking from the advocate of an Irish Socialist Republic the clue to the labyrinthine puzzle of modern economic conditions. The problem is a grave and difficult one, alike from the general ignorance of its controlling conditions and because of the multiplicity of vested interests which must be attacked and overthrown at every forward step towards its solution. The solution herein set forth is therefore not guaranteed to be absolutely perfect in all its details, but only to furnish a rough draft of a scheme of reform by means of which the ground may be prepared for that revolutionary change in the structure of society which can alone establish an approximation to an ideally just social system.

The agriculture of Ireland can no longer compete with the scientifically equipped farmers of America, therefore the only hope that now remains is to abandon competition altogether as a rule of life, to organize agriculture as a public service under the control of boards of management elected by the agricultural population (no longer composed of farmers and laborers, but of free citizens with equal responsibility and equal honor), and responsible to them and the nation at large, and with all the mechanical and scientific aids to agriculture the entire resources of the nation can place at their disposal. Let the produce of Irish soil go first to feed the Irish people, and after a sufficient store has been retained to insure of that being accomplished, let the surplus be exchanged with other countries in return for those manufactured goods Ireland needs but does

not herself produce. Thus we will abolish at one stroke the dread of foreign competition and render perfectly needless any attempt to create an industrial hell in Ireland under the specious pretext of "developing our resources."

Apply to manufacture the same social principle, let the co-operative organization of the workers replace the war of classes under capitalism and transform the capitalist himself from an irresponsible hunter after profit into a public servant, fulfilling a public function and under public control. Recognize the right of all to an equal opportunity to develop to their fullest capacity all the powers and capabilities inherent in them by guaranteeing to all our countrymen and women, the weak as well as the strong, the simple as well as the cunning, the honest equally with the unscrupulous, the fullest, freest, and most abundant human life intelligently organized society can confer upon any of its members.

"But," you will say, "this means a Socialist Republic; this is subversive of all the institutions upon which the British Empire is founded—this cannot be realized without national independence." Well, I trust no one will accuse me of a desire to fan into flame the dying embers of national hatred when I state as my deliberate and conscientious conviction that the Irish democracy ought to strive consistently after the separation of their country from the yoke that links her destinies with those of the British Crown. The interests of labor all the world over are identical, it is true, but it is also true that each country had better work out its own salvation on the lines most congenial to its own people.

The national and racial characteristics of the English and Irish people are different, their political history and traditions are antagonistic, the economic development of the one is not on a par with the other, and, finally, although they have been in the closest contact for seven hundred years, yet the Celtic Irishman is to-day as much of an insolent problem to even the most friendly English as on the day when the two countries were first joined in unholy wedlock. No Irish revolutionist worth his salt would refuse to lend a hand to the Social Democracy of England in the effort to uproot the social system of which the British Empire is the crown and apex, and in like manner no English Social Democrat fails to recognize clearly that the crash which would betoken the fall of the ruling classes in Ireland would sound the tocsin for the revolt of the disinherited in England.

But on whom devolves the task of achieving that downfall of the ruling classes in Ireland? On the Irish people. But who are the Irish people? Is it the dividend-hunting capitalist with the phraseology of patriotism on his lips and the spoil wrung from sweated Irish toilers in his pockets; is it the schem-

ing lawyer—most immoral of all classes; is it the slum landlord who denounces rackrenting in the country and practices it in the towns; is it any one of these sections who to-day dominate Irish politics? Or is it not rather the Irish Working Class—the only secure foundation on which a free nation can be reared—the Irish Working Class which has borne the brunt of every political struggle, and gained by none, and which is to-day the only class in all Ireland which has no interest to serve in perpetuating either the political or social forms of oppression—the British Connection or the capitalist system. The Irish Working Class must emancipate itself, and in emancipating itself it must, perforce, free its country. The act of social emancipation requires the conversion of the land and instruments of production from private property into the public or common property of the entire nation. This necessitates a social system of the most absolute democracy, and in establishing that necessary social system the Working Class must grapple with and destroy every vestige of every form of government which could interfere with the most unfettered control by the people of Ireland of all the resources of their country.

On the Working Class of Ireland, therefore, devolves the task of conquering political representation for their class as the preliminary step towards the conquest of political power. This task can only be safely entered upon by men and women who recognize that the first actions of a revolutionary army must harmonize in principle with those likely to be its last, and that, therefore, no revolutionists can safely invite the co-operation of men or classes, whose ideals are not theirs and whom, therefore, they may be compelled to fight at some future critical stage of the journey to freedom. To this category belongs every section of the propertied class, and every individual of those classes who believes in the righteousness of his class position. The freedom of the Working Class must be the work of the Working Class. And let it be remembered that timidity in the slave induces audacity in the tyrant, but the virility and outspokenness of the revolutionist ever frightens the oppressor himself to hide his loathsomeness under the garb of reform. And thus remembering, fight for your class at every point.

Our people are flying to the uttermost ends of the earth; seek to retain them at home by reducing the hours of labor wherever you have the power and by supporting every demand for legislative restriction. Your Irish railways employ thousands of men, whose working hours average twelve per day. Were they restricted to a forty-eight-hour week of labor, employment would be provided for thousands of Irishmen who at present are driven exiles from their native land. Let your representatives demand an

eight-hour bill for railways. Our Irish municipalities and other public bodies controlled by popular vote employ also many thousands of men. What are their hours of labor? On the average ten, and their wages just above starvation point. Insist upon the Irish corporations establishing the eight-hour day in all their works. They at least do not need to fear foreign competition. If you have no vote in the corporation you can at least help to hound off the political platform elsewhere every so-called patriot who refuses to perform this act of justice. Every Irish corporation which declines to institute an eight-hours' working day at a decent wage for its employees has virtually entered into a conspiracy with the British Government to expatriate the Irish people, rather than pay an additional halfpenny in the pound on the rates. In all our cities the children of the laboring class are dying off before their time for lack of wholesome nourishing food. As our municipalities and public trusts provide water for the people free of direct payment and charge the cost upon the rates, let them also provide at our schools free breakfasts, dinners, and teas to the children in attendance there, and pay for it from the same source. No matter what may be the moral character of the parent, let us at least save the helpless children of our race from physical and mental degeneracy, and save our teachers from the impossible task of forcing education upon a child whose brain is enfeebled by the starvation of its body. As the next step in organization, let the corporation and public bodies everywhere throughout the country establish depots for the supply of bread and all the necessaries of life to the people, at cost price and without the intervention of the middleman.

When, in addition to the foregoing reforms, we have demanded the abolition of our hateful poor-house system, and the imposition of a heavy and steeply graduated income tax on all incomes over £400 a year, in order to provide comfortable pensions for the aged, the infirm, and widows and orphans, we will have aroused a new spirit in the people; we will have based our revolutionary movement upon a correct appreciation of the needs of the hour, as well as upon the vital principles of economic justice and uncompromising nationality; we will, as the true revolutionist should ever do, have called into action on our side the entire sum of all the forces and factors of social and political discontent. By the use of the revolutionary ballot we will have made the very air of Ireland as laden with "treason," as fully charged with the spirit of revolt, as it is to-day with the cant of compromise and the mortal sin of flunkeyism; and thus we will have laid a substantial groundwork for more effective action in the future, while to those whom we must remove in our onward march the pledge of our faith in the Social Revolution will convey the assurance that if we crush their profit-making enterprises to-day, yet

when the sun dawns upon our freedom, if they have served their fellow creatures loyally in the hour of strife, they and their children and their children's children will be guaranteed against want and privation for all time by the safest guarantee man ever received, the guarantee backed by all the gratitude, the loyal hearts, the brains and industry of the Irish people, under the Irish Socialist Republic.

The Senate of Santo Domingo has voted to impeach the President of that Republic. But a gentleman named Caperton, backed by some of our "boys in blue," said that impeachment proceedings "don't go" while he is around. And he stays around to see to it that they don't. As is well-known we have never annexed Santo Domingo. No wonder the German Chancellor says he doesn't want to "annex" Belgium. What's the use of "annexing" a country, when you can accomplish your purpose much more cheaply by occasionally sending a Caperton or a von Bissing around to see to it that things are done the way you want them to be done?

EXECUTIVE EDITORS

Louis B. Boudin	Martha Gruening
Louis C. Fraina	Isaac A. Hourwich
Felix Grendon	Moses Oppenheimer

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Richard P. Appleton	Robert Rives LaMonte
Maurice Blumlein	Robert H. Lowie
Frank Bohn	Helen Marot
William E. Bohn	Joseph Michael
Floyd Dell	Austin Lewis
W. E. B. DuBois	John Macy
Max Eastman	Mary White Ovington
Jacob W. Hartmann	Wm. J. Robinson
Paul Kenneday	Wm. English Walling
Harry W. Laidler	

Published Monthly by the New Review Publishing Ass'n

256 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

Subscription \$1.50 a year in United States and Mexico; six months, \$0.75. \$1.75 in Canada and \$2.00 in foreign countries. Single copies, 15 cents.

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

If You Buy Books—

You want to concentrate
and get efficient service

NEW REVIEW BOOK SERVICE
256 Broadway, New York City

CLUB OFFERS

(For Canada add 25c., for Foreign 50c.)

New Review.....\$1.50 } \$2.00
 Masses 1.00 }

New Review..... 1.50 } \$2.00
 Critic & Guide.. 1.00 }

(Wm. J. Robinson, M.D., Editor)

New Review..... 1.50 } \$2.00
 The Public 1.00 }

New Review..... 1.50 } \$2.00
 Int. Soc. Review. 1.00 }

New Review..... 1.50 } \$2.50
 Sunday Call..... 2.00 }

New Review..... 1.50 } \$2.00
 Pearson's 1.50 }

New Review..... 1.50 } \$2.00
 Solidarity 1.00 }

(Official Organ I. W. W.)

New Review..... 1.50 } \$3.00
 Reedy's Mirror... 2.00 }

New Review..... 1.50 } \$2.50
 Little Review.... 1.50 }

New Review..... 1.50 } \$4.00
 The Survey..... 3.00 }

Ask us for our rates on any combination you desire.

NEW REVIEW

Do Business by Mail

It's profitable, with accurate lists of prospects. Our catalogue contains vital information on Mail Advertising. Also prices and quantity on 6,000 national mailing lists, 99% guaranteed. Such as:

War Material Mfrs.	Wealthy Men
Cheese Box Mfrs.	Auto Grease Mfrs.
Shoe Retailers	Auto Owners
Contractors	Tin Can Mfrs.
Druggists	Farmers, Etc.

Write for this valuable reference book; also prices and samples of fac-simile letters.

Have us write or revise your Sales Letters.

Ross-Gould, 814 Olive St.

Ross-Gould
 Mailing
Lists St. Louis

RED HOT If you want for, self or friends, a paper that combats all religious dogma send 50c for each subscriber **AGNOSTIC** and get the hottest paper published. Don't delay. Send today.

THE CRUCIBLE, K. **PAPER**
 1330 1st Ave., Seattle. **50 CENTS**

REPRESENTATIVE SOCIALIST OPINIONS

of L. B. Boudin's

SOCIALISM AND WAR

Eugene V. Debs—Boudin's *Socialism and War* is a masterly review and summing up of the war from a Socialist viewpoint and deserves the widest possible reading and circulation.

Joshua Wanhope—Boudin's work is well worthy the attention of every careful student of the problems raised by the war.

A. M. Simons—It is the only war book by an American Socialist that has added anything to the Socialist view of the war.

Austin Lewis—Boudin's *Socialism and War* is to a Socialist a most striking utterance on the conflict. * * * No student of modern conditions can afford to miss it.

Isaac A. Hourwich—This is an honest book, which is quite rare in these days. The author starts by candidly admitting the contradictions, brought to view by the war, between Socialist theory and practice, and seeks a way out.

Leo Deutsch—Boudin's new book has all the good qualities of his volume on the *Theoretical System of Karl Marx*—comprehensiveness, depth of analysis and a thorough knowledge of the subject under consideration. Boudin has something new and interesting to tell to all his readers—to those familiar with the subject as well as those new to the same.

California Social Democrat—Of all that has been said and written, L. B. Boudin's book, *Socialism and War*, is probably the most concise and inclusive statement of the problem.

Handsomely Bound in Cloth. \$1.10, Postpaid.

NEW REVIEW PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION

256 Broadway,

New York City.

Just Off the Press

The "Socialism" of New Zealand

By Robert H. Hutchinson

WHAT the effect of the present war will be on the structure of future society is not so easy to foretell.

But from the nature of the measures taken by the belligerent governments it should be of interest to the person who appreciates the difference between Socialism and State Socialism.

When one thinks of Germany nowadays one pictures a powerfully centralized mass of people divided roughly into those who command and those who obey, and the controlling power of it all, the government. So it is also with the other warring countries, and so it is becoming, though with less pronounced rapidity, among the nations at peace. State Socialism seems to be on the horizon.

New Zealand is a good place in which to study State Socialism, because there is more of it there than in perhaps any other place in the world.

—From the Author's Introduction.

CONTENTS

- I—The Historical Evolution.
- II—Railways, Post and Telegraph, and Other State Business.
- III—Public Debt and the Land Administration.
- IV—Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration.
- V—Woman Suffrage and the Position of Women.
- VI—Social Legislation and Labor Conditions.
- VII—The Recent Strike and the Present Situation.
- VIII—Observations and Conclusions.
- IX—State Socialism and the War.

Handsomely Bound in Cloth, \$1.10 Postpaid

New Review Publishing Ass'n.

Publishers of "Indispensable" Books

256 Broadway

New York City