

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

DEBS THE CANDIDATE

NOVEMBER ELECTIONS

MORE BRITISH
IMPERIALISM

MORRIS HILLQUIT
ARTHUR GLEASON

HARRIOT STANTON BLATCH
JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN

Contents

EDITORIAL NOTES

That League of Nations. L. S. G.	Page 149
Week-End Warfare. W. H. C.	Page 150
Workers' Control in Italy. H. W. L.	Page 150
Recent Strikes in New York. E. C.	Page 151
The Answer to Sweet. M. W. T.	Page 152
The Building Guild Again. W. H. C.	Page 153
The New York Call. W. H. L.	Page 153
New Labor Dailies. W. H. C.	Page 154
American Socialists and the Third International. H. W. L.	Page 155
A National Bail Fund. H. W. L.	Page 156
A Letter to the Editor. William Pickens	Page 156

DEBS THE CANDIDATE

Jessie Wallace Hughan....	Page 157
---------------------------	----------

RADICALISM IN AMERICAN POLITICS

Morris Hillquit	Page 160
-----------------------	----------

BRITISH IMPERIALISM AND THE AUSTRALIAN WORKERS

W. Francis Ahern.....	Page 162
-----------------------	----------

THE NEW VOTER

Harriot Stanton Blatch....	Page 164
----------------------------	----------

THE RISE OF BRITISH SOCIALISM

Arthur Gleason	Page 166
----------------------	----------

CAMPAIGN NOTES

Marian Tyler	Page 171
--------------------	----------

TO COLLEGE STUDENTS

J. S.	Page 174
------------	----------

WHY DEBS SERVES IN ATLANTA

.....	Page 175
-------	----------

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES

Mary Beard: A Short His- tory of the American Labor Movement.....	Page 178
Report of the British Labor Delegation to Russia, 1920	Page 178
Harry F. Ward: The New Social Order	Page 180
Isaac McBride: Barbarous Soviet Russia	Page 180

Our Contributors

W. FRANCIS AHERN. A prominent Australian labor journalist.

ARTHUR GLEASON. Author of "What the Workers Want." President of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society.

MORRIS HILLQUIT. International Secretary of the Socialist Party of the United States. Author of "Socialism in Theory and Practice," etc.

HARRIOT STANTON BLATCH. Well-known American suffrage leader.

JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN. Author of "American Socialism of the Present Day," etc.

MARIAN TYLER. Business Manager of *The Socialist Review*.

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. IX.

OCTOBER 1920

No. 5

That League of Nations

WOODROW WILSON'S poor little would-be League of Nations seems to be having as hard a time to get established in the American electoral campaign as to become a power in European politics. There the nations are polite to it, but prefer to do business independently—except England, which uses it as an instrument of imperialism; here the parties are respectful to the League as an idea, but are very chary of Mr. Wilson's League as a concrete fact.

Of all the four major parties the Socialist Party alone comes out flat-footed. Its platform is clear and to the point:

"The government of the United States should initiate a movement to dissolve the mischievous organization called the 'League of Nations' and to create an international parliament, composed of democratically elected representatives of all nations of the world, based upon the recognition of their equal rights, the principles of self-determination, the right to national existence of colonies and other dependencies, freedom of international trade and trade routes by land and sea, and universal disarmament, and charged with revising the treaty of peace on the principles of justice and conciliation."

The Farmer-Labor Party platform means the same thing but does not quite say so. It urges "withdrawal from further participation (under the Treaty of Versailles) in the reduction of conquered peoples to economic or political subjection to the small groups of men who manipulate the bulk of the world's wealth." But it does not once mention the League by name.

The Republicans take the better part of a column of fine newspaper type to express their aversion to any definite statement about the League. They stand "for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world," but feel that "the covenant signed

by the President at Paris failed signally to accomplish this purpose" and contained "intolerable" stipulations—they do not say which they were. They generously commend "the senators" for faithful performance of duty—apparently including the President's supporters, the mild and strenuous and more-or-less reservationists, and the bitter-enders in the universal cloak of their indiscriminate approval. And finally they "pledge the coming Republican administration to such agreement with the other nations of the world as shall meet the full duty of America to civilization and humanity in accordance with American ideals and without surrendering the right of the American people to exercise its judgment"—and so on in a magnificent Fourth-of-July style and with a truly masterly evasion of any definition of meaning.

And the Democrats? They "favor the League of Nations" and they "endorse the President's view of our international obligations and his firm stand against reservations designed to cut to pieces the vital provisions of the Versailles Treaty"—but in the next sentence they desert the President and "do not oppose the acceptance of any reservation making clearer or more specific the obligations of the United States to the League associates." And Governor Cox has dulled any meaning these words might have seemed to have by explaining in his speech of acceptance that

"The captious may say that our platform reference to reservations is vague and indefinite. Its meaning, in brief, is that we shall state our interpretation of the covenant as a matter of good faith to our associates and as a precaution against any misunderstanding in the future. The point is, that after the people shall have spoken the League will be in the hands of its friends in the Senate, and a safe index as to what they will do is supplied by what reservations they have proposed in the past. . . . Our platform clearly lays no

bar against any additions that will be helpful, but it speaks in a firm resolution to stand against anything that disturbs the vital principle. We hear it said that interpretations are unnecessary. That may be true, but they will at least be reassuring to many of our citizens, who feel that in signing the treaty there should be no mental reservations that are not expressed in plain words, as a matter of good faith to our associates. Such interpretations possess the further virtue of supplying a base upon which agreement can be reached, and agreement without injury to the covenant is now of pressing importance."

Mr. Wilson's own candidate seems to have deserted his League!

Meanwhile Mr. Harding, in magistral ignorance of the subject, reverts to the "Root plan" and talks of the Hague tribunal—unaware that the League had taken over custody of that orphan, and that the conference of jurists which Mr. Root attended at the Hague was called by the League itself. Mr. Harding is really more anti-Wilson than anti-League.

The poor League seems then to be something of a waif, abandoned by all save the invalid in the White House. If it had other friends left, they could console themselves with the thought that Mr. Lloyd George won an election on the slogan "Hang the Kaiser" and then promptly abandoned that dream—and that Republico-Democratic campaign platforms, speeches, and promises are about as worthless. What they say about the League is merely their guess at what the public wants them to say now, and subject to revision after or even before the election. The socialist plank has the unique virtue of meaning what it says, and of knowing what it means.

L. S. G.

Week-End Warfare

ON the second page of the New York *Times* for August 20, hidden away under a very small headline, "Reds' Terms Please Lloyd George," was a special copyright cable from Paris. At the close of the cable the correspondent reports that France was more anxious over a Russo-Ger-

man scheme to "establish a common frontier" than over the possible defeat of the Poles. In fact, continues this amazing cable, "it is *now possible to state* that the matter was judged so grave here last week that the *question of striking a sudden blow from the Rhine bridgeheads at Germany* was seriously considered." (Italics ours.)

It may yet prove that the French socialist and British labor forces were not so far wrong when they feared a new secret diplomacy was planted over night upon the workers of Europe, and that their vigorous protests were not by any means so superfluous as Premier Lloyd George would have Britain believe.

W. H. C.

Workers' Control in Italy

THE Italian workers have made a highly significant experiment in their recent seizure of 400 factories connected with the metallurgical industry. The events leading to the seizure are briefly as follows:

Last summer thousands of metal workers demanded an increase in wages of seven lire a day, now equivalent to approximately thirty cents. The employers flatly refused, and negotiations were broken off. As a result the unions declared a general strike, charging that the employers were able to meet their demands, but wished to force the government to recede from its position in favor of the immediate confiscation of all excessive war profits.

This general strike developed a feature new to industrial warfare. Instead of ordering their members to quit work, the unions advised them to remain in the factories and to inaugurate at once a policy which they designated as "obstructionism"—a mild form of sabotage. This consisted in lowering the working pace and manufacturing certain articles in preference to others. The workers were to oppose any effort to lock them out, even to the point of physical resistance.

The "obstructionist" strike of a half million men began Friday, August 20. A few days

later, the Employers' Federation ordered the factories closed. Immediately the workers, at the call of the union, barricaded themselves in the shops, organized vigilance squads, or Red Guards, hauled down the company pennants, and hoisted the red flag in their place.

During the latter days of August and the first part of September the movement spread rapidly, and in a short time it was announced that the strikers had confiscated 400 metal works and other industries, and were running them in their own interest. A few days later the metal workers submitted a series of moderate demands, which would have assured the return of the factories to the employers. These demands the employers, against Giolitti's advice, refused to consider.

The Confederation of Labor replied by demanding a convocation of the Chamber of Deputies to initiate legislation which, "through requisition of industrial plants and participation in their management by workmen, will prepare the way for direct control of workers in the interest of collectivity."

On September 10 and 11 some 500 labor leaders from all parts of Italy met at Milan with the Executive committee of the Socialist Parliamentary group, which numbers 156 deputies, and, by a vote of 591,000 to 245, took the following position:

That the struggle for workers' control for the time being be confined to the metal workers;

That the metal workers be ordered, with all the force at their command, to oppose any effort to oust them from the positions they have conquered;

That the directorate of the Socialist party be invited to take steps to guarantee the metal workers the turnover of the factories with direct management by the working staffs in the interest of the common welfare;

That this syndical control in the metal industry be only a clearing of the way for those vaster conquests which must inevitably lead to socialization of industry.

At present writing Giolitti is offering no opposition to the demand for a session of Parliament. The workers are selling the finished products from their factories at public sales conducted by local chambers of labor. Liberals condemn the stand of the em-

ployers. The *New York Times* correspondent (September 15) thus describes the situation:

"Many Constitutional Liberals are said to be prepared for fundamental changes in the civil and commercial codes in the conviction that natural initiative toward socialization of industry would stimulate the working class to the maximum output and enhance immensely Italy's industrial prestige abroad.

"The General Council of the Italian Engineer's association . . . met in Rome today and passed a resolution which, while deprecating any nationalization of the metallurgical industry, demands the reordering of the industrial organism, in which the salary system shall be suppressed, and in which capital and labor, both intellectual and manual, shall work together with renewed faith, sharing equally in the profits of production."

The movement is now at the parting of the ways. Whether the factories will be returned to private control with limited working class representation, or whether the seizure of the metal industries will be but a signal for general socialization of industry it is too early to state.

H. W. L.

Recent Strikes in New York

THE sensational outbreak of strikes in New York City during the past month and the circumstances that surround them are a fair index of the present status of the American labor movement.

The strike on the Brooklyn Rapid Transit lines seems at this writing destined to result in the sacrifice of the most promising union of city transport workers in the East upon the altars of labor sectionalism and business solidarity. While the guards, ticket choppers, and agents on the subways and elevated lines, members of the Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees, quit work to enforce the most moderate demands, the subway motormen, members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, ran the trains that broke the strike. When the motormen and conductors on the surface cars walked out in company with the workers on the other lines, the engineers and firemen in the power houses, work-

ingmen no less, supplied the current which ran the cars that lost the fight.

While labor was thus committing hari-kari, the open shop drive of big business marched on to one more triumph. Perhaps the main factor in this triumph has been the growing confidence of business in anti-union tactics: the understanding among those who sit in the seats of the economic mighty that now is the time for them to hang together lest they hang apart later on. There has been no statistical attempt to show the influence of growing unemployment on the failure of the transit strike. The assumption is a fair one, however, that even without the aid of the engineers and power house men the B. R. T. strikers would have won on a tight labor market. It is not the professional scab but the seasonal class-unconscious jobless worker who seems to be breaking this strike for the company. People are saying "if the war were still on the men would have won."

Less sensational but none the less significant have been the strikes of the painters, the express and moving van drivers, and the plumbers. Together with the walkout on the B. R. T. these disturbances throw the spot light on the losing race which wages still run with the cost of living.

Statistics prepared for the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers by the Labor Bureau show that the cost of living in New York City has increased from September, 1919 to September, 1920 some 24.2 per cent. Food went up 16.6 per cent., clothing (allowing for recent decreases) 8.6 per cent., housing 56 per cent., fuel and light 39.2 per cent., furniture and furnishings 38.1 per cent., and miscellaneous articles 30.7 per cent. Weighted according to the relative importance of these items in the budget of a New York family, according to United States Department of Labor figures, these percentages put the increased cost to live at 24.2 per cent. During this time painters' wages have been increased but 12½ per cent. The ten dollars a day asked by the men has been featured by the employers as an exorbitant de-

mand. The figures show, however, that, owing to the seasonal nature of the trade, painters are making less than \$2,000 a year. The statistics advanced for the union show that \$2,228 is the barest minimum on which a normal family can maintain a mere animal existence in New York City at the present time, with no allowance for education, amusement, doctors' bills, insurance, etc.

That the case of the painters is typical was proven by no less an authority than receiver Garrison of the B. R. T. himself. In a recent statement he said that B. R. T. surface car conductors and motormen get \$1,650 to \$1,950 and subway guards from \$1,450 to \$1,560 a year. He pointed with pride to these figures in comparison with the "hard-working and faithful letter carriers" who get \$1,400-\$1,800, and the New York police and firemen who get \$1,769 to \$2,280.

It may be added that in the face of the 24.2 per cent. rise in cost of living the B.R.T. workers have received no increase at all since last September and only demanded 20 per cent. The cases of the plumbers and the drivers are but repetitions of the same story.

American labor to-day faces, on the one hand, a gradual shrinkage of the purchasing power of its wages, and, on the other, the united and aggressive forces of business entrenched in an anti-union campaign by growing unemployment—and American labor faces this, divided. E. C.

The Answer to Sweet

THE five ousted assemblymen of the New York state legislature were all returned against fusion candidates in the special election held September 16. In every district the socialist vote was greater than last year's. The combined vote for these candidates in 1919 was 28,469 against 32,516 for the republican and democratic candidates opposing them. In 1920 they received together 17,654 votes against 11,336. These figures show an awakened interest in the question of representative government, and

increased dissatisfaction with the assembly's inactivity in such economic questions as high prices and the housing situation.

Assemblyman Cuvillier, who was active in last session's prosecution, referred in a letter to Speaker Sweet to "the stupendous blunder of the Socialist party in sending these men back," and was "of the opinion, after a thorough investigation, that they will not be entitled to their seats in the Assembly." The issue of military appropriations, a leading count in the former conviction, virtually means that the state dictates the Assembly's vote on certain questions. M. W. T.

The Building Guild Again

NEARLY two years have passed since the armistice was signed; three million pounds sterling have been voted out of public moneys in Great Britain to build the critically needed houses—but "neither subsidy nor contracts with private builders have availed to set brick on brick." The British Minister of Health, indeed, asserts that private building contractors have formed "rings" in restraint of building. Neither capital nor labor can be induced under present conditions to produce the homes that are lacking.

The only alternative method seems to be that of the Building Guild, which has been before the British public since January. Long and varied criticism has been levelled at the "guildsmen" in the intervening months, but they seem at last to have met all their critics. A contract for erection of 400 houses in Walthamstow has been granted the London Guild of Builders which claims to have over 12,000 building laborers and mechanics, architects, and draftsmen on its rolls. In Manchester City the local guild of the Ministry of Health has arranged a compromise, combining a lump sum per house built with a percentage on costs.

Finally, Mr. S. G. Hobson has had a successful interview with the National Ministry of Health as to the form of contract upon

which the Building Guild can set to work. Under the contract the Building Guild supplies the labor, the Coöperative Wholesale society provides the building material, and the Coöperative Insurance society will give the financial guarantee that the contract will be completed.

Though all critics are now answered, the real but hidden difficulty remains. The local housing committees are more than loth to begin building owing to the strong resistance offered by property owners and private builders. That these parties will in the end be the losers is evident when one understands that by the new form of contract, sanctioned by the Ministry of Health, labor now keeps the *whole* process, from raw material to finished house, entirely in its own hands. W. H. C.

The New York Call

EVERY lover of fair play and democracy has reason to rejoice at the recent decision of Justice William Hitz of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia ordering the restoration of second-class mailing privileges to the *New York Call*. In this important decision Justice Hitz takes the following position:

The Espionage Act gives to the Postmaster General no authority to issue "a blanket order operating in future upon issues of a periodical publication not yet in existence, and consequently not yet subject to the examination of the department."

The Post Office department apparently asserts that such power is implied under the act. But "the Court can find no such authority in the statute; fraud or wrong-doing is never to be presumed; and the Court will sign an order to the effect that such future issues of the paper as are mailable under the law shall be received and transmitted as second class matter."

The history of the *Call's* three years' struggle for its rights throws a vivid light on the extremes to which Post Office dictatorship may proceed under pretext of national safety. On November 15, 1917, six months after the United States entered the war, Postmaster

General Albert Sidney Burleson arbitrarily revoked the *Call's* second-class privileges. Not until weeks later—and then only as a result of organized protest from all parts of the country—did he feel it necessary to state any specific charges against the paper.

Despite the revocation of these rights, the *Call* refused to haul down its flag and the Post Office thereupon established a strict censorship over every issue. While it could not interfere with city deliveries, it prevented no less than 67 issues of the paper from being sent through the mail as first-class matter or through express companies to out-of-town purchasers. In most instances the *Call's* editors were left completely in the dark as to the articles to which objection was made.

In January, 1919, several weeks after the signing of the armistice, the *Call* made formal application for the return of its rights. The Post Office department acknowledged the receipt of this application, but apparently gave the matter no further attention during the succeeding nine months. In the meanwhile, however, it held up several additional issues of the New York daily.

In November, the *Call* began suit against the Postmaster General. A week later Mr. Burleson denied the paper's January application, alleging that it was violating not only the Espionage Act, but also a section of the penal code directed against the issuance of obscene publications, and incitations to arson, murder, and assassination!

In March of this year Attorney Block started proceedings before Justice Hitz for a *mandamus* order to compel the Postmaster General to restore its second-class privileges to the socialist daily. The petition presented to the Court accused the Postmaster General of acting contrary to the letter and the spirit of the laws and Constitution of the United States, and of conduct amounting to persecution. It continued:

"The New York *Call* has always openly and avowedly espoused the principles of socialism and of radical changes in government and industry. At no time, however, in its history has the New York *Call* violated any laws or counseled or advo-

cated the violation of laws. It has always advocated an orderly change in laws, political institutions, and in the organization of industry.

"Not only has the New York *Call* and your petitioner never been charged with, or prosecuted for, or convicted of, any offense, criminal or otherwise, under the laws of the United States of America, or any of its states or territories, but its editors, managers, and officers have also never been charged with, or prosecuted for, or convicted of, any such offense."

Mr. Burleson defended his action on the ground that "the *Call* aims not only at the present economic industrial system but essentially at the present system of government in this country." As a horrible example of the attitude of the *Call*, he cites an editorial of August 18, 1919, which contended that the Federal Constitution represents a series of compromises between representatives of various forms of property. After quoting this article, which but puts in popular language the views of numerous American historians, Burleson asserts:

"The Court will note that this is in itself a violation of Section 3 of Title 1 of the Espionage Act as amended. Moreover, respondent [the Postmaster General] submits that this editorial is in itself sufficient proof that in attacking 'the capitalist system' the New York *Call* is aiming at the federal government."

The answer throughout would make interesting reading beside the "Messages of Woodrow Wilson." It might throw some light on the application of Wilsonian idealism to the concrete problems of American life.

Justice Hitz considered the *Call's* petition and the reply thereto, and rendered his decision of August 26, which vindicated the *Call*, its able and courageous editor, Charles W. Ervin, and its devoted attorneys, S. John Block and Morris Hillquit.

The Postmaster General announces that he will appeal the case, and despite the claims of many lawyers that the *mandamus* order must be obeyed pending the appeal, the *Call* is still awaiting a Post Office notification of the restoration of its rights. Many of its friends are urging the *Call* officials not to be content with a mere return of privilege so long denied, but to take steps toward the

recovery of the many thousands of dollars lost by it during the last three years of persecution. Thus the *Nation* of September 4 advises:

"By the courage and ability of its editors and managers, and the loyalty of its readers, who made the survival of the paper their daily business, the *Call* has not only lived, but lived to get back its rights and to prove Mr. Burleson a law-breaker or at least a law stretcher himself. But no mere restoration of its mailing rights can restore the enormous sums of money lost through the action of the Postmaster General. Until the *Call* is adequately repaid for the almost incalculable damage inflicted by the Postmaster General, until some recompense is made for his cold-blooded attempts to strangle it to death, the case should not be allowed to rest. The *Call* should take immediate steps to recover through the Court of Claims or by suing the Postmaster General himself the full amount of its damages."

Satisfaction at this preliminary victory for a freer press should not blind the liberal and radical to the fact that even the *Call's* victory is not complete, and that the fight of scores of other periodicals for the restoration of their rights has just begun. Not only is the *Milwaukee Leader*—the second of the three socialist dailies in the country—still without second-class privileges, but letters sent to the office of the *Leader* are still returned to their senders as undeliverable under the provisions of the Espionage Act.

H. W. L.

New Labor Dailies

THE ranks of the daily labor press in the United States have been augmented this summer by *The Oklahoma Leader* and *The Minnesota Daily Star*. Oscar Ameringer, the humorist of the Socialist party, well known to all readers of *The Milwaukee Leader*, is the editor of the new Oklahoma daily, and Herbert Gaston, treasurer of *The Federated Press*, and author of "The Nonpartisan League," heads the editorial staff on *The Minnesota Daily Star*, published in Minneapolis by a company organized by the farmers' Nonpartisan league and union labor.

W. H. C.

American Socialists and the Third International

DESPITE the fact that the Socialist party of the United States has consistently expressed its support of the Soviet government and has voted overwhelmingly to affiliate with the Third or Moscow International, recent advices from abroad indicate that conditions exacted of affiliated groups will make coöperation between the American Socialist party and the Moscow International difficult if not impossible. These conditions, according to the delegates of the German Independent Social Democratic party to the Moscow congress, are in part as follows:

All affiliated parties must accept the communist program. All the papers of these parties must be edited by communist editors. Opportunists like Kautsky and Hilferding, two leaders of the Independent Socialists in Germany, Hillquit, leader of the Socialist party in America, Longuet in France, and Macdonald in England, must be expelled. The Moscow executives can at any moment demand that an undesirable member in the different nations be expelled, and that undesirable socialist representatives in Parliament shall resign. The national sections should organize communist groups in factories, and communist unions. They must conduct revolutionary propaganda in the armies on a large scale. Every national section will have to carry the name of Communist party.

The office of the Socialist party declares:

"The Socialist party of the United States cannot and will not accept dictation about its internal policies, or its handling of domestic issues from an executive committee in Moscow.

"The demands of the Moscow congress, as set forth in this report, are so absurd and impossible that the Socialist parties of none of the western nations can accept them. The attempt to force such conditions upon the parties in the United States, England, France, and Germany can only result in alienating much of the sympathy and support which these organizations are inclined to give the Third International. They make necessary and certain the eventual organization of a Fourth International, organized on a reasonable basis, which will permit necessary autonomy to the affiliated national parties, and give those parties proper representation in committees and con-

gresses, and a voice in determining International policies."

The Socialist party of the United States, in proposing affiliation, had insisted that "no formula such as 'the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of soviets' be imposed as a condition of affiliation." It also claimed the right to participate in movements looking to "the union of all true socialist forces in the world."

H. W. L.

A National Bail Fund

BEFORE the war anyone seriously proposing a national bail fund for political and industrial prisoners in this country would have been laughed out of court. During the war, however, hundreds of prisoners were sentenced for the mere expression of opinion or for membership in radical organizations. Although nearly two years have elapsed since the signing of the armistice, this number is steadily increasing. At present there are probably two thousand members of radical labor and political organizations sentenced under the criminal syndicalism and the criminal anarchism statutes, the Lever act, labor conspiracy acts and local statutes. Many of these are in prison, some are out on bail pending appeal. Many now in prison would be out if funds were available. In most cases surety companies refuse to go bail or propose almost impossible terms.

The directors of the American Civil Liberties union, with headquarters at 188 West Thirteenth Street, New York City, are therefore attempting to organize a national bail fund to serve these cases. Such a fund, they claim, will have at least two advantages: no publicity will attach to the name of the person supplying bail, and second, the administration of the fund will, it is hoped, relieve those going bail from attending to the details incident upon individual handling of these cases. It is also claimed that the chances of loss are greatly reduced, as subscribers to a national bail fund would share together any loss which might be entailed by the forfeiture of a bond.

H. W. L.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SOCIALIST REVIEW:

SIR: Whatever we may think of the Socialists, we must admit that they score a victory in forcing the Democrats and Republicans to "fuse" in certain districts of New York City. From these districts five Socialists were recently elected to the New York legislature, although they were unseated by that "fused" body. Now the Republicans and Democrats of said districts have decided to come together on their candidates and get out one ticket.

This is a great victory for the Socialists. It puts them in on a two-party basis. It forces the two older parties to admit what the Socialists have claimed—that those two parties are just alike: for they are enough alike to be *one*. It has been said that the only difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party was "that one is *out* and the other *in*." But in this Anti-Socialist fusion even that difference disappears: for the two old parties will be *in* or *out* together, accordingly as they may win or lose against the Socialists.

This is victory for the Socialists, and amounts to destruction of one or both of the other parties. It will make the issue of principles clearer. It will make Socialism seem less like something extraneous and impossible to the average voter and more like the natural opposition to old ideas and policies.

WM. PICKENS

New York City.

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Published Monthly by the

INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

Editor, HARRY W. LADLER. Wesleyan.

Managing Editor, W. HARRIS CROOK. Oxford.

Business Manager, MARIAN TYLER. Oberlin.

Editorial Board

JAMES W. ALEXANDER.....	Princeton
EVANS CLARK	Amherst
H. W. L. DANA.....	Harvard
LEWIS S. GANNETT.....	Harvard
FELIX GRENDON	Columbia
JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN.....	Barnard
WINTEROP D. LANE.....	Michigan
F. F. ROCKWELL.....	Wesleyan
ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG	Trinity

Contributing Editors

Louis B. Boudin, Stuart Chase, Arthur Gleason, Freda Kirchwey, John Haynes Holmes, Florence Kelley, Bruno Lasker, Caro Lloyd, James H. Maurer, Wm. P. Montague, S. Nuorteva, James Oneal, Harry A. Overstreet, Vida D. Scudder, Charles P. Steinmetz, Norman M. Thomas, Louis Untermeyer, and Bevel Zimand.

Debs the Candidate

Jessie Wallace Hugan

SOCIALISTS vote for principles rather than men, and if, by some feat of the imagination, personalities such as Cox and Harding could be conceived of as running on the socialist ticket, socialists would support them with faith in the outcome. It is fortunate, however, that, while the Socialist Party has throughout these trying years sought first its ideals with reckless disregard of the brilliancy and popularity of its leaders, all these things seem to have been added unto it in the personality of Eugene Victor Debs.

His Career

Old party candidates find it necessary to exploit the simplicity of their origin, their unadulterated Americanism, and their kindly attitude toward labor. Although their lives hitherto may have been directed chiefly toward financial and social success, their nomination must reverse this procedure, at least on the surface; and we find aspirants vying with each other in farm labor, overalls, humble birth-places, and ungrammatical relatives. They must show themselves men of the people.

'Gene Debs has no need of these devices. Born in a rude little dwelling in Terre Haute, in 1855, Debs was the son of hard-working French immigrants from Alsace. Upon his graduation at fifteen from the Old Seminary School of that city, he became a railroad worker, first in the shops and later as locomotive fireman. His mother could not overcome her fear of this dangerous work, however, and for her sake 'Gene regretfully left the railroad after four years for work in a grocery store. In 1879 he was elected city clerk of Terre Haute, holding this office till 1888. Meanwhile he had become editor of the *Firemen's Magazine* and an active organizer of various railway groups, including the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen. In

1892, however, he resigned from these offices, which brought him a salary of \$4,000 a year, in order to build up an organization broad enough to embrace all the workers of the industry. The resignation was refused and he was unanimously reelected, and upon his further insistence the organization voted him two thousand dollars for a trip to Europe. This also he declined, and proceeded to organize the American Railway Union at a salary of nine hundred a year.

In 1894 Debs conducted the great strike of the American Railway Union in sympathy with the Pullman workers, was several times imprisoned in an attempt to break up the union, and finally served six months in Woodstock jail on a charge of contempt of court.

One of our presidential candidates has adopted the custom of always shaking hands with the engineer who has transported his important person without accident. Eugene Debs does not do this. At present he does not travel. But engineers need wait for no condescending greeting from 'Gene. He is one of them. He went to jail for the railroad workers. Even after his imprisonment Debs continued his work for the A. R. U., receiving no salary at all for the last two years of its existence. When the organization at last went to pieces with legal obligations for \$40,000, Debs, who was not personally liable, helped with the proceeds of his lectures to pay off the last cent of this indebtedness.

His has been a life for labor. All over the United States, among the American Federation, the I. W. W., the independent organizations and the helpless thousands of unorganized, there is no name that can so arouse love and loyalty as that of 'Gene Debs. They may differ from him seriously in policy; they may decry political action on the one hand, or pin their faith to the "rewarding of

friends" tactics on the other. Yet all recognize Debs to be their whole-hearted representative, as the capitalists recognize Gary and Morgan to be theirs.

The Personality of Debs

There is a certain type of personality which, perhaps more than any other, is taken at present as truly American. Long, lank, and raw-boned, breathing the free spirit of the prairies, Debs is almost an exaggerated representative of the Hoosier American celebrated by James Whitcomb Riley. In fact, Riley has addressed more than one affectionate stanza to Debs himself. I wonder if any other figure in our present political life has ever received such a tribute as Riley's now familiar lines:

"And there's 'Gene Debs—a man 'at stands
And jest holds out in his two hands
As warm a heart as ever beat
Betwixt here and the Judgement Seat."

Debs is a real orator, of a distinctively American type. Epigrammatic and silver-tongued, he differs from the typical socialist orator in making his appeal to the emotions as well as to the reason, and to ethics as well as economics. The carping critic might sometimes call his style sentimental, for it shares with such poets as Field, Riley, and Carleton the play upon the emotions of home and family which the simple American loves. Where this appeal with other speakers is artificial, however, with Debs it is the spontaneous expression of a tender love for the mother, the child, and the helpless, which flows out, even more than in his oratory, in every day of his human relationships in Terre Haute. To quote Eugene Field:

"'Gene Debs is the most lovable man I ever knew. Debs is sincere. His heart is as gentle as a woman's and as fresh as a mountain brook. If Debs were a priest the world would listen to his eloquence, and that gentle, musical voice and sad, sweet smile of his would soften the hardest heart."

A Force in Politics

In speaking of a man who inspires affection to an unusual degree there is always danger of neglecting the intellectual and practical qual-

ities. Suppose that by some miracle of public opinion Debs should actually win the election, would the Socialist Party regret its choice of a standard-bearer? Assuredly not, for it believes that Eugene Debs is immeasurably more capable of discharging the serious duties of chief executive than any of his opponents.

As far back as 1878 Debs declined the Democratic nomination for Congress, and in 1885 was elected to the Indiana legislature on that ticket, with a successful political career opening before him. Only his deliberate refusal of preferment in becoming a socialist kept his oratorical gifts from winning him high political office. The crucial step was not taken hastily, however. Although Debs first became interested in socialism during his imprisonment in 1894, he experimented sincerely with liberal reform, as many others have done, before casting in his lot with the socialist movement. In 1896 he supported William J. Bryan for president. The next year, however, he declared himself a socialist, and, with other members of the A. R. U., organized the Social Democratic Party of America, which three years later merged with other groups to form the present Socialist Party.

In 1900 Debs was nominated for President of the United States, receiving 97,000 votes, in 1904 receiving 402,000, in 1908, 424,000, and in 1912, 901,000. He declined the nomination of 1916, but has accepted once more for the contest of 1920.

When the war came, Debs, a pronounced pacifist, joined with his party in the anti-war declaration of 1917. He continued to express his convictions in his public utterances, was arrested under the so-called Espionage act, and in April, 1919, five months after the armistice, began a ten years' sentence in federal prison. He has consistently refused to ask for pardon, or to allow others to ask for it except as part of a general amnesty, and during the long sixteen months has never been known to falter in his courage, steadfastness, and radiant, loving spirit toward both jailers and comrades.

Even though Debs resigned once for all the prospect of a governmental career, he has gained as an executive in powerful labor organizations a wide experience in dealing with men. Diplomacy is the quality in him which to any one acquainted with the radical movement inspires the greatest admiration. In the crucial ten years that have passed since the party emerged into prominence, years full of controversy concerning industrial action, violence and internationalism, of schisms and expulsions and resignations, Debs has made no enemies, has retracted no statements, but has remained always the reconciler, the friend of all, the center of the revolutionary forces of the country.

A World Figure

American politics has suddenly taken its place as a part of European history, what bids fair to be a permanent place. It would be an interesting experiment to test the names Cox, Harding, and Debs in the acquaintanceship of European publicists from Russia to Ireland. As friend to some, as opponent to others, Debs is a world personage, a force to be reckoned with. A shade of amusement must cross the European mind at the thought of the Ohio editors that have been set up against Debs.

To any but the Socialist Party there is danger in a personality too long the center of devotion. There was method in the choice by the old parties of dark horses. Socialism, however, just because of its disregard of men compared with principles, its definite philosophy, its platforms determined by referendum, and its strict control of officers, can afford this luxury. Debs knows, as Lenin and Trotsky know of themselves, that the cause is independent of him as it was independent of Jaurès, Liebknecht, and Keir Hardie. He therefore offers freely the wealth of his personality to serve his comrades, whether that service call him to jail or to the White House.

Issues of the Campaign

Debs the candidate possesses the only real issues of the 1920 campaign—the restoration of civil liberties, the abolition of capitalist

robbery, and the abolition of war. Even on the issue which Cox and Harding claim as dividing them, the ratification of the League of Nations with the Versailles Treaty, Debs alone can stand securely. Socialists can distance the republicans in their refusal to fight the battles of Clemenceau, and the democrats in their determination to bind the nations of the world in a league of peace. They alone, however, can consistently reconcile these two policies by their demand for an internationalism of democracies freed from capitalism and war.

It is true that the workers and middle-class radicals are not all ranged behind 'Gene Debs. If they were, he would be the next president. Some of them, following in detail the way of Russia, others that of Great Britain, they are experimenting with methods other than that of revolutionary political action along the lines of the American Constitution. We have a seasoned candidate, however. He has seen the gradual disintegration of the Republican and Democratic parties, the rise and fall of the Greenbackers, Populists, and Progressives during the generation that has developed American socialism from a little cult of doctrinaires to a formidable third party against whom the old political groups must now bury their differences in fusion. Our candidate can afford to be confident. The forces of economic development are ranged on his side.

Meanwhile his enemies have provided him with a rostrum, the most dramatic in our history, from which, unless fear too late teaches them clemency, he will silently conduct his Prison-Cell Campaign!

Shall we raise our price?

The Socialist Review is not self-supporting on its present basis. With subsidy, however, it can continue in the reduced size in which it has been appearing since July, or for an increased price can be issued in larger form. While the reduced size means the sacrifice of much valuable material, some busy readers prefer to have the editors assume the duty of selection. We should be glad to hear the opinions of many readers to assist us in deciding whether to increase our size and price.

Radicalism in American Politics¹

Morris Hillquit

THE United States is due for a strong radical wave. The whole civilized world is in a state of social and political ferment, and America is bound to be drawn into the general revolutionary current. The tendency towards a powerful movement of radicalism is clear and unmistakable. The symptoms of its rapid approach are multiplying. The industrial and financial derangements of the country are daily assuming more threatening proportions. The high cost of living keeps on mounting fast while wages move up at a dishearteningly slow pace and unemployment reaches serious dimensions. The ruling classes have proved themselves ludicrously inadequate to cope with the critical situation. Blind to the glaring signs of the new time, anxious to maintain their privileges uncurtailed, and reckless of ultimate consequences, they have embarked upon a policy of impossible promises and quack remedies coupled with high-handed methods of industrial repression and political violence. American workers are sore and humiliated, American liberals are outraged, American radicals are exasperated.

A large body of popular discontent and unrest is abroad, larger than at any previous time in the history of the republic. It is directed against both old parties as the political instruments of the ruling classes, and manifests itself in a deep indifference towards the feigned fight of the uninspiring Republican and Democratic candidates. It is directed against the official leadership of organized labor in the American Federation of Labor and the Railway Brotherhoods, which has shown itself timid, reactionary, and

inept at a time when labor's most crying need is for resolute and aggressive action. It expresses itself in frequent overthrows of old-line leaders, in numerous secessions, and in the irrepressible "outlaw" strikes.

The sentiment of revolt is as yet largely negative, unformulated and unorganized, but it will find voice and form eventually.

What are the present political indications of its probable concrete development?

Since our entry into the world war and the resultant political and economic upheavals the radical forces in American politics have been enriched by two new groups: the American Labor party, which has somewhat suddenly turned into a "Farmer-Labor" party, and the "Left Wing" socialists, who have gradually evolved into a "Communist" movement. Let us consider their respective contributions to the organized radical movement in America.

The Farmer-Labor Party

The first sporadic attempts to form political labor parties in several industrial centers of the country were met by the socialists of America in a spirit of rather benevolent neutrality. The socialists pursue no personal or party interests in politics. Their aim is to abolish capitalism with all the evils that the term implies and to socialize the industries of the country. Whether this program is to be carried out by the Socialist party as at present constituted or by any other organization or by a combination of organized political, industrial, and spiritual forces, is a matter of comparative indifference to them.

The cardinal point upon which there is general agreement in the socialist ranks is that no socialist revolution can be successfully accomplished in the United States without the active support and participation of the large masses of the American workers acting as a class in conscious and organized opposition

¹ In the effort to secure articles representing both of the radical parties in the coming election, *The Socialist Review* has obtained this presentation of the case for the Socialist party by Morris Hillquit, but has been unable, after canvassing four different sources, to secure a special article representing the Farmer-Labor party.

to the ruling classes. The bulk of the American workers have not yet reached the point of political class-consciousness. The task of the radical movement is to educate them to it. This process of education may follow one or both of two conceivable lines of development. A socialist movement may begin with a small group of fully schooled and trained socialists and increase its strength by a steady stream of individual converts, or it may take its starting-point in a large body of workers organized for the protection of their class interests but without a definite program of ultimate social and political aims, and even without a clear conception of the class character of their own movement. Socialist progress in such a case may be made through the process of growing class-consciousness and revolutionary clarity of the movement as a whole. Needless to say that both methods of socialist growth, the quantitative as well as the qualitative, may coexist and supplement each other. The first method is that of the Socialist party. The second might conceivably have been adopted by the Labor party.

It was undoubtedly the expectation of some of the founders of the party, notably the former Socialist party members among them, that it would follow that course. "The Socialist program is fundamentally sound," they argued, "but the body of American workers are not ripe for it and are deeply prejudiced against the term Socialism. They can, however, be approached through the medium of a labor party, and once arrayed against all old parties in independent working-class political struggle, they cannot fail in the long run to draw the ultimate consequences of the fight."

The Labor party would have justified such expectations and given promise of becoming an active factor in the struggle for the emancipation of labor if it had succeeded in enlisting the support of the bulk of the organized workers in the United States, or failing that, if it had at least established itself as a radical minority within the organized labor movement, determined to wrest the leadership from the hands of the reactionaries. Its whole existence and hope of suc-

cess lay in the fact that it was frankly a class party—a political organization of labor. Unfortunately the leaders of the new movement seemed to realize this cardinal point only during the formative stages of their party. When they entered upon their first national political campaign, they succumbed completely and pitifully to the besetting vice of "practical" American politics, the sacrifice of principle to the desire of momentary political success, the selling of the soul for votes.

The fusion of the Labor party with the nebulous aggregation of middle-class liberals known as the "Committee of 48" was an irretrievable surrender of the vital working-class character of the new party, and the coupling of its political destinies with the purely imaginary forces of the farming community made confusion worse confounded. It is therefore not to be wondered at that the party has produced a platform which is little more than a heterogeneous assortment of meaningless liberal and radical phrases utterly devoid of the cohesive cement of the modern working-class philosophy, nor that it has named for its principal standard bearer a man whose name and record stand for nothing in the labor movement or in the radical political movement of the country. The Farmer Labor party has killed the Labor party and committed suicide with one blow. It will hardly survive the presidential election for any length of time, and will eventually dissolve into the separate incongruous elements which go into its make-up or patch-up.

The "Communist" vs. the Socialist Movement

The birth of the Labor party was to some extent a manifestation of impatience with the "dogmatic," "uncompromising," and "unpatriotic" policy of the American socialists; the formation of the "communist" movement on the other hand was the expression of equal impatience with their "wavering," "opportunistic," and "nationalistic" tactics.

The presence of an extreme group in any radical movement is quite desirable. By their constant insistence upon purity of principle

and method, even when such insistence is pedantic, they serve to check any existing tendencies towards the opposite extremes of laxity and opportunism. The Socialist party of the United States, as the Socialist parties in all other countries, has always had and probably always will have such groups. But the specific "Left Wing" movement which sprang up in this country about two years ago was entirely different in origin and character. It was not a legitimate reaction against undue conservatism in the Socialist party. The party had all through the war and after the war taken the most advanced international socialist position.

Rather was it a peculiar echo of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, a quixotic attempt to duplicate it in the United States, to copy its methods, repeat its phrases, and imitate its leaders and heroes. It was as impractical as it was romantic, and only the extraordinary glamour and fascination of the great Russian revolution can account for the spread of the movement, short-lived as it was. While the "Left-Wing" propaganda was limited to negative criticism of Socialist party methods, and had the abundant arsenal of epithet and invective of the chairman of the Moscow International to draw upon for weapons against the socialist "leaders," all went well, but when the apostles of the new movement were confronted with the task of concrete organization and positive work, they foundered upon the rock of their confused theories and impossible creed. The short history of

their existence as "communists" has been marked by endless internecine strife and successive splits, each faction accusing the other of bourgeois conservatism and treachery to the revolution. To-day the much-heralded movement is reduced to a few thousand Russians, Ukrainians, Lithuanians, and Letts engaged in a comic-opera game of underground conspiracy to overthrow the bourgeois government of the United States, and a handful of American intellectuals with a generous sprinkling of Department of Justice agents. To the jaded tastes of some literary dilettanti and faddists such a blood-and-thunder pastime may provide a pleasant stimulus, but as a serious social movement aiming to lead the great masses of the American people in the paths of proletarian revolution, it is a ludicrous fiasco.

Thus neither the Farmer Labor party nor the Communist party, the new parties to the "right" and to the "left" of American socialism, have made any essential contribution to American radicalism. The Socialist party still holds the leadership in radical politics in the United States. Its ranks have been weakened of late by the "labor" and "communist" secessions and by government persecution. But the very failure of the rival organizations will in the long run prove a source of new socialist strength as will also the official attacks. The serious-minded working-class radicals still have only one present hope and one logical rallying point—the Socialist party.

British Imperialism and the Australian Workers

W. Francis Ahern

A DETERMINED attempt is being made in Australia to pave the way for imperial domination and a whitening down of the people's self-governing rights. All the powers of social and political prestige are being used to fasten the fetters of empire on the Australian people.

Just as in the early days of the war the people of Australia were made to see "red" by a carefully-planned propaganda campaign, so today they are being misled by the pseudo-idealistic sentiments of racial unity. Emboldened by the apparent success that has attended the public utterances of the im-

perialistic carpet-baggers, the imperial federationists of Britain are now leaving their underground engineering and wire-pulling, and are launching a public campaign which must, if successful, inevitably curtail the rights of the Australian commonwealth and those of other British oversea dominions.

Speaking in London on June 18 last, Lord Milner, Secretary of State for the colonies, made this important utterance:

"The consultations which have previously taken place between British and dominion ministers upon matters of mutual interest are declared to be inadequate and insufficient, and must be followed by constitutional development and the creation of a distant super-Parliament."

Such a statement, embracing empire and dominion policy, is hardly a mere opinion, but must be taken as the well-considered policy of the British imperialists. Milner went on to say that

"there was no ambassador anywhere representing the Empire in the same sense as an ambassador represented the United Kingdom; therefore, the question arose whether we should not devise a means of making the influence of the Empire as a whole as distinct from the United Kingdom continuously effective in the councils of the world. This was temporarily achieved during the war, and by the peace negotiations, through the Imperial War cabinet and the British Empire delegation.

" . . . He was absolutely convinced that something more was necessary than we had got in the constitution of the Empire.

" . . . He anticipated intense interest and a great hope in the meeting of the Constitutional conference next year, and he trusted that it would not separate without providing the Empire with some organ of government, based upon the recognition of the complete independence and equality of its different parts."

Australia unfortunately has a noisy minority of jingoes and imperialists who make no secret of their anti-Australianism. They argue that there can be no League of Nations until the British Empire has formed a working solution of its own nations, and they applaud the statements of men like Milner, whom they praise as experienced and capable public servants, giving their lives to the development of an imperial constitution.

Safeguards by Canadians

It is unthinkable that Canada—conservative as that dominion has always been, and is today—could be cajoled into this imperialistic reaction. For Canada, despite her conservatism, has demanded and secured a measure of independence not thought of in other dominions, much to the credit of her independent national spirit. Canadians have asserted and extended their freedom and liberty by:

1. Insisting upon the recognition of Canada first at all public functions. "The Maple Leaf," Canada's national anthem, is always sung before "God Save."

2. Insisting upon and arranging that Canada should be represented by its own ambassador in the United States, entirely independent of the British ambassador.

3. Insisting upon and arranging its trade direct with the United States, and having its exchange rate based on its own international trade.

4. Insisting upon the local choice of vice-regal representatives, such as governors.

5. Abolishing the further conferring of all titles and social distinction by the Crown upon Canadians.

Australian Handicaps

In every one of these cases, Australia is at a distinct disadvantage. Vice-regal representatives are thrust upon the Australian people, because they do not assert their own rights. Queensland is the only state in Australia that has chosen its own governor. The Australian rate of exchange is not based on Australia's favorable position, but upon Britain's unfavorable trade balance. All Australia's international bills are paid through the London money market. Thus the Australian business people are losing millions of pounds sterling because of the depreciated purchasing power of British money in the United States and elsewhere. Even India does not stand this, and Indian exchange is based upon Indian international trade. British capitalists reap huge harvests from Australia, but when the state governments of that country want to borrow money in London they are coolly told by British vested interests that they must legislate for the impoverishment and enslavement of their

peoples, or the financial squeeze will be applied.

Australia and the other dominions need more self-government, not less. The nations within the British Empire form a great world-wide federation. The looser the legal ties that bind, and the more each national entity with its own customs, claims, and environment is allowed to develop freely, the stronger will be the ties of mutual advantage. But with the imposition of additional checks and limitations, more division and dissension and disintegration will be created. Lord Milner and the imperial federationists, both in Britain and abroad, are therefore rendering the greatest disservice to the cohesion and solidarity of the English speaking nations.

Awakening of Labor

Fortunately, the Australian workers are learning by experience. Their ignorance of

foreign affairs in the past made them easy victims to the lies and crafty cunning of the imperialists who plunged the world in war, and cost Australia sixty thousand lives, probably more maimed bodies, a debt of four million pounds sterling, discontent and strife, and a score of other national and local calamities. They realize today that none of the objects for which they were dragged into war have been realized, but that militarism and capitalism are stronger than before.

It is well that labor's voice and pen are alive to the danger that besets the workers of Australia. And it may even be that, just as the courageous speakers and writers of the Australian Labor Party saved the workers of that country from the shackles of conscription, so they may save them now from the glittering net of Imperial Federation and exploitation by the capitalists of Britain.

The New Voter

Harriot Stanton Blatch

IN a presidential year some time ago, one of the old parties, after the heaviest suffrage guns had been trained on its platform committee, promulgated a plank recommending that "women be welcomed to wider fields of usefulness." Not to power, not to influence, but to *usefulness*, mind you!

This "splinter," as one witty suffragist dubbed the pronunciamiento, served to tickle woman's sense of humor, for it was funny that such an invitation should come from the sex which in more than one species furnishes the drones of the group and be addressed to the sex which produces all goods for immediate consumption in most species, especially in that to which the sons of Adam belong.

The platforms of 1920 contain similar mirth-provoking items. One party welcomes women to full "activities" in the machine, but assigns them to positions as modest cogs on the wheels. Both old parties heroically declare for national suffrage on the eve of the victory, neither having made in the days of

trial any sacrifice to advance the cause of enfranchisement. The promises that women's working hours shall be curtailed are not accompanied by any offer of financial compensation for the industrial limitation.

Women and the Farmer-Labor Party

In short, there is no reason why women as women should cast a ballot for either of the old parties, for neither attempts to solve their special, fundamental problem. Women produce the human race, they bake the biscuits, boil the potatoes, broil the steak, and serve the product of their toil to the hungry family. In the end as in the beginning, they remain dependents. The old parties meet this condition with silence. How does the Farmer-Labor Party meet it? In silence, too.

Taking into account the paid and unpaid work of women, they perform at least three-fifths of the labor of the world. The unpaid woman toiler, she who does more for human joy and comfort than any other laborer, leads

the vast army of the exploited. She lives in slavery, while in her womb she bears the race, and on her bent shoulders carries its heaviest burdens. Paid and unpaid, the women toilers are one-half the citizens of our country. And yet to this vast class the Farmer-Labor Party does not address one word of promise. There stands the problem, but no solution is offered.

I dismiss, then, with the old parties the new Farmer-Labor Party as sterile so far as the crucial need of women is concerned. As a citizen interested in general economic questions, I may prefer its cautiousness to the bold ignorance of the old parties, but as one who is seeking a platform that delves to the bottom of the exploitation of all forms of labor power, I can not but be suspicious of the omissions in the Labor Party program.

The Socialist Party

In the Socialist Party, and there alone, I find a radical promise to women. As a matter of course the platform demands "equal and unrestricted" suffrage, and it is abreast of Europe in urging the complete abolition of child labor and a minimum wage and shorter working day for all adult labor. But above all this stands the recognition in its "Declaration of Principles" of the racial meaning "of the sordid factor of the dependence of woman on man."

Many years ago, I was summoned by a friend in Yorkshire, England, to see an old manor house before it was dismantled. It was fully reminiscent of the eighteenth century. In the courtyard was the smoke-house where in the old days meat and fish were cured; in the cellar one saw the vats for melting down tallow, the utensils for preparing flax, for washing and carding wool. In the garret were the moulds for candle making, wheels for spinning the thread, looms for weaving the cloth. The housewife was a creator of mighty treasure in those days. She had an economic sphere at the manor, in the farm house, in the cottage.

Women the Burden Bearers

And how men writers miss the meaning for women of the economic changes of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Even Marx speaks of the woman of that day as if she were "supported" by her men-folk. And he regards the women hands in factory life as a new force in the production of commodities. This keen-eyed student does not mention women as leading factors in the development of the "manufacturing" period, although the "spinsters" were the very first workers to be herded within four walls to the end that they might be brought by the capitalist under supervision and discipline.

Were the enfranchised woman of the twentieth century to turn back and do her own investigating, she would find how she has been gradually robbed of her tools of production, robbed of the fruit of her toil, until she has fallen into the grip of capitalism. She would see, if she belongs to the class of the exploiting few, how she has been degraded from a position of self-reliant dignity to one of parasitism where she is used as a lay-figure for display of the wealth her lord accumulates, or as initiator of charities which bolster up an economic system which dooms her to slavery.

If she is of the working class, she finds herself as housewife and mother condemned to a life of drudgery, or as a factory hand regarded by men's trade unions as a poacher on preserves which were entirely her own in earlier times. As an unpaid worker she lives in perpetual tutelage; as a paid worker she yields the capitalist larger surplus value than any other wage-earner. Here is sufficient ground for the new voter to pause and take thought. What political party will break her chains?

There is but one party urging women to use their political power to the end of striking off their economic bonds. Let no one suppose that women fail to appreciate the amount and the value of their labor in the world. They feel the ignominy and the in-

justice of their dependence. And in the end they will come into the party which recognizes their difficulties, and invites them to help solve their knotty problems.

Every party, according to its lights, makes promises to labor; no party, except the Socialist Party, makes any promise to women. And yet never was there a more auspicious time to forward the endowment of mother-

hood. We do not sail on uncharted seas, for every belligerent nation adopted the scheme during the war and with happy results for its people.

Women are now voters, and as they grasp that their economic condition lies at the heart of social well-being, they will rally to the party which aims to end the "sordid dependence of woman on man."

The Rise of British Socialism

Arthur Gleason

A CERTAIN few books must be read in order to catch even a glimmering of what is working out in Britain. For no hasty change is under way but a long-prepared event. From the thirteenth century the ideas now prevailing have simmered and worked in British consciousness. These ideas were defeated and suppressed, but they were the projection of an ineradicable instinct, the instinct for equality. And now at last they emerge from their long subterranean burrowing, and become "the arbiters of contemporary events." The history of the next one hundred years will see these ideas shaped into legislation, built into institutions, and incarnated into an equalitarian society. To understand even a little of the British social revolution, now in its gentle prelude, one must at least have digested the work of the Webbs, Graham Wallas, and the Hammonds, and the reports of many committees and commissions.

And for understanding one stream of the thought that is remaking Britain, we have Max Beer's *History of British Socialism*. The quotations that follow are from this work, of which one volume has already been translated into English.¹

In his preface, Beer says:

"The English intellect, from its sheer recklessness, is essentially revolutionary, probably more so than the French intellect. But since 1688 it has been

the endeavor of English statesmen and educators to impart to the nation a conservative, cautiously moving temper, a distrust of generalization, an aversion from carrying theory to its logical conclusions . . . In periods of general upheavals, however, when the dynamic forces of society are vehemently asserting themselves, the English are apt to throw their mental ballast overboard, and take the lead in revolutionary thought and action. In such a period we are living now. Since the beginning of the new century a new England has been springing up . . . The masses are joining issue with the classes upon the question of a redistribution of wealth and power. A new Chartist movement has arisen and is daily growing."

Preparing for the Great Change

Political socialist labor, and revolutionary trades unionism have sought to substitute for the motive of personal profit and the method of unrestricted competition some principle of organization more social and free. And the ideas, back of this movement, are, as R. H. Tawney says, "not antiquarian curiosities, but a high explosive, and an explosive which has not yet been fired."

Beer says that his twenty years' residence in England taught him "how high an elevation of political and moral culture a nation must reach before it can embark on a socialistic reconstruction of society." All that makes the transfer of economic power inevitable took place through long years. The final steps in the process were the immense accessions to trade union organization and the Electoral Act. The machinery of economic and of political power had thus been

¹ For this reason most of the quotations are taken from the second and yet untranslated volume. The first volume is published by Macmillan.

given to the working class. Remains only the Act of Transfer. A revolution is the spectacular and relatively unimportant ceremony of handing over the keys of power to the new masters. If the real work has not been previously accomplished, no bloody uprising can bring it to pass, no rule of a minority can maintain it.

Beer deals with the argument of those who oppose next steps and social reforms on the ground that they take the place of fundamental measures.

"Strictly considered this argument is directed not only against parliamentary action, but against every kind of reform short of revolution. It may be applied to factory legislation, to social insurance, to trade unionism, and generally to all measures that are aiming at amelioration.

"The error into which William Morris fell, lay in regarding society as a mechanical contrivance, and reform as a sort of patching up some defective parts of the machine. This mode of viewing society allows of no other remedy than the complete removal of the old machine and its replacement by another of a quite different pattern. In reality, society is not a mechanical contrivance, but a living organism in constant change and development, an organization capable of being developed into a higher form by legislation and other measures granted to a new class rising in importance and power in society. At first the influence of such reforms on the social structure may be imperceptible, but with the increase of the quantity of reforms, the alteration in the quality of society grows apace, until it amounts to a revolutionary change, visible to all.

"Great social upheavals which are designated revolutions are the effect of the sudden entrance of the revolutionary transformation into the region of politics, or of the peremptory demand of a large portion of the nation to give legal effect to it and redistribute political power accordingly. The real revolution had been going on more or less silently for a long time anterior to the upheaval, but, it having been split up in particular changes and reforms effected during long intervals, there was no considerable resistance to its growth. The revolution in its dramatic or sensational form is but an attempt to add up the particular changes and reforms and bring out the sum total.

Liberalism was the creed of the middle class,—free trade, free speech, freedom of contract, freedom of the person. Liberal politics dies with the middle class; and the

final line-up between the privileged and the disinherited begins.

In recent years, books, which have moved the masses, shaped their instinctive action, and prepared them for this final line-up, have been (among many) Fabian Essays and Tracts, the Webbs' *History of Trade Unions* and *Industrial Democracy*, Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*, Blatchford's *Merrie England* and *Britain for the British*, Chiozza Money's *Riches and Poverty*, Orage's *National Guilds*, Cole's *Self Government in Industry*.

Challenge of the State

But these are only recent ripples of a tide that is age-long. Trade unionism as the instrument for overthrowing the economic system, rather than merely bettering the condition of the worker inside it—this is essentially British doctrine dating from the 1880's. The conception held so earnestly by Mr. Gompers is essentially a German conception. It believes in progressive betterment under the existing order. It derives from the German belief in the supremacy of the state, its unalterable nature, its perpetual unchanging sovereignty. The state to such minds is a foundation and a framework inside which the inhabitants may remodel the rooms, shift the furniture and decorate the walls. But they must not tinker with the underpinning.

The British radical, however, has always challenged the supremacy of the state from Gerrald Winstanley to Bertrand Russell. He has held that he could reconstruct the affair from the ground up, and build a more stately habitation for his soul.

In Beer's book, we are able to see the origins of British socialism in the instincts of the workers. We hear the recurrent expressions and explosions down the generations. We see the era of machinery working a suppression of those instincts, but at the same time creating slowly an organization of the wage-hands. We see them blindly rebelling against the machines, and tricked by electoral reform which still left them unenfranchised. We witness

"The disillusionment of labor and the consequent

rise of revolutionary trades unionism or syndicalism (1833-4), the growth of Chartism or a Socialist Labor Party (1836-48); finally the rise of the Oxford movement, Young England and Christian Socialism—all this stupendous mental ferment in the years from 1825 to 1850 appears to be repeating itself now on a larger and higher scale. . . . Or is it a mere coincidence that revolutionary trades unionism followed in the wake of the agitation for the Reform Bill, 1832, and that syndicalism and general strikes have been treading upon the heels of the constitutional crisis that began with Mr. Lloyd George's Finance Bill?

Growth of "Practical" Socialism

From the struggle and catastrophes between the beginning of Chartism in 1825 and its end in 1855,² "the lesson emerged that the revolutionary policy of 'all or nothing,' of a sweeping triumph by one gigantic effort, of contempt for reform and the supreme value of a total and radical subversion of the old, were foredoomed to failure and defeat. The generation that followed Chartism went into

² The period 1855-1914 witnessed:

(1) A ceaseless and more or less conscious struggle between Socialists and Liberals for the sympathies and votes of the working classes.

(2) The development of socialism from revolutionary doctrine to political practice.

(3) The tendency towards the transformation of individualist liberalism into social liberalism.

In 1884, John Burns called upon working men to rouse themselves from the slumber in which they had been sunk since 1848. The economic depression which began in 1875 reached its lowest depths in 1886. The dockers' strike of 1889 brought Ben Tillet, Tom Mann, John Burns, Will Thorne, Annie Besant, Eleanor Marx, into leadership. "Four-fifths of the socialist leaders of Great Britain in the eighties had passed through the school of Henry George."

In 1881 the Social Democratic Federation was founded by Henry M. Hyndman, later to become the British Socialist Party, and then to split further into the National Socialist Party (1916).

1884 saw the formation of the Fabian Society guided by Sidney Webb, the greatest mind in the labor movement of the last generation, perhaps the most important intellectual figure in British labor since Robert Owen.

In 1893 the Independent Labor Party was founded by Keir Hardie, and continued by Philip Snowden, Ramsay Macdonald, and others.

The Labor Party came into existence 1890-1900, in part guided by Ramsay Macdonald, and later also by Arthur Henderson and Sidney Webb.

The Socialist Labor Party was founded in 1903 by Scottish secessionists from Hyndman's Social Democratic Federation, "after the model of the American Socialist Labor Party, led by Daniel De Leon (died 1914), an extreme Marxist, who in the last years of his life embraced syndicalist views."

Gladstone's camp and refused to leave it either for the social Toryism of Benjamin Disraeli or for the social revolution of Karl Marx."

From its beginnings to the outbreak of the war, British socialism may be said to have passed through the following phases:

1. Primitive Christian traditions, Minorite doctrines and village communities. "It bore a religious, ethical and tribal character."³

2. Constructing ideal commonwealths. "Its character was essentially romantic."

3. Class war. "Unable to achieve reform, it rushed into the revolution. Strange are the mental processes of man. They lead him sometimes to the belief that, whilst he may be unable to achieve a little by daily efforts, he may accomplish everything by one supreme sacrifice. . . . Revolution is but the last act of a long evolutionary process, or the sum total of gradually accumulating reforms. Physical force is but an incidental phenomenon of revolution."

4. The application of socialism to practical politics. "Its foremost exponent is Sidney Webb. Its character is exclusively and consistently reformist. It has nothing to do with class warfare; it does not address itself to any class, but to enlightened public opinion."

Shaw and the Webbs

"The Fabian Society by its intimate connection with the Independent Labor Party, by its affiliation to the Labor Party, by drawing to its work some of the most alert university socialists, finally, by its close application to all live questions of socialism and labor, has, after thirty years of its existence, become the brain of the socialist movement of the United Kingdom."

To Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb "the Fabian Society owes its importance in the history of British socialist thought." They gradually shook themselves free from the old socialist traditions, separating themselves from the doctrinal bases and propagandist methods of all socialist organizations. "Were

³ Remaining quotations from untranslated volume.

his ardent temperament and dour determination not counterbalanced by an analytical intellect and sense of the ludicrous Shaw would have been a revolutionary leader."

"Socialism had to be adapted to democracy. This adaptation has been performed by Sidney Webb. It represents the transition from Marxism to Fabianism, or from social revolutionary doctrine to social practice." Conditions were ripe. The state was ready to enact social reform. The trade unions had won economic power. There was a public conscience on evils. "The magnum opus of Fabian reform is the Minority Report on the Poor Law. Socialism turns into a series of social reforms. The socialist agitator gives place to the social investigator."

The Labor Party

The attempts by strait sects and shibboleths and rigid abstractions to force socialism down the throat of the British worker had not succeeded. Then, the Fabians and the I. L. P. came along, omitted the word socialism, used the British method of next step compromise and succeeded enormously. Out of their work come the Labor Party, where three and a half million trade unionists are pushing a socialist program, but it is a socialism of practice. "The speakers of the I. L. P., in their educational work among the trade unionists, hardly ever referred to revolution and class-warfare, but started from the ethical, nonconformist, and democratic sentiments which appeal most to British workmen."

As the I. L. P. waxed, the Social Democratic Federation waned—and finally split. It was not the day for dogmas and crashing finalities. The I. L. P. and a few Fabians are the dynamic of the Labor Party. "The Labor Party stands for social reform—for a socialistic reorganization of society by gradual steps, but it is not social revolutionary. It has no final goal, but immediate aims; it does not occupy itself with theories, but with practical measures. . . . The rise of the Labor Party meant the beginning of the end of Liberalism."⁴

"The years from 1908 to 1914 formed a period of social upheaval which was essentially revolutionary." The war bred a further change, away from quiet permeation, and political practice, toward that increasing syndicalism which had been operating since 1910. Many of the young men began to want a stern code of action, with an ultimate aim and a Day of Judgment in it. A new fervor sweeps large masses, as the idea of workers' control seizes their imagination. They turn to the pure doctrine of Marx in labor colleges and study groups. So far as Britain is concerned, Marx has for the first time entered the region of practical politics. Once again the youths see themselves dramatically in the class war, at "the great historical moment." The vision that lifted itself in the 1880's, and died in 1848, has flashed again into their sight.

The Clyde area in Scotland and the valleys of South Wales are two regions where the winds of doctrine now blow increasingly. In particular, "the simple, emotional and enthusiastic nature of the Welsh working men was, and still is, averse from dilatory tactics and parliamentary methods; it expects sensational deeds in any popular agitation. Their temperament resembles that of the French proletariat, but it is nourished and stimulated by primitive Christian feelings rather than by logical inferences."

The New Syndicalist Phase

"The syndicalist movement or revolutionary trade unionism is differentiated from the socialist or collectivist movement by the emphasis it places (a) on the economic factor as the primary formative agent of social arrangements and social ethics; (b) on the economic antagonism between capital and labor; (c) on the direct action and struggle of the working class for its emancipation from the wage basis of livelihood or for the control of the means of production by labor

⁴ The gains (in 1910) of the constitutional socialists (Sweden, Belgium, Britain) show that the policy of the extreme Left does not as yet win votes, but that the policy of Branting, Vandervelde, and Henderson does.

itself; (d) on the trade union and not on the electoral district as the focus of labor power. Syndicalism, therefore, is averse from conciliation boards and industrial agreements between employers and employees; it recognizes no social peace or even truce as long as the wage basis prevails; it is opposed to Parliamentary politics being made an integral and important part of the labor movement; it scorns social reform by Liberal or Conservative or labor legislation; it refuses to believe in the efficacy of a labor policy acting through Parliamentary representatives and labor officials. The syndicalist movement is pre-eminently revolutionary; the socialist movement is largely reformist. The former puts itself deliberately outside the present system of society in order the better to get hold of it and to shake it to its very foundations; the latter is working within the present order of society with the view of gradually changing it. The syndicalist knows therefore of no compromise; class warfare, relentless and continual, is his supreme means. Starting from the premise, (a) that economics rules social relations and shapes social ethics, (b) that the economic antagonism between labor and capital is irreconcilable, the syndicalist cannot arrive at any other conclusion.

"These principles may be termed the syndicalist form of Marxism.

"The first body to spread syndicalist views in Great Britain was the Socialist Labor Party in Scotland, whose members originally belonged to the Social Democratic Federation but gradually came under the influence of the Socialist Labor Party in the United States of America and finally seceded from the S. D. F. in 1908. The leader of the American Socialist Labor Party was Daniel De Leon, a university graduate and a strict adherent of Marxism, who for a long time worked on the application of Marxist theories to the American labor movement.

Trade Union and Student Revolt

"The first symptoms of the operation of the new spirit manifested themselves in the rebellion of many trade unionists against their

officials; from 1908 onwards it became a difficult matter for the officials of many trade unions to obtain from their members the ratification of agreements and settlements entered into by them with the employers. The British workman, generally loyal, conservative and docile, began to refuse to follow his leader. Simultaneously some of the students of Ruskin College expressed their dissatisfaction with the spirit of the economic lectures delivered to them by some of their teachers and formed a Plebs League for the purpose of counteracting the influences which they thought to serve but the interests of the capitalists. The Plebs students formed a section of the Industrial Workers of the World and in 1909 seceded from the College and formed a Central Labor College at first in Oxford, then in London, where the lectures and lessons are conceived in the spirit of the syndicalist form of Marxism. It is supported by the South Wales miners and railway men.

French Influence

"The ideas of industrial unionism streaming from America through Scotland into England were supplemented and strengthened by the current of syndicalism coming from France. After the excitement of the Dreyfus affair and the disappointment with the Socialist Minister Millerand, some of the Marxists and anarchists coalesced and turned the French syndicalist or trade unions into the revolutionary *Confédération Générale du Travail*. French syndicalism has been more theoretical and philosophical than American industrial unionism, but in essence both of them represent the same revolt against socialist and labor parliamentarism and official-ridden and petty trade unionism.

"The French influence was brought to bear on the British labor movement by Tom Mann,⁵ who, after thirty years of truly

⁵ Mr. Mann has recently been elected secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. As executive of the leading craft union of Britain he is inside the citadel of trades union congresses and committees—instead of being a mighty rebel outside the city gates. His power is that of a primitive nature, without inhibitions, who speaks by instinct in a rush of feeling.

Odyssean adventures in the trade union and socialist movement of Great Britain and the colonies, went, in June, 1901, to Paris in order to see syndicalism at work. He was much impressed with the attitude of the revolutionary comrades in France, who had been able to accomplish a magnificent work by permeating the unions and forming the C. G. T. The journey to Paris was, however, by no means the hegira of Mann. Unconsciously he had imbibed in Australia the spirit of the American I. W. W. His studies among the French workmen were but the finishing touches to his conversion. After his return from Paris he at once set to work to permeate the British trade unions, which, as Mann admits, for some five or six years previously had carried on 'an agitation for the closer combination of the unions and for the adoption of different tactics.'

"In the meantime, Tom Mann and his brother industrial unionists, among whom the most prominent was James Larkin, were exercising considerable influence on the strike movement of those years, in which the English transport workers, the British railwaymen, the British miners and the Irish transport workers played so conspicuous a part. Nothing like the general strike of the British miners in the spring of 1912 had ever happened before. A comparison of this strike movement with that of the years 1839-42 exhibits in an unmistakable manner the enormous advance British labor has made in organizing and executive capacity. It is a growing and rising power; its activities are changing the structure of society.

Adaptation of Syndicalism

"Notable attempts at interpreting syndi-

calism and adapting it to British mental and material conditions have been made by several socialist intellectuals—G. D. H. Cole and a group of *New Age* contributors. Cole sees in the new labor movement the inchoate expression of the desire of the more intelligent and alert workmen for the control of production. He argues that the socialist and labor parties and collectivist schools had been regarding the social problem first and foremost as a problem of distribution of the division of the national income.

"The trade union should do for modern industry what the guild did for the mediaeval arts and crafts. Collectivism would form an industrial bureaucracy; syndicalism—an industrial democracy. Pending the consummation of this supreme end and aim the workers, if they desired an improvement of their condition, should coördinate their forces, organize on the basis of industrial unionism and use the weapon of the strike, since political action could achieve little, if anything at all. The Liberal reforms in the years from 1906 onwards, for all the praise bestowed on them by politicians, had practically done nothing to raise the conditions of labor. The strike from 1911 to 1913 had raised wages, improved the condition of labor and increased the respect for the organized working class far beyond what any so-called social reform legislation could have done. Where the strike failed it was due to the obsolete form of trade union organization. The day of the small union had passed. Large industry must be confronted with greater unionism. The small trade union was wasteful. Labor parliamentarism, as at present constituted, was a costly delusion."

Campaign Notes

Marian Tyler

"THERE are certain fundamental differences between the Republican and Socialist parties," wrote the secretary of the latter to Warren G. Harding,

and urged "a joint discussion by representatives qualified to speak authoritatively for their respective organizations." Harding and Seymour Stedman were both scheduled

to speak in Minneapolis on Labor day, and it seemed appropriate to make the occasion a debate. Whether this challenge alarmed him or not, Harding's plans were changed, and he ventured no farther from his porch than Lincoln Park in Marion.

His address there to a trade union picnic was a sample of what his side of the debate might have been. Of the Esch-Cummins law he said naively, "Many railway labor leaders have cried out against it, but I can only wonder why." As a solution of industrial disputes he coined the phrase "volitional arbitration," (possibly meaning voluntary arbitration) and expressed his thirst for progress in the eloquent words, "Our system is all right, it is the judgment of the ages, and here in America we have wrought the supreme achievement." (*N. Y. Times*, Sept. 7, 1920.)

In late August the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party met in Pittsburgh. It was officially announced that the declaration of principles, the international relations report and the constitutional amendments adopted by the majority of the delegates at the May convention had been carried by referendum vote of the party membership.

In reply to the committee's greetings, Eugene V. Debs sent a message urging that no compromises be made for the purpose of gaining votes. "Let us not be timid," he said, "or pattern after the capitalist politicians. In strong and simple words our message will be the gospel of deliverance to millions of hearts."

The committee appointed Morris Hillquit, George H. Roewer, and James Oneal to wait upon Attorney General Palmer and Joseph Tumulty on September 18 and present the party's demand of amnesty for class-war prisoners. Oneal, Algernon Lee, Joseph E. Cohen, and Alexander Trachtenberg were selected to visit Russia and the Baltic states on a mission of inquiry and investigation.

General strikes were indorsed in protest against allied war on Russia; and the Polish Socialist party, which had appealed for sup-

port of its policy, was rebuked in a long and emphatic resolution. "There can be no understanding," said the American socialists, "with an organization that has so grossly betrayed the ideals of international socialism. It has become a tool of the imperialist victors of the Entente and is a disgrace to working class solidarity."

Although the equal suffrage organizations have not announced a policy of rewarding their friends after the manner of Gompers, it is worth while for them to consider who their friends have been. In 1878 the world was howling indignant taunts at the mad women who wished to become men. In that year Eugene Debs, young city clerk of Terre Haute, Indiana, braved the vociferous ridicule of Terre Haute electors by escorting Susan B. Anthony through the streets and speaking from the same platform with her, publicly supporting her cause. Since its beginning the Socialist party has carried a plank for woman suffrage, and its speakers and writers have done much to popularize the idea. The two old parties, on the other hand, noticed the question only when long years of educational work by suffrage and socialist workers made a woman suffrage plank productive of votes. One wonders, if Saint Susan could vote this year, which party and candidate she would choose.

The National Nonpartisan League is kept busy contradicting statements that it has a ticket. The methods of the league from its beginning have been to nominate and indorse candidates of existing parties, or in effect to give old parties a local platform fundamentally opposed to their principles and make them live up to it. The league has indorsed no candidate in the national election, but announces that it hopes to be in a position to do so in 1924.

Attorney General Palmer heard two important delegations on September 18, asking amnesty for all political prisoners and particularly for Eugene V. Debs. One delega-

tion represented the Socialist party, the other the American Federation of Labor, with Samuel Gompers himself as spokesman. Comedy is proverbially close to tragedy, and the interviews affecting the lives and liberty of scores of men did not lack an ironic humor. Mr. Gompers, surprised at his own temerity in defending such desperate characters, hastened to intrench his position with assurances to Mr. Palmer of the Federation's loyalty, and pleas that the government "tranquillize the people of the United States." Mr. Palmer worked up a fine emotion of astonishment at his own leniency. "The fact that there are less than 175 imprisoned on these charges out of 110,000,000 persons in the United States, following the greatest war in history, is amazing," he said. "The *New York Call* states that there are 4,000 in prison. That is an exaggeration." When a socialist deputy explained that this figure included political prisoners under state laws, Palmer plaintively remarked that the public was inclined to misunderstand this fact and blame him for the total number. Then recollecting himself he uttered the following extraordinary statement: "I recognize some of the war legislation to which you object as being necessary only under the exigency of the Espionage Act, and I have seen to it that no prosecutions under its provisions have been instituted since the armistice." Debs and the others are still in prison.

In the vital issue of election expenses, even the non-commercial Socialist party does not go unaccused. J. Francis Miller, formerly United States Consul General in Venezuela, has urged the Senate committee on campaign expenditures to investigate the funds of all minor parties, including the Socialist party. He views with alarm the campaign fund which the socialists are raising, and which he claims is the largest in the history of the party. With such a fund against it, he seems to fear that the capitalist system will disastrously collapse. The Socialist party replies that it welcomes an investigation and the publication of its list of contributors, and

assures the public that it has no bolshevik funds in its safe. Its well-known affection for the Soviet republic is platonic in character, not commercial.

Parley Parker Christensen, candidate for president by the Farmer-Labor party, is not only "a fine fellow," as Debs described him; he is the type and acme of sportsmanship in a candidate. Soon after his nomination he sent and published telegrams to the presidential candidates of the Republican and Democratic parties, to the effect that it was unfair in all three of them to accept so great a handicap from their rival Debs as his continued imprisonment. He urged them to use their best influence for his release, along with that of other political and industrial prisoners. Christensen having shown them the way, Cox and Harding failed to follow it, doubtless because they cannot consider with dignity the pretensions or persecutions of such insignificant rivals. A late rumor gives Christensen credit for recommending that citizens choose local candidates on the Farmer-Labor ticket, but *vote for Debs for president*.

The United Communist party has issued proclamations urging the workers to boycott the elections, and in particular recommending a boycott of the special elections to fill the places of the socialists expelled from the New York state legislature. "The capitalist government must be destroyed," say the handbills, "and in its place must be established the Workers' Dictatorship—the government of the Workers' Councils—Soviets. This cannot be done by electing representatives to legislative bodies. A few companies of soldiers would get rid of a socialist majority in a legislative body as quickly as the capitalists got rid of the socialist assemblymen." They also accuse the socialist candidates of a counter-revolutionary attitude during the war. The effect of these accusations and the boycott of the elections is regarded by the socialists as slight, or even beneficial.

It is worth noting in contrast to this position, that the former Communist Labor party

of the state of Washington has refused to affiliate with the United Communists. Among their reasons they give the fact that the proposition of their accredited proxies at the "unity conference" in May for the organized support of Debs as presidential candidate was rejected without consideration.

Every voter for his own issue. Teachers demand promises of federal aid in increasing their salaries, fruit-growers rejoice in Harding's position on the Sicilian lemon, and some social workers refuse to vote for any candidate who does not publicly declare in favor of a bill appropriating money for pre-natal care. All agree that the principles of representation by industrial unit and socialization of industry are fundamentally unsound.

After reading speech upon campaign speech filled with half-truths and dummy is-

sues, the voter may be relieved to find a simple statement of a fundamental problem. We quote Seymour Stedman's letter of acceptance of his nomination for vice-president of the United States by the Socialist party:

"The ever-increasing cost of living, shortage of coal cars, scarcity in coal production, high interest rates, increasing unemployment, call for an immediate remedy.

"We declare the remedy now—socialize the railroads, the coal and metalliferous mines, now; the flour mills and stockyards, now; open unused land to cultivation, now; prepare to substitute for the capitalistic oligarchy the social ownership and democratic management of the means of production and the control of government for the producers by the producers. . . .

"Mere political issues will not meet the requirements of today's social problems. Economic readjustment of a fundamental character must be made, and can be made peacefully if we prevail."

Debs makes this contrast even stronger with his terse question: "I challenge them, what are they going to do about coal?"

To College Students

"As I look over the universities of my land to-day I see the students asleep, asleep in the face of the awful facts of poverty I have given you, asleep in the greatest revolution that has come to the world. Oh, it is sad! Not long ago revolutions began, grew, broke out in Oxford. Today, Russian universities seethe with revolution. I say to you then: University men and women, you men and women in the full glory of life, here is a cause that appeals to all the romance in you. Awake to its call."

Fourteen years ago, one year after the founding of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, Jack London, first president of the society, spoke these words to an audience at Yale. He was a picturesque crusader, and the students flocked to hear him. For in those days we were "Utopian dreamers," tolerated mainly because socialism seemed too remote to be taken very seriously. Today that attitude has changed. The thing we dreamed about is coming to pass. The workers are taking control of industry. The old social structure is giving way before the new. In Europe, those

nations which are not already in the grip of revolutionary change, have reached the point where their statesmen must heed the demands of labor, or lose their jobs. In our own country, in spite of unparalleled repression, the power of the workers is steadily growing. The college students sleep on.

Never before has the world so greatly needed the courage and vigor of youth. But American students have the opinions of old men—the old men who control the distribution alike of wealth and of ideas. They remain aloof in their narrow academic universe, and are only occasionally roused to action through hysterical propaganda. Thus we have the shameful phenomenon of American students breaking strikes. This very year, for example, students earned nine dollars a day pin money, thereby preventing trained railroad workers from securing an increase to a much lower wage.

On the other hand, the kind of idealism

acquired by many students often does more harm than good, for in a period that is essentially industrial any attempt to better conditions requires a knowledge of fundamental economic causes. The aim of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society is to broaden the student's training, and to supplement the work of the classroom by spreading an intelligent understanding of the labor movement. We do not ask that students accept any dogmatic creed. We create the opportunity for thorough investigation of Socialism and allied movements, and for independent conclusions.

Interested students may group for the study of any phase of the movement, choosing their own program and their own name. The advantage of affiliation is that the I. S. S. keeps in constant touch with the chapters by sending *The Socialist Review* and other literature, by assisting in the arrangement of study courses, and by supplying speakers. Already John Haynes Holmes, Norman Thomas, and Harry Laidler are scheduled to speak in the colleges this year. Other prominent men and women will be available from time to time. We will have I. S. S. organizers in the field, and will reach many students by personal contact and through correspondence. All students and alumni interested in our work are urged to communicate with us.

To those students who are already members of the I. S. S., we send greetings at the opening of the college year, and urge that you do everything in your power to make your group a potent factor in college life, to increase your membership and your strength, and to help prepare yourselves for practical service in the social movement.

J. S.

Corrections

The Socialist Review wishes to correct the following errors in the September issue:

The editorial note entitled "Steel and the Interchurch," on page 118, second column, quoting the report on the steel strike, should

read, "in the minds of hundreds of thousands who know best that they are not bolsheviks," instead of, "know best that they are bolsheviks."

The article by Jessica Smith entitled "The Candidates and Labor," page 126, first column, should read, "has in no instance stood for conservation measures" instead of "conservative measures."

In Girolamo Valenti's article, "Divisions in Italian Socialism," page 138, column one, bottom, the words "a deputy in Parliament" should be deleted. Serrati is editor of *Avanti*, but not a member of Parliament.

Why Debs Serves in Atlanta

On September 13 tens of thousands of lovers of liberty united in a plea for the release from prison of Eugene V. Debs, the Socialist party nominee for president. In view of the world-wide importance of this case, and the prominence of Debs in the presidential campaign, the following facts concerning his arrest and imprisonment are of especial interest.

On June 16, 1918, over a year after America entered the war, Debs appeared before the Socialist state convention at Canton, Ohio. A short time before, Rose Pastor Stokes had been sentenced to ten years' imprisonment for intimating that this was a government of profiteers. Debs referred to this conviction in the following passage—a passage selected for special condemnation by the prosecution:

"I want to say that if Rose Pastor Stokes is guilty, so am I. If she should be sent to the penitentiary for ten years, so ought I. What did she say? She said that a government could not serve both the profiteers and the employes of the profiteers. Roosevelt has said a thousand times more in his paper, the *Kansas City Star*. He would do everything possible to discredit Wilson's administration in order to give his party credit.

"Rose Pastor Stokes never said a word she did not have a right to utter, but her message opened the eyes of the people. That must be suppressed. That voice must be silenced. . . .

"Every socialist on the face of the earth is animated by the same principles. Everywhere . . . they are calling one another 'comrade,' the noblest word that springs from the heart and soul of unity. The word 'comrade' is getting us into closer touch all along the battle line."

In opening his address Debs referred to his visit to the workhouse where several socialists

were "paying the penalty for their devotion to the cause of the working class." He stated that "they have come to realize, as many of us have, that it is extremely dangerous to exercise the constitutional right of free speech in a country fighting to make democracy safe for the world."

He said that he recognized the need for careful statement, but added: "I would rather a thousand times be a free soul in jail than a sycophant or coward on the streets."

"Are we opposed to Prussian militarism?" he asked. "Why, we have been fighting it since the day the socialistic movement was born and we are going to continue to fight it today and until it is wiped from the face of the earth."

The secret treaties between France, Great Britain, and Italy, "which were to divide the territory of the Central Powers if the Allies were victorious," showed, according to Debs, "that the purpose of the Allies is exactly the purpose of the Central Powers."

War and the Master Class

The speaker declared that wars have been made for conquest, and that, since the feudal ages, the war lords responsible for wars "did not go to war any more than the Wall Street junkers go to war. . . . The master class has always brought a war and the subject class has fought the battles. The master class has had all to gain and nothing to lose, and the subject class has had all to lose and nothing to gain. They have always taught you that it is your patriotic duty to go to war and slaughter yourselves at their command. . . . The working class who make the sacrifices, who shed the blood, have never yet had a voice in declaring war. The ruling class has always made the war and made the peace.

"Yours not to question why,
Yours but to do and die."

Debs also denounced the sentence imposed on Kate O'Hare, spoke of the capitalist bias of the federal courts, expressed sympathy for the imprisoned members of the I. W. W., praised the Russian workers, urged closer industrial and political organization, and predicted a great advance in the socialist movement.

He concluded: "Unite in the Socialist party. Vote as you organize. Stand with your party. . . . Then, when we vote together we will develop the supreme power of the one class that can bring peace to the world. . . . We socialists are the builders of the world that is to be."

Opposed to Violence

Immediately after the address, government officials in waiting arrested the socialist leader and took him to Cleveland where, in a hostile atmos-

phere, he was tried, charged with violation of the Espionage act. His speech, the prosecution contended, was calculated to hinder enlisting and recruiting. In his address to the jury, Debs maintained that there was not a word in the Canton speech to warrant the charges brought against him. His purpose, he declared, "was to educate the people to understand something about the social system in which we live, and to prepare them to change this system by *perfectly peaceable and orderly means* into what I, as a socialist, conceive to be a real democracy.

"From what you heard in the address of counsel for the prosecution, you might naturally infer that I am an advocate of force and violence. It is not true. I have never advocated violence in any form. I always believed in education, in intelligence, in enlightenment, and I have always made my appeal to the reason and to the conscience of the people. . . .

No Holy Wars

"I have been accused of having obstructed the war. I admit it. Gentlemen, I abhor war. I would oppose the war if I stood alone. When I think of a cold, glittering steel bayonet being plunged into the white, quivering flesh of a human being, I recoil with horror. I have often wondered if I could take the life of my fellow men, even to save my own.

"Men talk about holy wars. There are none. Let me remind you that it was Benjamin Franklin who said, 'There never was a good war or a bad peace.' . . .

"Twenty centuries ago One appeared upon earth whom we know as the Prince of Peace. He issued a command in which I believe. He said, 'Love one another.' He did not say, 'Kill one another,' but 'Love one another.' He espoused the cause of the suffering poor, just as Rose Pastor Stokes did, just as Kate Richards O'Hare did, and the poor heard him gladly. It was not long before he aroused the ill-will and the hatred of the usurers, the money-changers, the profiteers, the high priests, the lawyers, the judges, the merchants, the bankers—in a word, the ruling class. They said of him just what the ruling class says of the socialist today. 'He is preaching dangerous doctrine. He is inciting the common rabble. He is a menace to peace and order.' . . .

An Internationalist

"If we had internationalism there would be no war. I believe in patriotism. I have never uttered a word against the flag. I love the flag as a symbol of freedom. I object only when that flag is prostituted to base purposes, to sordid ends, by those who, in the name of patriotism, would keep the people in subjection.

"I believe, however, in a wider patriotism. Thomas Paine said, 'My country is the world. To do good is my religion.' Garrison said, 'My country is the world and all mankind are my countrymen.' That is the essence of internationalism. . . I love the people of my country, but I don't hate the people of any country on earth—not even the Germans. I refuse to hate a human being because he happens to be born in some other country. He is a human being endowed with the same faculties . . . and I would infinitely rather serve him and love him than to hate him and kill him."

Former Wars Opposed

Debs declared that the war of 1812, the Mexican war, and the Civil war were all opposed, but that the Democrats and others who condemned these conflicts were not regarded as traitors and disloyalists for refusing their support. He had a perfect right under the provisions of the first amendment to the Constitution, he declared, to speak as he did. Under no circumstances would he gag the lips of his bitterest enemy. "It is far more dangerous to attempt to gag the people than to allow them to speak freely of what is in their hearts."

The Meaning of War

In the latter part of his speech he gave the general socialist explanation of war and militarism, dwelt upon the class struggle in America, and described the agony of the battlefield.

"I can see it [the battlefield] strewn with the wrecks of human beings, who but yesterday were in the flush and glory of their young manhood. I can see them at eventide, scattered about in remnants, their limbs torn from their bodies, their eyes gouged out. . . I think of the mothers who are bowed in the shadow of their last great grief—whose hearts are breaking. And I say to myself, 'I am going to do the little that lies in my power to wipe from this earth that terrible scourge of war.'"

"If I believed in war I could not be kept out of the first line trenches. I would not be patriotic at long range. I would be honest enough, if I believed in bloodshed, to shed my own. But I do not believe that the shedding of blood bears any actual testimony to patriotism, to love of country, to civilization. On the contrary, I believe that warfare in all of its forms is an impeachment of our social order, and a rebuke to our much vaunted Christian civilization. . . ."

"I cannot take back a word. I cannot repudiate a sentence. What you may choose to do to me will be of small consequence after all. I am not on trial here. There is an infinitely greater issue

that is being tried today in this court, though you may not be conscious of it. American institutions are on trial here before a court of American citizens. The future will tell."

Social Injustice

The jury declared Eugene Debs guilty, and the judge pronounced sentence. Before he received the sentence, however, Debs addressed the court. He reiterated the fact that he was opposed to the present government and to the social system in which we live and drew attention to its inequalities. He continued:

"I am thinking this morning of the men in the mills and factories; I am thinking of the women who, for a paltry wage, are compelled to work out their lives, of the little children who, in this system, are robbed of their childhood, and in their early, tender years, are seized in the remorseless grasp of Mammon, and forced into the industrial dungeons, there to feed the machines while they themselves are being starved body and soul. I can see them dwarfed, diseased, stunted, their little lives broken, and their hopes blasted because in this high noon of our twentieth century civilization, money is still so much more important than human life. . . ."

"I believe, as all socialists do, that all things that are jointly needed and used ought to be jointly owned. . . . There are multiplied thousands of others who, like myself, have come to realize that before we may truly enjoy the blessings of civilized life, we must organize society upon a mutual and coöperative basis. . . ."

"In that day we will have the universal commonwealth—not the destruction of the nation, but, on the contrary, the harmonious coöperation of every nation with every other nation on earth. In that day war will curse this earth no more."

Asks No Mercy

"Your Honor, I ask no mercy. I plead for no immunity. I realize that finally the right must prevail. . . . I can see the dawn of a better day of humanity. The people are awakening. In due course of time they will come to their own."

Following these remarks, Eugene Debs was sentenced to ten years in the West Virginia penitentiary, and was afterwards transferred to Atlanta where, despite enforced silence, he has become the center of the revolutionary movement of the United States, and one of the most striking figures in the world movement toward industrial democracy.

(For a more complete account of this trial see "The Debs Decision" by Scott Nearing, N. Y. Rand School, 44 pp.)

Book Reviews

Labor History in Capsule Form

A Short History of the American Labor Movement. Mary Beard. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 174 pp.

Labor history is already a vastly more important part of the equipment of the man or woman of affairs than, let us say, constitutional history or the history of warfare. It will soon outrank political history. In fact, the history of the future will resolve itself more completely as time goes on into labor history. It will be the history of the new society.

And yet, as Mrs. Beard points out, "it was not until 1918 that there was any authoritative and exhaustive history of the American labor movement." "It was still more significant," she adds, "that the preparation of this history was undertaken not by professional historians, but by economists who could not after all entirely ignore labor in studying industry."

Considering the actual effect upon the course of American political and economic affairs which labor exerts even today, the density of ignorance about it displayed by educated men and women is almost unbelievable, although the reason for this ignorance is, upon analysis, not hard to find.

Several years ago I was talking with a member of the junior class at Princeton. A strike of hod carriers had halted building operations on one of the luxurious upper class clubs. Several workers were picketing the premises.

"What are those fellows up to walking back and forth like that?" asked my student friend.

"They're pickets," I answered.

"What do you mean, pickets?" he queried, and he meant it!

For such as these Mrs. Beard's book can be of great service. It is written in good text-book style. Neither the Princeton junior nor a bank president—and in some ways they are very much alike—would have his suspicions aroused. Propaganda it certainly cannot be called. It might even pass the scrutiny of a board of education or a high school principal. And yet it conveys a great deal of essential information. It is short enough, too, both for "the busy man" and the "average reader."

Its faults are the faults of this sort of book. Mrs. Beard has reached the ultimate in even-handed justice. Objectivity is carried to the dulling point. There is not a personal opinion in the whole book. Only twice, I think, has she been drawn away from the straight and narrow

path of fact into any sort of interpretation or deduction. And yet there are many alluring openings.

For instance, the cycle of prosperity and hard times seems to fit in pretty closely with the swing of the labor pendulum from "pure and simple unionism" to political action. Again, the effect of wars on the fortunes of the labor movement tempts generalizations drawn from both the Civil and the World wars. One wishes that Mrs. Beard had worked these through. Some one should do it, for it needs to be done. The relation between the permanence of labor organizations and the conservatism of their programs is another question which flings out a challenge Mrs. Beard has failed to meet.

Besides the paucity of opinion and generalization there are several facts of importance which have not received the attention that would seem to be their due. For instance, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers are not mentioned at all, and yet this organization, a "secessionist" union, has grown in five short years to a position of leadership in the American labor movement. The One Big Union Organization, in contrast to the I. W. W. is also not mentioned.

But these criticisms are matters of detail. As a presentation in capsule form of the outstanding facts of American labor history Mrs. Beard's book is invaluable. If sales are measured in terms of needs, the book should accomplish much to let light shine where the darkness is great.

EVANS CLARK.

Russia Investigated by Labor

Report of the British Labor Delegation to Russia 1920. London: Labor Party. 29 pp.

Advance copies of the Report of the British Labor Delegation to Russia in 1920 have been distributed to the press. These advance copies lack the special appendices of the full report, whose inclusion would have caused some delay.

The delegation consisted of nine representatives, seven men and two women, from the Labor Party and the Trades Union congress. They arrived in Petrograd on May 11, visited Moscow, Nijni-Novgorod, and Saratov. None of the party was in Russia less than three weeks, and most were there for six weeks.

The report itself is admirably successful as the "independent and impartial inquiry" which was undertaken, showing only here and there a bias of "British democracy," or a degree of pardonable

heat about the blockade. In general it corroborates the more reliable and sympathetic of the reports which have come through.

Public order is reported to be quite normal, transportation imperfect but improving, the food supply inadequate in the cities, and sanitary conditions very bad. Severe epidemics of cholera, typhus, Spanish influenza, and other diseases have swept the country since the revolution, costing thousands of lives. "A large number of these deaths from typhus could have been prevented, had it been possible to check the spread of the fever by cleanliness, by washing with soap, and by disinfection. Soap, however, is a commodity for which Russia is dependent on the outer world, as she is also for disinfectants. In the deprivation of these two prime necessities of public health the Allied policy of the blockade stands condemned as the cause of many thousands of deaths."

The revolution is said to have worked a social transformation. "Large masses of the town population are now enjoying a share of the available national wealth (including house accommodation) greater than they enjoyed before; and new possibilities of life and culture are opening out before them; and this is true in a very special degree of the child population. . . . Social equalization is, indeed, far from complete. . . . But . . . the material advantages enjoyed by the 'new bourgeoisie' over and above the rest of the population are extremely small when compared with the advantages enjoyed by the propertied classes in every capitalist country. The Soviet government . . . has consciously adopted, and is practically enforcing, the principle to which lip service has so often been rendered—that at any given time the life of the rising generation is of greater moment to the state than the lives of the adult population." The delegation's sympathetic account of changes in the status of women and the family and progress in education adds little to the reports of previous unofficial investigators.

The dominance of the Communist party is upheld by a rigid restriction of speech, compared in degree to the British "Defence of the Realm Act," and probably less than the curtailment of liberty by the authorities of the United States government. There is a general fear "that any expression of opinion adverse to the dominant party will be treated as 'counter-revolutionary.'" This Communist dominance "is not only accepted in practice, but defended as something which, though not in the written constitution, is an essential part of the working of Soviet institutions under the present transitory conditions. The right of bearing arms, possessed by members of the party, is based on this idea. The counterpart is

to be found in the onerous and dangerous obligations which attach to membership." The obligations are illustrated by the party's conscription of members for overtime work on railroads, etc., referred to in the report of the party's ninth congress as follows: "At the present moment when the Russian Communist party is responsible for the economic life of the country, the most inconspicuous and roughest work in the economic sphere is one of the greatest importance, and is to be considered responsible party work."

The majority of the population (i. e., the peasants, who constitute 90,000,000 of the 125,000,000 population of Russia and Siberia within the present frontiers) at present "support, or at least do not oppose, the Bolshevik government for at least two reasons: (1) The revolution has given them more land, which they wish to keep; and (2) their experience of the rule of Denikin, Kolchak, and other counter-revolutionaries has made them see that Bolshevik rule is less severe."

The danger of militarization is represented as a real one, but the anti-imperialist policy of the country is credited, and the delegation states, "We are of opinion . . . that the Russian government, while hoping for social revolution elsewhere, does not intend to carry this out by force of its armies, and that it will be possible to make a durable peace with it on a basis of mutual non-intervention in internal affairs."

Here and there one notices an indication of the curious social inversion which must exist in Russia: Trade unionists point out the need for "independent class organization" in opposition to the tendency of government policy to be framed to suit the peasantry; and numbers of industrial workers desert the factories from time to time to go back to the farms. One can picture the joy which such desertion would bring in America, where the proportion of farm labor is insufficient; but in Russia the deserters are arrested by soldiers and forced to return to town.

In conclusion the delegation reasserts its neutrality. "Various questions of great importance naturally suggest themselves—e. g., whether the various measures taken by the Communist party have or have not been necessary; whether the same results could have been brought about by milder means; whether any more democratic form of government could not be established; and lastly, whether the Russian Revolution ought to serve as a model to other countries, and if so, in what respect. These are questions on which opinions differ widely, and we do not propose to deal with them. We only desire to point out, as essential to the understanding of the Russian Revolution, the extraordinary conditions under which it has been and is being carried through."

MARIAN TYLER

Programs for the New Order

The New Social Order. Harry F. Ward. N. Y.: Macmillan. 1920.

It is not surprising that "The New Social Order" has brought down maledictions upon the head of the author. It is both Christian and scientific, facing open-eyed the facts of 1920 and confronting them with the principles of the new order.

The first of these principles, Equality, has ceased, according to Professor Ward, to be characteristic of America, which is fast becoming, like the rest of the world, a society of classes. The achievement of equal opportunity, however, essential though it is, will not of itself bring in the new social order, but education and religion must combine to build for it a spiritual foundation. The principle of universal service should be extended from the military to the economic field, and the efficiency principle must be enlarged to include distribution as well as production and the choice of ends as well as the means for achieving them. The supreme end, to Professor Ward, is human personality itself. The last principle to be emphasized is that of solidarity, all-inclusive as Christianity, and embracing every nation and class.

The latter half of the volume is an examination of specific programs for the new order, chiefly those of the British Labor party, the Russian Soviet republic, and the League of Nations. Each is fairly examined on the basis of its own documents. Especially valuable is the criticism of Soviet tactics, a criticism well supported from the non-resistant stronghold, but carrying a far more severe accusation of the hypocrisy which condemns the Soviet government for preserving itself by the customary methods of other non-pacifist nations.

A rather weak portion, from our own biased viewpoint, is the treatment of the Socialist program. Professor Ward is far from unfair, as his discussion is chiefly an abstract of our excellent Congressional program of 1918. He is not unfriendly, as his only criticism he applies also to the program of the British Labor party. This one criticism, however, is below the author's standard. "Behind the demand that 'the state, the industries and education—all three, must be owned and managed by the people with no thought of profit,' there is the same assumption involved in the program of the British Labor party, namely, that state ownership and state management of these three functions would give true democracy" (p. 291). This assumption is not present, however, as shown by the author's own quotation on p. 293, taken from the Socialist party platform, "Government ownership without democratic management may become a greater menace to the

world than the system of private ownership and exploitation which is passing away."

There is also an odd appearance of misunderstanding caused by the selection of the 1918 program of the Socialist party, exceptional among our many programs as "avowedly a program for a transition period, rather than for a new order," and assuming rather than expressing outright the ultimate demands of revolutionary socialism. Hence the peculiar impression that American socialism is a mere reform movement, formulating its demands tentatively as occasion demands.

Last of all, the lack of emphasis given the socialist program may give cause for criticism. We feel rightly or wrongly that the third political party in the United States, almost the only majority socialist group in the world to stand against the war, deserves from the idealist more than a passing notice in a chapter of miscellanies, and more than half the space allotted to the farmers' leagues.

While there is an advantage, too, in bearing no party label, something is lost by the view of American radicalism which culminates in the statement, "At present the socialist and labor groups of the United States are in the crucible; they do not fully understand their situation or themselves."

Only slight criticism is possible, however, of this sincere and daring book. The thoughtful Christian cannot read it without moving a step toward radicalism, the thoughtful radical without moving a step toward Christianity.

JENNIE WALLACE HUGHAN.

Book Note

Barbarous Soviet Russia. By Isaac McBride. N. Y.: Thomas Seltzer. 1920. 276 pp.

A vivid story of late developments in Soviet Russia told by a radical American journalist. The book gives some significant word pictures of the leading characters in Soviet Russia, some of the actual achievements of the Soviet Government in industry and agriculture and in the protection of women and children. The book also contains a valuable appendix and some excellent illustrations.

The author, during his five weeks in Soviet Russia, "found nothing but the utmost kindness and good will towards the whole world, all through Russia. 'If they will only let us alone, they have nothing to fear from us—not even propaganda,' was said to me over and over again. . . . I found many critics in Soviet Russia, but they insisted that whatever changes are to be made in the Government must be made without foreign intervention."