

JANUARY 25, 1913

FIVE CENTS

The New Review

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

Showing His Hand	<i>H. S.</i>
The Present State of French Socialism	<i>Paul Louis</i>
Tabooed Aspects of Suffrage Discussion	<i>Theodore Schroeder</i>
Direct Action and Sabotage	<i>Moses Oppenheimer</i>
The Socialist Situation in Massachusetts	<i>Rev. Roland D. Sawyer</i>
Financial Aspects of the Balkan War	<i>M. Pavlovitch</i>
The Conqueror	<i>Louise W. Kneeland</i>
Socialism and Anarchism	<i>Anton Pannekoek</i> (Translated by Richard Perin)
The Man of the Iron Jaw	<i>J. William Lloyd</i>

150 NASSAU STREET

NEW YORK

THE NEW REVIEW

Published Weekly at 150 Nassau St., New York City, by

NEW REVIEW PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION

ALEXANDER FRASER
PRESIDENT

MOSES OPPENHEIMER
TREASURER

JOSEPH MICHAEL
SECRETARY

SUBSCRIPTION, \$2.00 PER YEAR \$1.00 SIX MONTHS FOREIGN, \$2.50
SINGLE COPY 5 CENTS

Entered at the New York Post Office as second-class mail matter.

The following articles are among those that will appear in future issues of the NEW REVIEW:

Walt Whitman in France, by Charles Vildrac; Social Classes in the United States, by Isaac Halevy; The Panama Canal, by Michael Pavlovitch, of Paris; Charpentier, Musical Anarch and Labor Agitator, by Andre Tridon; Facts for International Socialists, by Dora B. Montefiore, of London; The Flower of the Selva, a Tale of the Upper Amazon, by W. E. Hardenburg; Syndicalism and Mass Action, by Austin Lewis; Socialism and the Negro Problem, by W. E. B. Du Bois; The Exhalation, A short Story, by Allen Updegraff; The International Co-operative Alliance, by Albert Sonnichsen; Socialist Gains and Losses in the Recent Election, by Wm. English Walling.

The New Review

Copyrighted by New Review Publishing Association, 1913. Reprint permitted provided credit is given.

Vol. I.

JANUARY 25, 1913

No. 4

SHOWING HIS HAND

Two months and more are yet to elapse before Woodrow Wilson becomes President of the United States, and already many of his staunchest supporters in the late campaign are beginning to doubt him and to ask themselves whether or not they have been deceived. And those who are asking this question, as yet in a veiled manner and with bated breath, are not the working masses that have voted for him and raised him to the highest office in the land, but those who dominate the bodies and minds of the working masses through their domination of industry and finance and the public press. The working people of America, and particularly the wage-workers, are not in the habit of looking to the government for aid in their struggle for mere existence. All they know of the government is the ward politician and the policeman. The burden of obtaining their daily bread presses upon them heavily and unremittingly, while the government in Washington is so far removed and its doings are so complicated, so incomprehensible. But it is far different with the propertied classes. To them the government and its acts are very palpable and comprehensible agencies for maintaining their power over the workers and for enriching this or that of their rival factions at the expense of other less favored factions and of the people as a whole. They are accustomed to manipulating the government and bending it to their will. They are familiar with the vast powers for good and for evil lodged in the hands of the President of the United States. And they are anxiously listening to every utterance of the President-elect and scanning every one of his acts in order to construe his mind, fathom his intentions, ascertain his resolves, and shape their course accordingly.

And it must be admitted that this hardly concealed anxiety

is not without its good cause. One complaint that has been made against Mr. Wilson is to the effect that he goes on talking now just as if he were still campaigning for the Presidency, although "the bearing and activities of a President-elect ought to be different from those of a Presidential candidate," as the *Evening Post* says. But the exact opposite is the truth. The bearing and activities of the President-elect are, indeed, vastly different from his bearing and activities during the Presidential campaign. Instead of being all things to all men, instead of studiously avoiding every definite statement, instead of expressing himself in vague and intangible generalities, he now states—as he did in his recent speech before the Commercial Club of Chicago—that the business men in this country, meaning the masters of industry and finance whom he was then addressing, have devoted their thought very successfully to exploiting the resources of America, but very few business men have devoted their thought to husbanding the resources of America; that the raw materials obtainable in this country for every kind of manufacture and industry must be at the disposal of everybody in the United States upon the same terms; that there are inner circles and outer circles of credit in this country, regions of chilly exclusion and regions of warm inclusion; that the banking system of this country does not need to be indicted, since it is already convicted; that we must see to it that the business of the country is set absolutely free of every feature of monopoly; that you cannot have prosperity conducted by small circles of individuals, and that no body of men less than the whole manhood of the nation knows enough to be trustees for the rest.

These are plain words such as the real rulers of this country have not been accustomed to have addressed to them by any President or President-elect of the United States. But Woodrow Wilson did not stop there. Echoing the words of warning uttered two months ago in the New York Chamber of Commerce by that most adroit, faithful and obedient servant of the plutocracy, Elihu Root, that "there are thousands of people outside the great industrial communities who think you are a den of thieves; there are hundreds of thousands of people who think that the manufacturers of the country are no better than a set of confidence men," the President-elect told his audience of multi-millionaires that the rank and file of the citizens of the United States have a stern attitude toward the business men of the country; that business methods in general are not trusted by the people, taken as a whole; that it is believed in this country that a poor man has less chance to get justice administered to him than a rich man; and that as a result of the prevailing attitude of the people, he felt obliged to warn his audience that "I cannot deal with you until you make the general public understand your motives, because their belief that you are not acting upon high motives is the fundamental, underlying,

governing belief of the way they vote, and you have got to clear yourselves before the general jury." And lest there remain any doubt as to his intentions, he made his meaning still more explicit: "There are men whom I have a very warm feeling for, whom I cannot encourage to take an active part in affairs because the general public does not believe in them." In other words, the political tools of the plutocracy are to be excluded from any share in Woodrow Wilson's administration until the plutocracy shall have won over public opinion to its side. The Col. Harveys are to be kept at arm's length until the J. P. Morgans have squared themselves with the people.

From this negative declaration made in Chicago there is but one step further to the subsequent positive declaration made in Trenton, N. J., that in making appointments for his cabinet he "will pick out progressives, and only progressives."

These speeches in Chicago and Trenton have naturally caused consternation in certain quarters. Thus the *Times*, which speaks out rather more bluntly than other Wall Street organs, charges that Mr. Wilson "spreads doubt and sets people guessing, and that is a state of things very favorable to the speculators (meaning the bearish speculators) whom he holds in abhorrence. It also tends to create a feeling of distrust and apprehension, tending toward disturbance." And the *Evening Post*, which is much more restrained in tone and is, moreover, a genuine admirer of Woodrow Wilson, suggests that he keep such utterances as he made at Chicago for the inner circle exclusively. Let him first "give out to the press an authorized version of what he means to say. That will be for general reading and for the record; and if the occasion prompts him to depart from his prepared remarks, and to indulge in one of those bursts of extemporized but vivid speech in which no one can excel him, he may do so at his pleasure. The official report will have gone out, and only by that will he be judged." The plutocratic gathering will have received its warning and the people will be none the wiser. Indeed, if the plutocracy is called upon by the future Chief Magistrate of the nation to mend its ways, what business is this of the people, anyway?

Such is the situation two months and more before the entrance of Governor Wilson upon his tenure of power in Washington, a situation tense with doubt, mutual distrust and veiled threats. What then, it seems pertinent to ask, are the real intentions of the President-elect? If he intends to clip the wings of the plutocracy, or to enter upon a real and not a feigned struggle with it, to whose advantage is he going to do so, and whom does he count upon as his allies and supporters in the impending conflict?

The answer, it seems to us, is plainly set forth in this same Chicago speech. The principal charges and demands made in that speech relate, without exception, to the standing grievances of the

strata that have suffered most from the encroachments and deprivations of the plutocracy, the middle class, high and low, in the widest acceptance of the term. That raw materials should be made accessible to all upon the same terms; that banking credit should be open to all upon the same terms; that business should be freed of every feature of monopoly—these are the cardinal demands of those individuals and corporations that have succumbed in the struggle with the banking and industrial giants. To be sure, these individuals and corporations are themselves powerful in capital, in resources, and in means to influence public opinion, and it is precisely because they are powerful that they are able to obtain the ear of the government, to institute searching investigations, and to control in large measure the policies of the Democratic party. But in justice to Mr. Wilson it must be stated that all the signs point to a determination on his part to fight the battle, not only of those capitalists who have been foiled by their more powerful rivals, but also of the middle class as a whole, including the farmers, and of what he regards as the general interest. Thus in his last message to the legislature of New Jersey he recommends not only the prohibition of holding companies, a measure aimed against the trusts and in the interest of the smaller corporations, but also "salutary checks upon unwarranted and fictitious increases of capital and the issuance of securities not based upon actual bona fide valuation," a reform that would be to the interest of the entire middle class. He demands improvements in the methods of taxation, so that small property owners shall not pay much heavier taxes in proportion to their holdings than large property owners, as is now the case in many localities of the State. He further demands municipal home rule, an efficient and comprehensive system of instruction for the farmers, the calling of a State constitutional convention, and recommends the adoption of the amendments to the national Constitution in regard to an income tax and the direct election of senators. All of these are measures in the "general interest," that is to say, under the existing conditions either wholly or primarily in the interest of the middle class in the widest sense.

Such then is the prospect that the coming Wilson administration holds out to us. The plutocracy is to be kept down, if it can be kept down. The working class is to be utterly disregarded, excepting possibly in relation to such grievances as cry out to heaven and are not tolerated in any other civilized country. But the middle class is to be the grand axis around which all its policies will revolve. The middle class, which has succumbed in the economic struggle, is to be given a new lease of life through the interference of the government, which is itself a great economic power.

And this brings out the grand distinction between "progressives" of the type of Roosevelt, and "progressives" of the type of Wilson, Bryan and La Follette. The former takes the results of

the economic struggle as he finds them, and attempts to reconcile the working class as well as certain sections of the middle class to the rule of the trusts, first, by subjecting the trusts to national regulation, and secondly, by proposing a large scheme of reform in the interests of the working class and of the farmers, respectively. But the "progressives" of the type of Wilson, Bryan and La Follette are true middle-class politicians, who regard the trusts as the enemy, the working class as an unpleasant accident, and whose whole attention is centered upon a revival of the middle class through a deliberate and consistent policy of the government.

H. S.

THE PRESENT STATE OF FRENCH SOCIALISM

BY PAUL LOUIS (Paris).

In this first article I would like to make clear to our readers the present state of Socialism in France. And as the Socialist party will play a capital and often paramount rôle in the events which I shall describe and comment upon from month to month, it is necessary that our readers be in possession of exact information in regard to its present condition.

Some years ago Socialism in France was weakened by a dispersion, we might call it, characterized by divisions which almost sterilized it. In 1899, at the time when the great crisis was provoked by the entry of a Socialist, M. Millerand, into Waldeck-Rousseau's cabinet, five factions were facing each other. These were the *Parti Ouvrier Française* with Guesde, the *Parti Socialiste Révolutionnaire* with Vaillant, the *Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Révolutionnaire* with Allemane, the *Fédération de Travailleurs Socialistes* with Brousse, and the *Confédération des Indépendents* with Jaurès, the latter being the last organized of the Socialist parties. The first time that these factions attempted to unite they were unsuccessful. Nevertheless there remained two large groups only, the *Parti Socialiste de France* and the *Parti Socialiste Française*. The *Parti Socialiste de France* repudiated any alliance with the bourgeois democratic factions, any vote for the budget, any participation in executive power. The *Parti Socialiste Française* was unwilling to break completely with the bourgeois democratic elements, and it was represented by delegates in what was called the republican "Bloc." In 1904, on the eve of the International Congress of Amsterdam, the struggle between these two parties became very lively. The Congress of Amsterdam sided with the *Parti Socialiste de France*, but at the same time it invited all the Socialist parties of France to unite. They loyally engaged to realize unity and negotiations were at once opened, which ended

in the Congress of Unification of Paris, called the "*Congress de la Salle du Globe*," which was held in April, 1905.

At that time there were 34,688 members in the various organizations—the two most favored regions being the Department of the Seine, the chief city of which is Paris, with 7,378 dues paying members, and the Department du Nord, the chief industrial region, with 7,130 members.

At the Congress of Chalons (October-November, 1905) 40,000 members were represented; at the Congress of Limoges (November, 1906) 43,462; at the Congress of Nancy (August, 1907) 43,237; at the Congress of Toulouse (October, 1908) 49,348; at the Congress of St. Etienne (April 1909) 51,692; at the Congress of Nimes (February, 1910) 53,928; at the Congress of Saint Quentin (April, 1911) 63,358; at the Congress of Lyon (February, 1912) 63,657.

It will be noted that the advance was very regular up to the congress of 1911, and that the year 1910 was particularly fruitful, since it brought in almost 10,000 new members. A regrettable stagnation is apparent in the year 1911-1912. The last published statistics show that this stagnation has ceased to exist, for from February to October of 1912 there has again been an increase of close to 3,300 members.

How is this membership distributed over the whole territory?

Of course it is the localities where great industries flourish—mines, blast furnaces, glass works, the chemical factories, railroad centers—which offer the best opportunity for Socialist propaganda.

The Nord (mining, weaving, spinning, metallurgy) is now at the head with 12,300 members. The Seine follows with 10,000. This last figure is relatively low if account is taken of the fact that the Seine (Paris) has four million inhabitants, a quarter of whom at least have Socialist or revolutionary aspirations. The Pas de Calais, which contains the richest coal deposits (Lens, Bruay), has 2,550 members. But all the departments from now on will have their groups, which are united into sections. These sections are combined, in their turn, into federations. The agricultural Departments are the only ones where the forces are weak; such as the Haute Saône (68) or the Sarthe (75). The great problem now before the Socialist party is how to push its agrarian propaganda and to win over the peasants—the latter forming almost one half of the total population—while they form over a third in Germany and less than a quarter in England. Certain results have already been obtained, particularly in those places where the small agriculturists and peasants are in touch with the industrial wage-workers, but these have been all too rare up to the present time.

It is of interest to compare the Socialist party of France, with its 70,000 members, and the Social Democratic party of Germany,

with its million members, and to ask ourselves why the Socialist forces of France are apparently so backward in point of numbers.

Several causes should be considered here:

1. France has a considerably smaller population than Germany, 39 millions and 65 millions respectively. But this disparity cannot be taken as a sufficient explanation. It would be a valid solution only if France had 600,000 or 700,000 dues-paying members against Germany's million.

2. The great capitalistic industries are far less powerful to the left of the Rhine than to the right. The fuel deposits are infinitely less rich in France than in Germany, where they consequently furnish occupation to much larger numbers. In spite of the advance made during the last ten years in the metallurgic basin of Meurthe and Moselle (Bricy, Nancy), German metallurgy far surpasses it. The great industrial cities of France cannot, with rare exceptions, be compared with the great industrial cities of the German Empire, with three and four times the number of inhabitants. No French maritime port has the importance of Hamburg. The railroads, much better developed on the other side of the Rhine, have a much larger staff of employes.

French capitalism tends rather to financial operations properly speaking, to banking transactions, foreign loans (loans to Russia, Hungary, Spain, South America), investment of funds in the gold and diamond mines, than to industrial production. If we except some centres—Lille, Roubaix, Tourcoing, Amiens, Rouen, the Parisian and Marsellaise regions, Le Creusot—France is still a country of industries of average size. Although industrial evolution and capitalist concentration are undeniable, as is proved by periodic statistics, there are no trusts comparable to those of Germany and the United States. Although commerce is tending, at least, to combine into powerful companies, and although houses which have the appearance of being independent are, in reality, branches of great companies, the small retail commerce is trying to resist the current, and the supplying of food, in particular, has offered it a real refuge. It must be repeated here that the rural element yields comparatively slowly and that the urban development is not as great as in many other countries.

Now, great urban concentration, on the one hand, and the triumph of great industry, on the other, are the essential conditions for Socialist expansion as well as for labor union advance.

3. The French temperament is antagonistic to the discipline of a firmly organized party as well as to the payment of regular dues. When we study the history of the labor union movement of this country, we perceive that the groups, at least until about 1890, disappear as fast as they are formed. This was true of the "Syndicats" as well as of the trade unions. It was no less true of the Socialist sections. And it is only since the unification of

the party, that is since 1905, that there has been a reaction against these tendencies of extreme individualism. But although the reaction against them has been strong and salutary, it has not yet been able to overcome them entirely. Time alone can accomplish that.

4. And finally, to explain the numerical weakness of the Socialist party, it is necessary to take into consideration the differences, of historic origin and of a practical nature, which have arisen between this party and the *Confederation Generale de Travail*, differences to which we shall again refer some day. France is the only country of the European continent where the Socialist party and the federated or central organization of the unions (*Syndicats*) are not in contact.

Whatever the difficulties which lie in its way, the Socialist party in France nevertheless plays no unimportant rôle. It might even be said that in no state of the world, and I make no exception of Germany, has the Socialist party so much influence. This influence is due, first, to the courage of certain of its militants, but chiefly to the revolutionary spirit of the French nation. Many people who do not belong to the party, because they refuse to enlist in any organization and because their individualism is antagonistic to highly disciplined associations, give it their moral support and will in some cases render it material aid. This is because they recognize the sovereign justice and broad humanity of the Socialist conclusions. It has happened, and it happens oftener and oftener, that the Socialist party of France is the only one to raise its voice in behalf of the oppressed, to oppose the brutalities of the capitalist regime, to denounce the crimes and the shames of the money dealers, and to make war against war. The more the bourgeois democratic parties turn from their own past, the more they forget their traditions, the more they throw aside the reforms they once espoused, just so much the more does the Socialist party perceive the communion of ideas that exists between the working masses, as yet more or less unorganized, and its propagandists.

What is lacking, or rather what was lacking during recent years, is sufficiently active recruiting. The organized central body and the organized locals of the French Socialist party are now occupying themselves with this situation, as they should. At the present time an effort is being made to improve the means of propaganda, and, if possible, to add new means.

When we look at the results accomplished by the party in the electoral struggle, we find that they are far from being negligible. In the elections to the Reichstag in 1912, the Social Democratic party of Germany received 4,250,000 votes, or about 33 per cent. of all the votes cast, and in Berlin this percentage was exceeded considerably. Here, too, the Socialist party of France cannot be compared with it.

The statistics of the election to the Chamber of Deputies, held April 28, 1910 (these are the last that we can consider), show 1,106,000 Socialist votes; this is about 12 per cent. of the whole. But distinction must be made between the agricultural regions and the industrial regions. In the former the votes received were generally low, in the latter they amounted to considerably more than 12 per cent., in the average, for the Socialist party. Thus in the Seine they reached 25 per cent. and in the Nord 27 per cent. These elections of April 28, 1910, gave the party 76 electoral seats, of a total of a little less than 600—that is to say, about an eighth of the whole number of deputies elected by universal suffrage. It has not yet been possible to penetrate into the Senate, elected indirectly by means of a clever filtering system.

It is interesting to compare the results of the election of 1910 with those of 1906, the election immediately preceding.

In 1910 the party nominated about as many candidates as in 1906; 351 instead of 346. We know that in 1910 there were 1,106,000 votes; in 1906 there were 878,000, or 228,000 less. On the earlier date only 52 seats were won, or 24 less than in 1910.

Since we are reviewing the electoral strength of the party, it should be added that 137 cantonal candidates were elected (*conseillers generaux*, and *conseillers d'arrondissements*) the jurisdiction of the *conseiller general* extending over a whole Department, which in France is the administrative unit, and that of the *conseiller d'arrondissement* over the whole Arrondissement, which is the sub-section of the Department. Both are elected by the Cantons, which are an intermediate subdivision between the Commune and the Arrondissement. There are also 5,530 *conseillers municipaux*, distributed among 282 Communes—a number of large cities being in the hands of the party.

When we examine the parliamentary action of the Socialists, we find that, although it may give occasion for criticism more or less justified, in general it has conformed to the resolution passed in 1904 at the International Congress of Amsterdam, and which provides a rule for Socialist parliamentary delegations throughout the world. We no longer find a single deputy voting for the budget, and although we might feel that, in certain cases, the opposition was not vigorous enough, there has never again been an alliance with any bourgeois group.

In international matters the Socialists of France have consistently done their duty. There is no party in the two hemispheres that has fought more vigorously against militarism, armaments, imperialism, bellicose colonialism, and which has done more to safeguard peace. It kept up a continuous protest throughout the whole Morocco campaign. In 1911, during the Franco-German crisis, which followed the incident of Agadir; and again in 1912, during the entire Balkan crisis, the party, with vehemence and

without flinching before governmental threats, made manifest the firm will of the French proletariat to resist a bloody conflagration by every means in its power.

From the foregoing our readers will gain some idea of the party which I shall very frequently have occasion to discuss in these pages in the future.

TABOOED ASPECTS OF SUFFRAGE DISCUSSION

BY THEODORE SCHROEDER

With a small-souled social reformer, considerations of expediency weigh much more heavily than love for the whole simple truth. He is more delighted with the power to influence unreasoned conduct, than with securing intelligent conviction. There is an army of pettifogging agitators, who evade the unpopular aspects of problems; who deal in half-truths; who mislead by question-begging epithets; who are careless of truth itself, quite unconscious that they are intellectual frauds. That is why we have tabooed aspects of problems. It also explains why many act on motives, which their public "arguments" are designed to conceal. I am going to indulge in another sort of discussion, in which I will expose my naked mind to public scrutiny.

The problems of women and sex are generally so befogged with maudlin sentimentalism, with cowardice and hypocrisy masking as chivalry, that any one writing on these subjects critically and with robust frankness must expect to be misunderstood and misrepresented. Some stupid ones will call me "woman-hater." A few will see that I can not hate or love women as a whole, nor merely as women. A very few will see that I am really trying to help women and humanity, by trying to liberalize all. Certainly I know some women of fine feeling and big brain, to whom the following strictures do not apply. These will understand and will not feel hurt, even when they disagree with me. That will be the test of the reader. "If he tries to see what it means, what truth excuses it, he has the gift and let him read. If he is merely hurt, or offended, or exclaims upon his author's folly, he had better take to the daily papers; he will never be a reader," (Stevenson).

JUSTICE AND WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE

A handsome and very successful literary woman recently stated to me her reasons for opposing woman's suffrage, substantially as follows: "Woman's Suffrage is the cult of the incompetent. Without suffrage a clever woman can always get more than her share of special privileges and advantages. I get more than my share. Why should I help the suffrage cause?" To such persons

one can only answer that if woman's suffrage is really the cult of the incompetent, then such anti-suffrage sentiments express the cult of the unjust. It is to be hoped that a time will come when women and men are willing to renounce all advantage, whether gained by cunning or by law, because all advantage is parasitic. It is to be hoped that some day all will develop so fine a sense of justice as not to desire special privileges and to be ashamed to gloat over their possession. Such women, as the one quoted, although enjoying economic independence, still retain the mental status of the conscious, willing parasite. This is the mental state which upholds exploiters and slaves, get-rich-quick swindles, and child factory labor. But we must not be too certain that adherence to the cause of the suffragists necessarily implies the existence of a more refined sense of justice, nor does it imply willingness to renounce unjust advantage.

The pioneer suffragists were earnest apostles of justice and liberty. Then the suffrage cause was too unpopular to be attractive as a mere fad for the bored victims of idle ease. Then, more than now, women suffered from unjust legal discriminations, and suffrage was insisted upon as a means to the end of securing to them more justice, and probably was not yet thought of as an end in itself.

Incident to their pursuit of justice, these women attacked boldly every intervening superstition. In those days it required courage to repudiate the unjust sex-discriminations in property-rights, which religious custom, statute law, and Christian ignorance had sanctified. These founders of the suffrage movement were essentially iconoclasts, who dared to question rules of "right" even though founded on alleged "divine revelation." By courageous and intelligent criticism, in which they dared to doubt even the religion which had sanctified their wrongs, they did much to make us sceptical as to "Holy Writ." Men became ashamed of their laws and their creeds, so that new laws have abolished most of the former property-wrongs inflicted upon women. Modern suffragists, however, often ignore or even repudiate some of the women most conspicuous in bringing about this wholesome change, such women as Mary Wollstonecraft and Matilda Joslyn Gage.

As another proof that now woman's suffrage bears but little relation to the abolition of *all* unjust sex-discrimination, I call attention to the eloquent silence of suffragists on the property-wrongs of married men. I concede that under our present property system, parents should, to the full extent of their possessions, be jointly and severally liable for the maintenance of their children to a fully developed maturity. But just why the law should coerce a man to support for life an idle and childless wife, merely because she once rendered him a legalized sex-service, is not clear to me. With our advancing civilization, we have abolished impris-

onment for debt, *except* where it has been incurred as the price for authorized sexual relations. "Eminently respectable" suffragist conventions have not yet been heard to make public protest against this statutory discrimination in favor of woman. It will be observed that no law imposes imprisonment for debt upon prosperous wives who refuse to support their impecunious husbands. If a refined sense of justice were the real motive-power behind the suffrage movement, we would more often hear demands for the abolition of unjust advantages, as well as disadvantages. In some states women have an advantage over men in the matter of dower rights and exemptions from execution. Since we do not hear of any protest against these advantages, we may suspect that the suffragist mind is obsessed by "votes for women" as an end in itself and that the lust for power precludes conscious concern with promoting either human justice or liberty.

Under present laws every woman whose expectations and vanity are damaged, can find profit and sweet revenge in that legalized blackmail known as a suit for breach of promise to marry. There are women big enough to scorn such "balm" for wounded "affections"; others are afraid to expose their greedy "love affairs" to public scrutiny; but no suffrage convention has pledged itself to help abolish this advantage of the old sex-slavery. Are suffrage conventions interested only in such "justice" and such "emancipation" as will induce women to desire "votes for women" more than justice for men?

When some court invokes an old common-law precedent to justify a sex discrimination *against* women, public protest meetings have been held and denunciatory resolutions promulgated. When recently a New Jersey court, likewise following ancient precedents, decided that a married woman engaged in the business of her spouse must be presumed to be so merged in her husband that she cannot become a criminal in her own right, but that in relation to such business her criminal act (because of the marriage) is the crime of her husband, and that he alone is punishable for it, there was no suffragist's protest against the injustice. They want "votes for women," not just relations of the sexes.

For this feminine silence in the face of injustice, it is no sufficient excuse to say that men impose these laws on themselves. First, because that is a lie. A few men impose such laws upon other men. No sane man ever consciously imposed an unjust disadvantage upon himself. And, secondly, because no true lover of justice will countenance injustice simply because of its source. Many of our friends want "votes for women" as an end, not as a means to greater equality of men and women before the law, not as a promoter of liberty. Hence they only protest against injustice when it serves propagandist purposes, and thereby make us doubt

the genuineness of their interest in real justice as between the sexes.

I presume that the present difficulty with the suffrage movement of America is that it suffers from blight of respectability. In consequence of this, our suffragists too often hedge and trim and compromise and pettefog, and too often are willing to use every intellectual trickery as a justifiable means to their end. It seems quite likely that from now on the suffrage movement will more and more neglect its foundation-demands for personal and material justice. Such demands will still be urged, but rather as a mask to conceal a lust for power; not that justice may be done, but that power for injustice be increased. For example, no suffrage organization would allow any of its officers publicly to urge the eminently just proposition, that in the matter of sex women should be accorded the same freedom which is tacitly conceded to men. In States where women have suffrage, they have utterly failed to protest against either proposed or existing laws which make sex-discriminations on questions of personal liberty. Neither the slave-ideal nor unjust female slave-virtues can be eliminated by statutes.

THE WAGE EARNING WOMEN

The present demand for woman's suffrage comes chiefly from two sources: Working women and Christian women. Many working women feel that they suffer much economic injustice, especially in time of strikes, the outcome of which in so far as it depends upon official action, would be more favorable if working women had votes. These injustices are seldom found in the letter of laws, but on the contrary are purely effects of their mal-administration and mal-execution, sanctified by a perverse public opinion and founded upon lawless official "discretion." We may well doubt the existence of such discriminations against women, *as women*, because every one of the wrongs suffered at such times is also inflicted upon male workers under like conditions. The fact remains that, though the male worker has a vote, he gets no more relief than do women. The remedy here is not to be found in suffrage as such, but must come through that higher intelligence which working men have not yet achieved and for want of which the "captains of industry," who control practically all important means for the manufacture of public opinion, can with absolute certainty fool most laboring men into the indorsement of "the system" and its political organizations, no matter how outrageously these deal with the laboring man's interests, or violate party pledges made to secure his vote. At best, suffrage is only another opportunity to secure larger economic and political intelligence. In this respect woman's suffrage, as such, will have no *necessary, immediate* and *direct* effect in promoting economic justice, though in the long run it will promote intelligence and thus indirectly promote justice and

liberty. Here the demand for suffrage is based simply upon opposition to some particular injury from arbitrary power, without protest against tyrannous power as such.

There are strong reasons for believing that the first effect of woman's suffrage will be to retard the rate of legislative progress. For some time to come women will average less intelligence than men concerning economic, political, and ethical problems, and consequently will be fooled into supporting "the system" more easily than men. Furthermore, women as a class, being by education and an absence of self-reliance much more conservative than men, can more easily be counted upon to support any "standpat" proposition of the powers that be. More effectually than men, women are influenced by a superstitious reverence for "respectability." The woman who dares to be an iconoclast, or even a "doubting Thomas" toward anything in our social system that has a "respectable" rating, is still too rare a person to be accepted as typical of her sex or to receive much countenance from present American suffragist organizations.

PERSONAL LIBERTY AND SUFFRAGE

The motive underlying the demand for suffrage in some quarters will readily be apparent when we remember that the largest single organization of American women to demand suffrage is the Women's Christian Temperance Union. The bulk of its members neither know nor care to know about either economics or politics, in the broader sense. They despise liberty, probably because they usually feel themselves incompetent to assume the responsibility which liberty imposes. Conscious of their own incapacity for self-government, they put their trust in God, the preacher, or the politician. Judging others by themselves, such women feel certain that all persons are and must remain forever incompetent to look after themselves. Since such others will not lean on God, our pious suffragists wish to force a godly prop under these faithless ones, by using the machinery of the state to compel conformity to their dwarfed conception of the religious life. The great bulk of its membership is moved by most intense moral sentimentalism, the chief aim of which is to inflict their own stupid ideals upon a suffering public, by means of an ever increasing and progressively irksome maternal legislation. So far as this class of women and this organization are concerned, I believe they demand suffrage, not to enlarge liberty and thereby perfect humanity, but to destroy liberty and to perpetuate indefinitely the seeming necessity for tyranny and slavery. Being devoid of any rational conception of right conduct, and being also guiltless of any intelligent justification for such "moral" creed as they profess to have, they are necessarily devoid of confidence in human capacity to produce right conduct by diffusing enlightenment. They can't be real democrats, and so, if too poor to be social snobs, they

can at least have the self-exaltation of moral snobbery. Thus they are always led to favor the tyranny of moralization through legalized violence. Never having attained to that intellectual stature which is a condition precedent to an impersonal view of ethical problems, they regard as the most important things in life the little toy virtues demanded by the etiquette of the countryside. Never having indulged in any game more devilish than croquet or authors, these dearies are certain that all games which they do not understand should be punished as crimes. Perhaps a sporty son sometimes thinks it is smart to persist in violating the village requirement of "good breeding" by smoking a cigarette in the "sitting-room"; so my self-righteous lady tyrant believes a law should be passed making it a crime to sell tobacco to any of the Johnnies on her block. Never having swallowed anything more stimulating than water, our goody sister obviously can't understand why anybody should desire anything else. The appetite for anything more stimulating than pop and sweet parsons is to her evidence of satanic possession. The booze merchant appears to her as a real imp, deserving to be punished by new laws against witchcraft, or the mob law of a Carrie Nation. Hence, also, "prohibition." She is certain, this dear little soul, that all conduct or ideas not prescribed in the decalogue nor taught in the Squeedunk-corner's Sunday school, must of necessity be pleading the "devil's" cause. Especially is this so if she does not know the meaning of these new teachings. Convinced that the "devil's" side is not even entitled to be heard, this sugar-coated duncelet insists that she will not read any book not recommended by the sky-pilot of the cross-roads. Fearing that "satan" has as much influence over others, as she knows he would have over her if she ever allowed him to dance a "turkey trot" in her imagination, she vehemently demands the suppression of all literature which describes scenes not acted by herself—not yet—at least, not in public. It is to be expected that when they get votes, those to whom a lawn party given to promote the sewing society's interest in Chinese Missions is the most ravishing vision ever presented to longing eyes, will try to abolish the theatre, have a religious censorship of the mails, as demanded by the American Federation of Catholic Societies, and exclude the mention of tobacco and beer from the mails, as already attempted. So we will secure a literature devoid of heresy, smokeless, boozeless and orthodox, as we have already secured a sexless literature.

Many of the intelligent suffragist agitators who do not approve these tyrannies, discreetly avoid giving to their dissent any publicity. Apparently this is so because suffrage has become an end in itself. Its promoters are but little concerned with liberty as a means to human betterment and suffrage as a means to liberty. Suffrage is wanted as an end, or as a means for satisfying

the lust for power. Hence it is impolitic for propagandists to discuss problems of liberty from any other viewpoint than that of our ethical sentimentalists and moralists for revenue. Many women would commend themselves more for their intellectual honesty and moral courage if they were to "admit the corn" and defend suffrage on the broader ground, conceding that probably women's votes would injure the state as a guardian of liberty, but help society by enlarging woman's outlook upon life and by educating her into a greater desire for and understanding of liberty.

PROPERTY QUALIFICATION

The argument that women should vote because they pay a property tax is regularly used by certain suffragists. Manifestly the argument proves too much, since lunatics and infants also pay a property tax. The property qualification for voting logically results in multiple voting, according to the quantity of property possessed. Do suffragists believe in that? If they are ready to give legal sanction to our little aristocracy of dollars, they should openly proclaim such a purpose. If they are opposed to it, more of them should so declare and urge "votes for women" without any sacrifice of democracy. In theory, at least, our government is not established on the sacred rights of property owners, but is declared to have been established to promote liberty and justice, which are as much rights of the pauper as of the millionaire, and more important to the former. The tax-paying argument for woman's suffrage is about as silly as the argument that women should not vote because they only beget soldiers, without being soldiers.

I am opposed to all arbitrary discriminations as the basis for voting, and so am opposed to a property qualification for voters. But if I must discriminate in this matter, I would make it a *poverty* qualification. As a rule, rich women have no real interests which their male providers, or other rich friends, do not adequately protect. This is conclusively shown in the general advantage of the rich, without reference to sex. If the protection which the male relatives of a rich woman are able to furnish shall prove insufficient, then she can buy legislation, special privileges and liberty, and so she has comparatively small need for the ballot, except as an aid to economy, thus leaving more of her income to be spent in ostentatous waste. Poor women cannot buy either liberty, legislation, or exemption from the exploitation of the privileged, and so have a greater need for the ballot to protect their purely personal and economic interests against legalized injustices, vested wrongs, or official invasion.

(To be concluded.)

DIRECT ACTION AND SABOTAGE

BY MOSES OPPENHEIMER

A great deal of heated discussion has gone on of late among our comrades as to Direct Action and Sabotage. Aside from the question of personalities unfortunately dragged in, what does it all mean?

Our recent national convention adopted a new enactment under which anybody advocating crime, sabotage or violence as aids in the emancipation of the working class, shall be expelled from the party. A considerable minority of the delegates voted against this provision. They secured enough signatures to an amendment eliminating this dogmatic "omnibus" provision from Art. II, section 6, of the party's constitution.

Both the original majority enactment and the substitute of the minority were submitted to the party membership for a referendum vote. Less than twenty per cent of our dues paying members took the trouble to record their opinion by a vote. To cap the climax of confusion, both versions received a majority against considerable minorities. But the printed and promulgated constitution contains Art. II, section 6, in its full dogmatic text. The substitute, also carried by a majority, got lost in the shuffle.

What, then, is the clearly established will of the party as to this much mooted question? We don't know. The great majority of the membership has not declared itself. Only a small minority has spoken in a confusing, bewildering manner.

The case is by no means unusual or exceptional. Practically all our referendums result similarly, because we have not provided for a thorough instructive discussion prior to the act of voting. The mode of submitting questions to the voters follows the methods of Napoleonic plebiscites rather than the democratic way of getting real opinions based on mature understanding.

But on this part of the question I shall not dwell now. Suffice it to state that prior to the Indianapolis convention our comrades were startled and amazed by the assertion from within our ranks that in a republic in which the courts are the supreme law-makers, all Socialists were in duty bound to obey all capitalistic legal enactments until they succeeded in effecting changes in the manner provided by the courts. Any other course was vehemently condemned as "ethically unjustifiable and tactically suicidal."

The lively discussion started against this new-fangled doctrine had not entirely subsided before the convention met. It is fair to surmise that the enactment of Art. II, section 6, was intended to settle the question dogmatically, by sheer force of numbers.

But matters settled in such a manner have a tendency of not staying settled. Socialists cannot be successfully muzzled. Free and full discussion they will have. It is the breath of life to the movement.

Thus it happens that the underlying issues come up again and again. Just now the storm rages around the phrases Direct Action and Sabotage.

What is Direct Action? What is Sabotage? No definite authoritative answer is given or can be given at this time. A lot of dust is raised. As far as an interested observer may gather, we are dealing with tactics of the working masses arising from their economic condition, bound up closely with their economic activities. We are dealing with mass action as distinct from isolated and individual action in the sense of anarchist doctrine and philosophy.

Considered as mass activity, Direct Action chiefly crystallizes in the General Strike idea. But no calm judge will say that the General Strike as a weapon of the working class under given conditions is either generally approved or generally condemned by International Socialism. We may still hold that the test of the pudding is the eating of it. As far as we know, this new weapon may be a two-edged sword or it may develop into an all-powerful engine of class warfare.

Virtually the same view holds good as to Sabotage. Perhaps even more so. For only the name is new, not the thing itself which has been in existence before as "ca' canny," as "limitation of output," as "union rules," and so forth. Craft unions in the printing, building, mining, textile and other industries have known and practiced it in various forms long before the word Sabotage was coined. We have here a weapon of defense against unbearable exploitation.

For illustration, let me cite a case in point that happened more than thirty years ago in a butter factory in Germany. The management introduced piece work in place of weekly time wages. Instantly a number of the workers rushed their work. They earned, under payment by the gross, nearly double their former pay. Thereupon the management cut down the price allowed for the gross. More hustling, harder work again produced good pay envelopes. More price cuts were the only result, until the workers realized that they were up against an endless chain of exploitation. Then, rather late, ensued a limitation of the individual output for the protection of all. Here, as in other lines of piece work, appears an embryonic form of sabotage or striking on the job.

Sabotage, according to its advocates, is many-sided in its form and application. It may be slow work, poor work, literal carrying out of orders in the manner of the celebrated jester, Till Eulenspiegel, observance of all sham rules in mines, mills and transpor-

tation systems, confusion and miscarriage of mail matter, and what not. To be successful, it must be mass action, obviously.

Is it then for the Socialist party, the political organization of the working class, to condemn this weapon dogmatically? Are we ready to assume a lofty attitude of infallibility and to put our ban, the anathema of our church, upon every transgressor?

Surely, we should not be frightened by the furious howls against Sabotage set up in the capitalist camp. That camp howled with exactly the same rage against the other natural weapons of the workers, the Strike and the Boycott. And the capitalists did much more than howl platonically. They set their judges to work to dull the edge of these two weapons by practically declaring every effective strike and every effective boycott a criminal act, a conspiracy against sainted Property.

If we are now witnessing in the labor world the development and trial of a new defensive and offensive weapon of the masses, are we to get so frightened by a strange name that we must fall on our knees and promise to the united respectables, hypocrites and kept tools of capitalism that we Socialists, at least, will be good, law-abiding children? Shade of Karl Marx, what an absurdity!

THE SOCIALIST SITUATION IN MASSACHUSETTS

BY REV. ROLAND D. SAWYER

Socialist Candidate in the Late Campaign

In the splendid increase of the Socialist vote in the last Presidential election the great industrial state of Massachusetts did not share. This fact was quickly noticed by the comrades, and a caustic editorial in the "Call," under the head of "What's the matter with Massachusetts," fixed the eyes of American Socialists upon the state. It is generally felt that Socialism is not in a satisfactory condition here; that it was once in a flourishing condition here, and that the decline is the fault of Massachusetts Socialists.

To the first indictment we plead guilty; the situation is not what it should be. But that there was ever any flourishing movement here is not true, and bad as the present condition of the movement is, it is better to-day than it ever was before. To the third count in the indictment, namely, that the present condition is the fault of the comrades, my reply is as follows: No doubt if the comrades were wiser the movement would be better here, but were they as wise as possible, I believe there are obstacles in the way that they could not overcome.

Let us look at the figures. Socialism first got its start here in 1896, when the more thorough-going of the Populists refused to follow their party into the Democratic fold, and united, or at least voted, with the Socialist Labor party; Matchett that year got 3,114 votes for President. The S. L. P. steadily built up its vote to 1899, when the Social-Democrats first appeared in the field; this rival movement seems to have helped rather than hindered the movement in the state, and the vote in the next five years rose to the highest totals ever cast for Socialism in the state. This is what the comrades have in mind when they speak of the former glory of Socialism in Massachusetts. The figures are:

1899 (Gubernatorial election)	
Socialist Labor Party, Peare.....	10,778
Social-Democratic Party, Porter.....	8,262
1900 (Presidential election)	
Socialist Labor Party, Maloney.....	2,599
Social-Democratic Party, Debs.....	9,607
1901 (Gubernatorial)	
Socialist Labor Party, Berry.....	8,898
Social-Democratic Party, Wrenn.....	10,671
1902 (Gubernatorial)	
Socialist Labor Party, Berry.....	6,079
Social-Democratic Party, Chase.....	33,629
1903 (Gubernatorial)	
Socialist Labor Party, Brenan.....	4,561
Social-Democratic Party, Chase.....	25,251

These are the big figures for Socialism in Massachusetts; but they did not represent so many Socialists. When the Social-Democrats appeared in 1899 their candidate in Haverhill was elected mayor, and with him a minority of the city council; but not by Socialist votes. Haverhill had a big element of greenbackers, labor men, and had passed through a big strike in the winter of 1894-5; it was on this wave that the mayor and three aldermen and two representatives were elected.

It was a somewhat similar situation that in 1900 elected Coulter in Brockton, together with a minority of the city government and one representative in the legislature.

The big vote for Chase in 1902 and 1903 was largely a protest vote against the coal-strike and did not mean a real increase in the number of Socialists.

In 1904 the S. L. P. vote fell to 2,359 for President, and for several years held around that figure; the figures running as follows, 2,182, 2,999, 2,018, etc. The Socialist vote in 1904 gave Debs, 13,604, and since then the figures in the yearly gubernatorial elections have been as follows: 1905, James F. Carey, 12,874; 1906, James F. Carey, 7,938; 1907, John W. Brown, 7,621; 1908, John W. Brown, 14,480; 1908, Debs, candidate for President, 10,781; 1909, Dan White, 10,137; 1910, Dan White,

11,396; 1911, James F. Carey, 13,355; 1912, Roland D. Sawyer, 11,500; 1912, Debs, candidate for President, 12,615.

These figures show that there was no loss suffered by Massachusetts Socialists in 1912, and when we consider that Roosevelt was here a very strong candidate for President, that Bird was a very strong candidate for Governor, and that the Bull Moose campaign was prosecuted here with vigor and with money, we may dismiss the charge that the vote here is not up to former years. And when we consider that the membership in the organization is better than ever, we may see that the movement here is as hopeful as it ever was. Now to note some of the things that Massachusetts Socialists are up against.

1. All our industrial centers are filled with Irish-Americans, who give us a miniature Tammany Hall machine in every city; in addition they are loyal Roman Catholics, and the R. C. Church is not at the present time helping Socialism very much.

2. Our rural centers and the state as a whole are in the hands of the Puritanic Yankees; these people are smugly self-centered, and like the Pharisees of old they have little interest in reforms.

3. Our working class is composed of many nations, all suspicious of each other, which suspicion is carefully fanned into flame by petty politicians and oftentimes by religious leaders.

4. There is no labor union movement in Massachusetts. There are a lot of labor-leader politicians who play with the movement, but there is no united labor movement here, nor has there been since the Knights of Labor passed off the stage.

5. Massachusetts has been the field of more Anti-Socialist propaganda than almost any state in the Union.

Such are the things we face. I believe the outlook is hopeful. If we will bend ourselves to two lines of advance, I believe we shall yet see Massachusetts at the forefront of the Socialist movement in America. These two lines of advance are, first, **TO SOLIDIFY THE WORKING CLASS AS A WORKING CLASS**; national, racial, religious divisions must be overcome; we have no time to fritter away begging for votes, we must build up a class-conscious organization ready to give battle on both the political and economic fields. Secondly, we must waste no effort flirting with near-Socialism, we must keep straight to the line and build up a Marxian movement. The workers in Massachusetts work at such low wages and live under such conditions that as a class they are anxiously looking for immediate improvements. The old parties can promise these with a far greater show of success than can we; the only way we can meet the old parties is by advocating, along with our political action, a direct economic action. A revolutionary, class-conscious labor union like the I. W. W. would be the greatest asset that Socialism could have, if we could get over the jealousy of leaders. Ambitions of leaders in

both the unions and the party threaten to put back the American movement. The splendid solidarity of a Lawrence strike should teach the Socialist movement the necessity of standing firm and solid to help the workers in their battles on the economic field; any other policy will be suicidal in a state like Massachusetts.

I am not criticising the comrades in this state for aiding and abetting near-Socialist movements; it may have been necessary in the past when we were so weak. The comrades have advertised and supported and encouraged these near-Socialists. It has worked well in Haverhill, for instance, where the preachers have one after another become too much inoculated with the Socialist virus to please their congregations. In this way much prejudice has been broken down and the people have come to look more kindly on us; but these people all go off after the near-Socialists when it comes to voting. Now that the Progressive movement is in the field, we must drop these tactics—we must go ahead and put our efforts into the propaganda of straight-out Socialism. We must cease to aid in holding up the hands of those who are flirting with our movement, and the clear-cut and avowed Socialist propaganda must be supported from this on.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THE BALKAN WAR

By M. PAVLOVITCH (Paris)

On October 8, 1912, Montenegro, the very smallest of the Balkan States, with a population of only 250,000 inhabitants, declared war upon Turkey. On the following day, before the hostile armies had even met, there lay around the building of the Paris Stock Exchange, dead and heavily wounded, with financial bulletins in their hands instead of guns, thousands upon thousands of large, medium and small stockholders. These had invested their savings, small and large, in all sorts of French and foreign government and industrial securities, among which were very many which seemed to have absolutely no relation to Balkan affairs.

During the last few years many economists have repeatedly insisted that France is the richest country in the world, that her gold reserve exceeds considerably the gold reserve of other countries, that her enormous metal reserve removes the possibility of a panic in France in case of any international shake-up. The French Stock Exchange seemed a sort of financial Gibraltar which feared no onslaught. Only last year a French economist, Count Saint Maurice, pointed out the financial power of France and showed

that her gold reserve put her in a privileged position in comparison with other countries. Saint Maurice states with great satisfaction that the gold reserve of the Double Alliance, i. e., Russia and France, is over one and a quarter billion dollars, while the whole gold reserve of the Triple Alliance equals little more than six hundred million dollars, or half as much.

In an article by me published toward the end of 1911, I proved to what extent the optimistic deductions concerning the unlimited financial power of France were unfounded. Concerning all European powers without exception, I wrote: "One can say that each one of them resembles a sick man suffering from rheumatism, whose every motion causes unspeakable pain. In case of war or any serious international complications, neither France nor England would occupy any specially privileged position in comparison with Germany."

The events which took place on the Paris Stock Exchange the day after the unceremonious king of Montenegro, not considering in any way, according to his own admission, the interests of European capitalists, challenged Turkey, serve as illustrations of the above thesis. On October 9, French government securities were already lower than 90, and then fell to 89.95. In the course of the last twenty-two years the French financial world had not witnessed similar phenomena. Only on May 19, 1890, did the quotations stand at the same level. Even in the panic of February 9, 1904, caused by the Russo-Japanese War, the quotation of French exchange stood at 94, while at the time of the Agadir incident, July 6, 1911, it stood at 94.40. But the fall of French government securities did not now stop at 89.95. In three days more they stood at 87 and in three weeks from Sept. 20 to October 1, 1912, the holders of French securities lost by the depression of the Exchange exactly two hundred million dollars (one billion francs). It is not hard to imagine what happened with other securities. Paris bank stock fell 184 points; Credit Lyonnais, 115 points; Omnibus Co., 107 points; Thomson-Houston, 107 points; Suez Canal, 437 points.

Although there seems to be no relation between the company of Paris omnibuses, the Subway (Métropolitain), the gas and electric companies, with the king of Montenegro, they too suffered. All stocks fell. People lost those few days entire fortunes, and there were cases of suicide. The French papers, which so often in past years insisted on the stability of the Paris Exchange, were compelled to write articles under the headings, "Panic on the Exchange," "Financial Hecatombs," "Catastrophe on the Exchange." This rapid account of the financial upheaval which France underwent at the first alarming signal in the Balkans, frees me from the necessity of dwelling on the Berlin, Vienna, St. Petersburg and other exchanges. If the first shots fired on the Montenegrin frontier shook the foundations of the most formidable fortress of the financial world, it is not hard to guess what happened in other

countries. Even in the small Spanish city of Bilbao, the existence of which is known to probably no more than a few dozen Montenegrins, local holders of stocks of all sorts lost, according to the communications of financial newspapers, in the single day from October 8 to October 9, three hundred thousand dollars.

Therefore we can easily imagine what will happen in case of a European war. Let us take for example France herself. Her capital, placed in Turkish loans and various railroad and other enterprises of the Ottoman empire, equals \$400,000,000, her trade with Turkey equals (1910) \$33,600,000, but the figures of the trade of France with Germany are ten times greater, i. e., \$332,000,000 (1910). And how many French millions are in German enterprises, and vice versa? What perturbations would a Franco-German war bring about in the economic life of both nations!

If a war should break out between the Triple Alliance (Austria, Italy and Germany) and the Triple Entente (Russia, France, England), hitherto unforeseen catastrophes would devastate all Europe. The Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente would have to mobilize against each other more than twenty million men, according to official data: Germany 3,600,000 soldiers, England 1,500,000, France 3,400,000, Italy 2,800,000, Austria-Hungary 2,600,000, Russia 5,000,000, a total of nearly 21,000,000. Each day of war would cost Europe, counting only the expenses of maintaining the armies, from fifty to seventy million dollars. Besides, trade would stop for the reason that the railroads would transport only soldiers, cannon, artillery supplies, cartridges, and ammunition for the armies, and would refuse to carry ordinary freight, because there would not be cars enough for the demands of war. Banks would fail, factories would close for the reason that so many working men would be called to arms. And so, having begun a European war, the bourgeoisie itself would actually decree a general strike, and in a form most disastrous to the capitalistic structure of society. That would be the beginning of a social revolution. But the bourgeoisie understands right well the results of a European war, and therefore fears it so.

The great depression of government and industrial securities in connection with Balkan occurrences, the heavy economic disturbances in Russia, Austria and all Europe, caused by the war of small Slavic kingdoms against Turkey, entirely refute those economists who, basing their hypotheses on the results of the Russo-Japanese war, tried to prove the groundlessness of "socialistic theories" concerning the inevitability of unforeseen economic catastrophes in case of a European war. But to cite the Russo-Japanese campaign as an example is wholly misleading. It was, so to speak, a "colonial war," one that was waged in a domain lying not only beyond the borders of both hostile countries, but away from the great commercial routes and the industrial centers of contemporary world-economy. It is evident that the results of such a

war could not be particularly grave in Germany, France, Austria, etc. On the contrary, that war benefited some branches of European industry, furnishing clothing, boots, provisions and war supplies to the fighting armies. But a war in the heart of Europe—well, look at the effects of the short and small Balkan war!

THE CONQUEROR

BY LOUISE W. KNEELAND

In those dread hours
When Pain assails the soul
With gibes and taunts
In bitter mockery
Of life, saying:
"Thy bones shall be full of aching
And I will fill thy heart with tears.
Thy flesh shall be the seat
Of impotent desires,
And thou shalt cry in agony
On the rack of my making.
I will tear thy soul asunder
And thou shalt descend with me
To the very depths of hell."
Then, then do I think of thee
And from my heart there leaps
The exultant cry:
"All this, and more, is in thy power,
Oh Pain, thou terrible and mighty,
But yet thou canst not quite undo me,
For oh, for oh, I have looked
Into the face of Love!"

In that drear time
When Death steals through the dark
With whispering hideous,
Saying:
"I breathe on the cities of men
And they vanish.
The flowers of the field bloom
But to bow to me.
Thou shalt take Life into thine arms
And taste of the lips of Death.
I will make of thy desire a dream
And of hope a memory.
Thou shalt eat of the fruit
And thy mouth shall be filled with ashes."
Then, then do I think of thee,
And from my heart there leaps
The exultant cry:
"All this, and more, is in thy power,
Oh Death, thou terrible and mighty,
But yet thou canst not quite undo me,
For oh, for oh, I have looked
Into the face of Love!"

SOCIALISM AND ANARCHISM

BY ANTON PANNEKOEK

(Translated by Richard Perin)

1. THE SOCIAL IDEAL

When we read the books of the official professors of social science on the subject of Socialism and Anarchism, we are astonished to find how little the sociologists, even those friendly to us, understand of the great scientific revolution which Engels called the Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science, a revolution now more than half a century old.

Scientific Socialism, as established by Marx and Engels, combined into a harmonious unity two things which from the bourgeois point of view appeared to be irreconcilable opposites: on the one hand dispassionate objectivity, science indifferent to ideals, and on the other hand the passionately sought subjective ideal of a better society. Those who do not take the point of view of scientific Socialism believe that an ideal, that is to say, something which we desire, can never be a subject matter of science, and that, conversely, passionate desire must be a hindrance to objective truth. To the alleged objective science of society they give the name of sociology; and the sterility, the lack of results which is everywhere in evidence in the countless books of these "sociologists," furnishes the best refutation of their contention that social truth is born of dry book-learning, rather than of participation in the social struggles. A social ideal, on the contrary, they know only as Utopianism—as the conception and propoganda of a better or best social system—which has nothing to do with the science of society, even though its advocates maintain that they are able to prove "scientifically" the excellence of their new system.

Scientific Socialism has overcome this contradiction through the discovery of the economic basis of social evolution. It has taught us that with the continuous improvement in the technical methods of labor and the social organs and organizations necessary to their operation, the entire social order undergoes an uninterrupted transformation, including the opinions and ideals of mankind. Man must continually adapt his ideas and opinions of possible and desirable institutions and organizations, to the progress of the productive forces; in other words, he follows ever new social ideals. Therefore, such a social ideal does not signify the construction of a faultless social system, but it is a mental picture of a subsequent, more highly developed social system, in which the disadvantages of the preceding system have been overcome, and which is adapted to that development of the forces of production which has just been attained. Since everything which man does must first exist in his mind as purpose and will, therefore every

new social order, before it becomes a reality, must first exist as a more or less adequate, conscious ideal.

Thus in the youth of capitalism, when the new inventions of the steam engine by James Watt and the spinning machine by Arkwright opened up boundless possibilities to industrial development, the natural social ideal was: unconfined freedom of private production and of competition, the sweeping away of all feudal and guild obstacles. So now, when capitalistic appropriation stands in the way of the full employment and development of the forces of production, when the gigantic establishments and trusts have shown the possibility of a well-devised organization of labor, the natural social ideal is: the socialization of the means of production. And this social ideal forms the chief demand in the programs of the Socialist parties of all countries.

Consequently, if we Socialists are asked: "What order of society do you recommend as the best?" we answer: "None at all." We do not extol any system of society as the most perfect or the only good one, in comparison with which all others are objectionable. Various social orders are necessary, hence advantageous, according to the height of technical and economic development; upon a certain plane of development, an order, which previously was necessary, becomes injurious and unbearable, as is now the case with capitalism. Hence all our struggling and striving is now directed toward the next step, and toward the removal of the obstacles which stand in the way of the acquisition by society of the means of production. These obstacles are mainly two: the political supremacy of the capitalists and the defective organization and discipline of the working class; therefore, our most immediate aims are the organization and training of the workers and, by means of these, the conquest of political power.

Consequently, we are by no means of the opinion that after this victory and with the commencement of the nationalization of the great industries, the ideal of the best of all worlds will have been attained. On the contrary, it is our conviction that this new condition—like its predecessor, capitalism—is only a link in a continuous chain of development. Our program naturally contains nothing in regard to the further phases; our practical task is merely the realization of our present social ideal, that is, the displacement of capitalism by the social order which naturally follows it. We must leave it to the members of the society of the future to raise the banner of new social ideals to correspond to the new needs that will arise.

This does not mean that the subsequent forms of development do not interest us and that we therefore need not concern ourselves about them. It simply means that it would be absurd for us to put our views in regard to future orders of society into the form of demands the realization of which should determine our practical line of action. On the contrary, since it tends to clarify

our views and opinions, it may be of value in our present struggle to attempt to forecast the various future phases of social development by means of our historic-materialistic method.

2. THE FUTURE STATE.

The substitution of Socialism for capitalism will not be a single, world-convulsing act, but a process of gradual change, however rapid as compared with the present time.¹ The nationalization of the great industries and trusts will effect no fundamental change in capitalism, for certain industries are even now nationalized; the fundamental change will lie only in the fact that the power of the state will be at the disposal of the working class. The great contrast between the new proletarian supremacy and the former capitalist supremacy will manifest itself immediately, not in a deliberate revolution of the mode of production, but in vast cultural measures—promotion of education, care of the public health, aid for poverty and suffering—by which the new society must make up for the neglects of capitalism. Although we are unable to say to what extent private production will at once be replaced by social production—certainly not completely—yet it is certain that the vigorously executed measures for the promotion of the welfare of great masses of the people will form the basis of the new economic development. Kautsky has already shown how the simplest, most necessary and, to every worker, immediately urgent measure for the checking of poverty, namely, bounteous provision by the state for the unemployed, strikes at the very roots of capitalism; it will be one of the most effective levers for putting a speedy end to private production undertaken for the sake of profit.

When private production is then, for the greater part, replaced by social production, there will nevertheless be little change apparent in the method of production, except that in place of many producers and employers there will be but one; hence the expressions and forms originating in the production of commodities will continue to exist. To the products there will be attributed a certain *value* for which they are sold; the participants in production will be paid a *wage* for the labor-power they have expended in the service of society—to be sure, the value of labor-power will be rated far higher than now—and perhaps this wage will be calculated to vary according to performance and supposed service. The division of that portion of the social products intended for individual consumption will, at this stage of development, be effected by their purchase from society by means of the wage which society pays to its members for their labor. Hence private property will still play an important role; disparities in this form of property

¹This theory of transformation has been set forth at length by Karl Kautsky in the second part of "The Social Revolution."

will exist; money will be used for the payment of wages, and for buying and selling among the still existent private producers. However completely the abolition of poverty may change the aspect of society, production will at first be but little altered in its superficial aspect by the overthrow of capitalism. Nevertheless this aspect will be deceptive. Even in production the basic difference will be enormous; it will no longer be a means for the creation of surplus value, and it will no longer be left to the hazards of private undertakings, but it will be directed toward the satisfaction of needs as its immediate aim, and hence will be controlled with conscious foresight.

This stage of social development cannot endure; it will gradually undermine itself. Internal contradictions will even in the future be levers of social evolution; to be sure, they cannot, as under capitalism, manifest themselves in a class struggle, for the classes will have vanished; the contradictions will become perceptible in the form of inadequacies, and will furnish the inducement for their removal by means of conscious modification of the foundations of society. Here the contradiction consists in this, that value is a quality of products which originates in private production, and hence vanishes when private production ceases to exist. In a society of commodity-producers value expresses the social character of their private labors; it is in their common quality as values that the products of these private labors announce themselves to be qualitatively similar to each other and to incorporate within themselves social, abstract labor. That the private persons are participants in a social labor-process, becomes apparent only in the quality of value that is common to their products; hence in the inverted form of a quality of things. In the act of exchange the producers and the products meet; there the social character of their private labors comes to light; there value is formed, or more correctly, there it passes from an abstract, conceptual existence into reality. "It is only in exchange that the products of labor receive a socially equal existence as values which is distinguished from their naturally different existences as use-values" (Marx, "Capital," I).

When the social character of labor is immediately apparent to everyone, it need not be embodied in the fanciful form of an objective quality of the product. With the disappearance of private labors, which formerly constituted value through their equalization in exchange, value itself will vanish. It may for a time lead a traditional existence: the impossibility of determining it practically when it has lost its real existence will put an end to the order of society in which it played the chief rôle in the distribution of the means of consumption. When a generation shall have passed after the first abolition of capitalist poverty and new generations have been born which only know it from hearsay, men will gradually cease to comprehend the capitalistic idea of paying wages for

work done. With the universalizing of that scientific and technical education which under capitalism is the monopoly of privileged classes and is used by them to extort higher payment for their labor power, the differences in wages will disappear. With the memory of capitalistic inequality will also disappear the feeling that a man who accomplishes more than another should receive more. Moreover, how would the measure of performance be determined, except in entirely similar labors? Therefore some other rule for the distribution of articles of consumption will have to be sought for.

Possibly, for lack of something better, recourse will be had to the idea that everybody is entitled to the same amount. However, the development of the productive forces will soon lead to another standard. One of the first and most obvious consequences of the abolition of capitalism will be a tremendous development, to an extent now hardly conceivable, of natural science and its technical applications. The universality of scientific education will augment the now small group of natural scientists and inventors by countless numbers of powerful, creative minds. Nowadays this group works only for the profit of the capitalists and to satisfy the thirst for knowledge of a small guild of scholars; in addition, it is demoralized by avarice and place-hunting, as well as hampered by worry and disappointment. Under Socialism the natural scientists and inventors will be sustained by the ennobling consciousness that all their researches and discoveries will redound to the immediate benefit of the community. Then the knowledge of the forces of nature and their technical application will receive an impetus never possible before; the productivity of labor will increase enormously, and the drudgery of the individual will be considerably lightened. The means of life will thus be produced in such abundance that it will no longer be necessary to use painful exactness in apportioning to each his rightful share. Where unlimited abundance reigns, each can take as much as he needs without arousing the jealousy of others. On the other hand, the knowledge that there is always enough will restrain each one from taking more than he actually needs, whether to hoard it or to waste it, both of which would be equally without purpose. The only measure at this stage of social development for the division of the means of consumption will, therefore, be the necessity of the individual. It is obvious that under these circumstances, where each takes what he needs from the social store, the idea of private property, even in means of consumption, will gradually disappear.

This immense increase in the productivity of labor, as a result of the advance in science and education, can commence only when the Socialist order shall have prevailed for some time; for the increase itself will be a consequence of the cultural measures of the new society. Therefore, in the beginning the superiority of Socialist production over capitalist production will have to be

based upon entirely different factors. All these factors will be directed toward an effective economical and carefully planned system of production and the avoidance of all useless waste of material and labor-power, in one word, *organization*. We often conceive the aim of our present struggle to be the organization of scattered, wasteful and anarchic production, and this is to be accomplished by the state as soon as we shall have seized it. The proletariat, then, needs the power of the state to force its will upon the classes it has conquered, to advance education, culture and instruction by vast measures, and in addition to organize the process of social production. Old political institutions will be remoulded into new organs, which will play a part in the management of production; hence they will receive an entirely new significance, while the old forms and names will remain unaltered. Thus the political structure will also be altered but little in its superficial aspect, but greatly in reality. The nature of the State will undergo such a basic transformation that Engels could say with justice: The state will die. Instead of an institution for the oppression of one class by the other it becomes a corporate body with purely economic functions. In accordance with this combination of political form and economic substance, the working regulations will have the form and force of laws.

(To be concluded.)

THE MAN OF THE IRON JAW

BY J. WILLIAM LLOYD.

Roosevelt the Candidate was the cynosure of all eyes. Roosevelt the Beaten is still not forgotten. This is a man who cannot be forgotten nor ignored.

Let us be just. The Man of the Iron Jaw is a wonderful personality. He has that peculiarly dynamic quality which all possess who do not attempt to be consistent, but who, like animals and thunder-clouds, express freely the stress of the moment.

Life is paradoxical, and the Man of the Iron Jaw is like life. Life, today, is in the mood of the Social Conscience, and Roosevelt, the Nietzschean, bidding in supreme egotism for the niche of the Superman, suddenly finds himself caught and twisted by the invisible Composite Will to serve its ends. Do you not see? Roosevelt the egoist has to work altruist; Roosevelt the Anti-Socialist has to be the step-ladder whereby Socialism may mount and enter the second story windows of a bourgeoisie too contented to look out and see it in the street.

Roosevelt is no coward. It was a brave man who could stand up after receiving an assassin's bullet and address an audience. Ay, a brave but a boastful one. For it was a fool act, the act of a neurotic egotist, hungry for

the plaudits of the crowd, welcoming a wound as a dramatic opening for a picturesque impression and using it even at the risk of life. Yet what is life but being noticed and a warfare to win?

Yet life should be picturesque. As a race, as a people, as an age we are stupidly, criminally unpicturesque. The Man of the Iron Jaw has the good taste to make himself picturesque and a grateful country gives him his reward.

Roosevelt says he will go on. Of course. When he stops exhibiting himself and stops fighting he will be dead. He is a dynamo of neurotic egotism, energy, persistence and combativeness. That makes him the Man of the Iron Jaw.

The Man of the Iron Jaw is no charlatan. He is sincere. He is a Cromwell. It is his ethics you do not understand—a very simple one. Just this: Roosevelt is right. Whatever helps Roosevelt is right. Whatever opposes Roosevelt is wrong. Whatever, whoever, contradicts Roosevelt is a lie and a liar.

That's all.

A procession of dead Roosevelts stalks past the hell-hounds of Hades, but the Man of the Iron Jaw says, "Look at Me now!" and we look at him now. Nothing more is necessary.

Roosevelt never looks backward. He is untrammelled by the past. To kill this lion and have himself photographed with his foot on its neck is the one supreme concern of the moment. Therefore, no force is wasted and all has the concentration and impact of an express bullet.

And this man has the instinct of the opportune; he was born with the politician's finger for the public pulse.

But the Iron Jaw is a tool. We are all tools, and a Great Hand presses. Egotism and humility alike cut; crime and comradeship cut. We make or mar and wonder at each other and at ourselves, but Kismet cuts on. There is a change coming over the world, and this Iron Jaw must, willy nilly, bite and chew for it.

The red oriflamme floats over an ever-increasing phalanx of those who march in uniform step with eyes fixed on the high ideal of Socialism, but the Man of the Iron Jaw is breaking in an Awkward Squad of those willing enough and patriotic enough, but who do not yet know what the enemy looks like or what their pieces are loaded with.

Some day they will march with us.

Thanks to the Iron Jaw.

