

April 5, 1913

Five Cents

The
New Review

A-WEEKLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

The Deluge Log-Rolling Reform *H. S.*

France and the Increase of Armaments *Paul Louis*

The Garment Workers' Strike *Isaac A. Hourwich*

The Pragmatism of Marx and Engels . . . *Wm. English Walling*

Concerning Historical Materialism

II. Idealistic Philosophies of History . . . *Paul Lafargue*

The Wind and the Sea *Louise W. Kneeland*

The Teachers' League *Benjamin Glassberg*

150 Nassau Street

New York

The **New Review**

Published Every Week at

150 Nassau Street, New York City

by the

New Review Publishing Association

Alexander Fraser, *President*
Bertha W. Howe, *Treasurer*
Robert M. Lackey, *Secretary*

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

One Year, . . . \$2.00 Six Months, . . . \$1.00
Foreign Countries, \$2.50 per year
Single Copies, 5 cents

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

AN INTRODUCTION

Copies of this issue of the NEW REVIEW are being sent to a number of people whose names were given us by our friends, who wanted their friends to know about this publication.

We feel sure that our new readers will like the NEW REVIEW and hope that they will avail themselves of the opportunity to read the notable articles appearing in every issue by subscribing in time to receive the next number.

New Review 150 Nassau Street
NEW YORK CITY

Some of the articles to appear in future issues of THE NEW REVIEW

FACTORY REFORMS

By Abram I. Elkus.

THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN

By W. E. Hardenburg

PERSECUTION OF THE POLES IN PRUSSIA

By J. Karski (Berlin).

STATE SOCIALISM AND THE INDIVIDUAL

By William English Walling.

SIDELIGHTS ON THE CENSUS OF 1910

By Benjamin Glassberg.

THE GRAND JURY SYSTEM

By Frederick Haller.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

By J. Salwyn Schapiro.

The **New Review**

Copyrighted, 1913 by New Review Publishing Association. Reprint permitted with credit

Vol. I.

APRIL 5, 1913

No. 14

THE DELUGE

The devastation wrought by the floods is the work of capitalism. The thousands of lives lost, the diseases that have been engendered—smallpox, diphtheria and measles, the destruction of property and the consequent impoverishment of many thousands, the nameless terrors that overwhelmed whole populations. all this is the work of capitalism. This apparently natural calamity is just as much the work of society as are its Triangle factory fires, its mine explosions, its endless procession of workers maimed and killed, its millionaires and multi-millionaires. Even that arch-capitalist organ, the *New York Times*, has finally been forced to a recognition of this fact, as may be seen from the following:

The danger from floods is yearly increasing, not decreasing. The public of the United States has been instructed upon this point by men qualified to tell it that as the forests are hewed down their retaining "sponges" of roots and humus are destroyed; the Spring thaws, hastened by heavy rains, find no counterpoise against the downrush of waters through the great drainage areas. The bridges, levees, and dams that, until a few years ago, would have amply withstood the worst conditions of freshet and flood, have lost their "factors of safety." The present floods are sweeping territory never hitherto inundated. Where thousands of dollars might have been utilized two decades ago to conserve the forests, millions must now be spent to build higher dikes and great systems of retaining reservoirs. The remonstrances of nature rise above exhortation; they teach concretely, relentlessly, the wisdom of foresight and conservation.

It is in the interests of Private Capitalism that the forests, nature's protective agency against floods, were destroyed. But can the Capitalist State repair the havoc wrought by individual

capitalists? We doubt it, not only because it will take centuries to repair the destruction of decades, but chiefly and above all because the Capitalist State never will and never can obtain the necessary means for this work of rehabilitation. The army and the navy, which are inseparable from capitalism, absorb the major part of the revenues of the national government. The remainder is largely expended extravagantly and uselessly, to feed the parasites that are so essential for the maintenance of capitalist power. The large funds that are so imperatively needed for the work of conservation and restoration can be raised only through the imposition of direct and heavy taxes on income, and these all capitalists, progressive as well as reactionary, are bound to resist as a unit. Only a Socialist society, utilizing and directing the labor of all its adults for the common good, can undertake and accomplish the work of restoring the natural equilibrium so rudely shaken by capitalism.

Log-Rolling Reform

The special session of Congress, to begin within a few days, will deal first of all with tariff revision and the income tax, and all reports from Washington unite in describing the situation as chaotic. The President considers himself bound by his party's platform to revision downward. So do the representatives of his party in the House and Senate—as a general, purely abstract proposition. But when it comes to a particular application of the general principle—ay, there's the rub. Then the conflict of special interests begins and chaos reigns supreme. Each industry and each section of the country insists upon its own special needs. Louisiana dearly loves the tariff on sugar, as do also the states producing sugar-beets. Is the duty on cloth to be reduced? Then the manufacturers of cloth and clothing demand, in the sacred name of justice, the abolition of the duty on raw wool. But the representatives of the wool-raising states can't see it that way. Missouri wants a duty on wool, zinc and lead; Texas, on mohair, onions and cattle; California and Florida on citrus fruits. On the other hand, Representative Francis Burton Harrison, who comes from a district in New York largely inhabited by Greek and Italian fruit dealers, thinks that a duty

on lemons is "ethically unjustifiable and tactically suicidal." The bill that will finally emerge from the Committee on Ways and Means will, as usually, be the product of assiduous log-rolling.

The fate of tariff revision hinges largely, if not chiefly, upon the kind of income tax that is to be levied. Originally it was the intention of the Democratic leaders in Congress to raise a straight one per cent. tax on all incomes of five thousand dollars and over. Later, however, they discovered that they could not raise in that way the necessary \$110,000,000 that would be lost to the government through tariff revision. Hence they are now discussing a graduated or progressive tax on all incomes of over \$3,500 or \$4,000, beginning with one per cent. and rising, for the higher incomes, to two and more per cent. The *New York Times* is shocked at the indecency of the proposal. Why drop the revenue of \$50,000,000 from the duty on sugar? asks this redoubtable organ of free trade; why not impose a tax on incomes of \$225 a year as in Prussia, or on those of \$800 a year, as in Great Britain? why not reduce expenditures, particularly those on river and harbor improvements, public buildings, and pensions? To which questions the Democratic leaders can only reply by asking whether they are expected to drive away all their followers—the army vote, the politicians, the working people, and those portions of the middle class that verge on the proletariat.

The tariff and income tax wrangle typifies the incessant conflict of interests within capitalist society as well as the inability of that society to take any radical or decided step in the direction of reform, not even of such reform as is necessary to its own continued existence. It is one thing to discuss, to propose, to promise, but it is another thing to carry out your promises in spite of the opposition of the classes upon whose continued favor depends the existence of your party.

H. S.

France and the Increase of Armaments

By PAUL LOUIS (Paris).

Europe at this moment is passing through the most painful, the most formidable armament crisis that she has yet known. Just after the war of 1870-71, when the race in military expenditures began, \$100,000,000 budgets for army purposes seemed colossal to the great nations. Step by step the military budgets rose, but the increase, however rapid it may have been, was infinitely less disconcerting than what we see to-day. Then the governments reckoned with the financial resources at their disposal, and they stood in awe of parliamentary resistance, such as Bismarck encountered on several occasions. Now they have become reckless, while the parliaments tamely register their will.

Here we are forty-two years removed from the last great war that Europe has undergone. Humanity is priding itself on having a superior civilization; it is proclaiming its contempt, its hatred for massacre and bloody deeds of violence. Nevertheless the earth is sprouting guns, sabres and cannon. Diplomats hold their peace conferences, and never has peace seemed more unstable, more in danger. Capitalism predominant is unchaining imperialism, and imperialism wills that millions of men should take up their arms to serve eventually the interests, the appetites, of financial oligarchies.

Never were the armed forces so enormous; never have military and naval budgets risen to such monstrous totals. It is as though the armies were still too weak, as though their demands were still too moderate. Germany is announcing the need of 120,000 more troops to raise her contingent to 850,000; and France is re-establishing universal service of three years in order to increase her force of 575,000 to 775,000 men. Notice also that this refers to armies on a peace footing; on a war footing they would demand not hundreds of thousands, but millions of citizens.

We must cite detailed figures here. They show to what scandalous aberrations the governments of Europe are treating themselves before plunging into madness still more outrageous. We are now at one of the stages on this rocky road. Let us go back to gain some idea of the ground we have already traversed.

Of all countries, Germany has been the one to devote to armament the heaviest appropriations and to possess in consequence the most powerful forces. Her army and navy budget, \$193,000,000 in 1898, rose to \$327,000,000 in 1912. She determined not only to extract from her increasing population (52 millions in 1898 and 65 millions in 1912) a growing number of soldiers, but also to make her naval squadrons rival those of England. "Our future is on the sea," said William one day. Then he was dreaming of conquering the empire of the ocean, but he seems since to have given up that ambition. In 1898 the German army numbered 581,000 men, to-day it has 730,000; the German navy registered 325,000 tons, now it has reached 893,000 tons. In time of peace there are eleven soldiers from every thousand Germans, and each German pays five dollars annually to militarism.

France, in 1898, devoted \$190,000,000 to her military budgets; in 1912, \$383,000,000. Her army effective has remained about the same meanwhile, but the two-year service has been substituted for the three-year term, and to fill up the gap, she has appealed for re-enlistments, to be rewarded by bounties and increased pay. Her navy has increased from 701,050 to 727,000 tons, but the earlier figure included many worthless boats which have since been abandoned. In time of peace, fifteen out of every thousand Frenchmen are soldiers, and each Frenchman pays seven dollars a year for armament. What distinguishes France from Germany is that her population is no longer increasing, so that she cannot scatter the burden over an increasing number of citizens.

But France and Germany are not anomalies in Europe. Army and navy budgets have grown within fifteen years from \$250,000,000 to \$350,000,000 in England, from \$80,000,000 to \$128,000,000 in Italy, from \$83,000,000 to \$128,000,000 in Austria-Hungary, from \$193,000,000 to \$326,000,000 in Russia. The English army in 1912, as in 1898, consists of 258,000 men, but the Russian has risen from 900,000 to 1,300,000, the Austro-Hungarian from 356,000 to 415,000, the Italian from 257,000 to 305,000. The English fleet has risen from 1,695,000 tons to 2,300,000, the Italian from 369,000 to 577,000 tons, the Austrian from 133,000 to 255,000, and the Russian from 470,000 to 780,000. In short, there are in Russia, eight soldiers per thousand inhabitants, and nine per thousand in Austria-Hungary and Italy.

Both budgets and armies are going to increase immeasurably in the period now opening, and the armaments announced from

every direction seem to be, if not the logical, at least the evident, effect of the Balkan crisis. It would seem as if the victory of the Bulgars, Serbs, and Greeks over the Turks had let loose an extraordinary thirst for war, and by over-exciting Slavism, had completely upset the equilibrium of Europe. For reasons which I shall not try to particularize here, Germany has taken the initiative in abruptly strengthening her troops.

Early in the month of January, the Pan-Germanic organs of the empire, which are always the first, if not the best informed in such matters, hinted that a great military project was being considered. Then the naval minister, Admiral Tirpitz, declared in the Reichstag that for the moment he would not press certain increases in the fleet, and that he accepted the program announced for the naval forces by the First Lord of the Admiralty of England. Was this proposal to be attributed to a sudden decision of the German government to reduce armaments? Not at all. Temporarily they were resigning themselves to a slower pace of naval construction, but only because the army seemed to require in their eyes new sacrifices. The land force was to be increased by 120,000 men. They would be obliged to provide for that purpose an immediate sum of \$250,000,000 and an additional annual expenditure of \$50,000,000. The immediate expenditure was to be covered by an extraordinary tax on incomes. As for the additional annual outlay, they postponed the announcement of the means to be taken to meet it.

Pan-Germanism was rampant in Germany. How was French chauvinism, which proceeds from analogous motives and is *only* too glad to find any pretext whatsoever for armament, how was it to avoid taking advantage of the occasion? Instantly the newspapers representing large capital, those which habitually exploit the idea of "patriotism," and which two years before had obtained the increase in the navy, demanded a response to the German policy. They did not stop to consider the promptings to which Germany was yielding, nor whether the German government's plans would not encounter a formidable resistance, a resistance all the more strong in that the Chancellor could not calculate the French response. They did not ask whether Germany would not have to fight on three fronts, while Italy would hesitate to mobilize against France. They began a campaign of unprecedented vehemence. They besought the government to revise the army legislation and to stop at no sacrifice for national defence. They strove to create a current of opinion against the law of 1905, which they were above all determined to destroy.

Since the defeat of 1870-71, France has had three military bills: that of 1872, which instituted obligatory personal service of five years, maintaining the "optional" alternative of one year service for young men who had passed certain examinations and paid in \$300; that of 1889, which brought back the term of service to three years with a part of the contingent (men with higher degrees, artists, supporters of families), serving only one year; and of 1905, which unified the service at two years for everybody. This reduction, which the Radical party forced through to mark its advent to power, and behind which it shielded itself with some success before the electorate, was criticised from the first by the Conservatives and by the professional soldiers. Both of these maintained that an army composed entirely of soldiers of two years' experience would lose the military spirit. Since then other defects have been discovered in the 1905 law. It netted too slight a force, since the subsidized enlistments and reenlistments furnished very small quota; and the corps made up under this regime were mere skeletons, which did not assure the education of the soldiers in campaigns nor the preparation of the officers. For a year and a half it had been clear that the partisans of the prolonged service would have their revenge, a revenge which they made haste to ensure the moment the German government gave them the pretext. This explains their eagerness not to let the opportunity slip by.

Without waiting for the German project to be submitted to the Reichstag, the French government yielded to the pressure of the chauvinists. Composed of Conservative elements, which from time immemorial have preached militarization to the extreme limit and which are affiliated with the cliques of the great industries, and of Radical elements which are bent on laying additional stress on the nationalism of the Conservatives, the government did not hesitate a minute. The German Chancellor now can exert influence on the Reichstag by pointing to the new French program. Little mattered it to M. Briand, who was directing the affairs of France. He was all the less reluctant to yield to the pressure of the ultra-patriots, since he realized his weakening grip on the Chamber and the Senate, and he hoped that this militarist manœuvre would serve to maintain him in power. Early in February the minister of war, M. Etienne, who is one of the principal agents of High Finance, and who among other things is directing the powerful company of Parisian omnibuses, requested from Parliament \$100,000,000 for re-examination of the defences and the construction of new forts; and the study

of the question of the three-year term of service was begun. There was no doubt that some difficulties would be encountered among the city workers and the rural masses, who have never gone to the regiments with enthusiasm. The governmental press was directed to enter the struggle in earnest. On the fourth of March the upper council of war got together and unanimously pronounced for the return to the three-year term. On the fifth, the government itself gave sanction to the measure, and with the unanimous approval of its members, decided not only that in future the three years' service should be the rule, but also that the soldiers actually under the flag and levied on the two-year principle should remain an extra year. For some time the ministerial council seemed divided. Suddenly its rifts disappeared. The French army, then, will number 200,000 men more, and the war budget will swell by some \$70,000,000 or \$80,000,000 annually. When it is remembered that the total budget of France already reaches \$900,000,000 and that this expense is met only by financial expedients, when one bears in mind that the propertied classes of France are more niggardly in their contributions to the public treasury than those of any other country, one is inclined to question whether it will be an easy matter to collect the necessary funds. For any extra burden on the poor classes at this moment would strangely hasten the hour of social crisis.

The Socialists from the very first proclaimed that they would relentlessly combat the new armaments. It seems that in France, as in Germany, the government wished to hurl at Socialism an open challenge, for these monstrous projects came forward only a few weeks after the impressive Congress of Basel, where International Socialism took its oath, so to speak, against war. That Germany took the initiative in the increase of armaments is a fact; but another fact is that for months previously the chauvinists had been preparing French opinion; still another is that France has to defend herself only in one direction, while Germany may be threatened from three; a fourth is that Germany will henceforth send to the barracks 1.3 per cent. of her population and France nearly 2 per cent. of hers; and finally France is spending five times more money than Germany for her foreign dependencies, and her public debt is the heaviest in the world.

The Socialist campaign against increased armaments has already begun. As early as March 2, at the same time as the Social-Democrats of Germany, the Socialists issued a manifesto in which they again denounced the madness of the government, the risks to which this madness was exposing international peace,

the close relation which exists between militarism and capitalism, between the development of armies and the exploitation of man by man. It is certain, furthermore, that no action against these armaments could attain to the maximum of efficiency unless it were concerted on both sides of the frontier. The German Chancellor is accustomed to hold up before the Social-Democrats the patriotism of the French Socialists, and the French ministers adopt in their turn similar tactics. For the past month the bourgeois press of France, which never shrinks from slight alterations of the truth, has been shouting that the German Socialists have always voted for the military expenditures and that they will do so again this time. Nothing, to be sure, is more false, but they succeed in convincing their readers of its truth. That is why the propaganda against the increase of armaments cannot be too vehement on both sides of the Vosges. Any lukewarmness, any hesitation on one side would break the powerful offensive taken by the Socialists on the other side.

If Socialism is obliged to combat to the last ditch this militarist enterprise, it is because these armaments may in spite of everything lead to a bloody conflagration in which the very existence of civilization itself would be endangered; it is because they over-excite the pride of the corps of officers, wherein lies a permanent danger to the liberty of any modern nation; it is because they increase, temporarily at least, the defensive strength of the propertied classes in every country. But in addition they aggravate the burdens of the urban and rural proletariat. They take men away from industry and agriculture; they retard the moment when the workingman can create for himself a home, earn his livelihood, fight for his emancipation. They increase the load of taxes, which in the last analysis falls upon the masses and restricts the means of life. They tend to increase the price of everything at a time when the high cost of foodstuffs and of housing has strangely complicated the existence of the proletariat. Socialism, then, would be failing in one of its fundamental duties if without bitter protest, without methodical opposition, without efficient agitation, it allowed the exigencies of the capitalist class to triumph over those of the masses of workingmen. It would be committing suicide, if by complaisant abstention it made easier the task of bourgeois nationalism. The French Socialist party has understood the need of unceasing struggle. This time again it does not expect to succeed in obliterating this militaristic fury, for if it succeeded it would from that moment become master of the public power. But by re-

sisting those governmental initiatives, which tend to increase the burden of the nation by adding a load heavier than all preceding ones, it accentuates its propaganda and its chances of early success.

Whatever may be the current of chauvinism which is passing over France, neither the artisan nor the peasant will be satisfied at seeing an increase in the tax of money and of blood. They will understand that as in the days of Louis XV, they are subject to arbitrary corvée and requisition, and that as long as the capitalist regime exists there will be for them neither liberty nor security. They will come to see that the Socialist regime only will offer them the necessary protection, that only an International Socialist regime will restore peace to mankind. The Radical party has been in power in France for fourteen years. Already, in view of the failure of its social reform program and in view of its evolution towards unmodified reaction, the urban and rural masses have been turning against it and showing an inclination towards Socialism. What limit will there be to the anger of the millions of citizens, wage-workers, artisans, owners of small farms (owners in theory only, to be sure), all of whom gave the Radical party their votes? What losses will it sustain in the elections of 1914? How much will Socialism gain?

The new armaments offer to our party in France a gigantic opportunity for expansion. It will surely know how to profit by it.

The Garment Workers' Strike

By ISAAC A. HOURWICH, Ph. D.

Chairman, Committee on Mediation, Cloak Makers' Union.

The strike of the men's garment industries is over. The tailors have gained a reduction of working hours from sixty and over to fifty-three per week, with a slight advance in wages. It will take, however, a couple of years before the increase in wages will have compensated them for the loss of earnings during the nine weeks of idleness. The union has failed to secure recognition from the large manufacturers, instead of which Mr. Benjamin, leader of the organized manufacturers, appointed a commission to settle the question of hours. The commission promised the strikers that in serious controversies it would act as

mediator between the employers and the workers, and as a pledge of good faith it chose Meyer London, the legal adviser of the strikers, to fill the vacancy opportunely created by the resignation of one of its members, Mr. Robert Fulton Cutting. There can be no doubt of the good intentions of the commission; it remains to be seen, however, what it may be able to accomplish with its vaguely defined authority. This is the only shadow of recognition which the leading manufacturers have conceded to the union. They have promised to make no discrimination against any of the strikers who will return to work, *i. e.*, their employes will be at liberty to belong to the union.

But the factories will be conducted as "open shops" and the employers will not deal with representatives of the union, or even of their own employes. Each of the workers will have to face the employer individually, except on important occasions when the commission will undertake to speak on behalf of the workers.

In the smaller shops, the strikers have been able to secure better terms. Each manufacturer or contractor individually signed an agreement with the union, giving the officers of the union access to the shop for the purpose of organizing the workers. A few of the larger manufacturers also settled individually with the union. These individual agreements contain a provision for a fifty-hour week.

It is doubtful, however, whether this provision will stand after the settlement with Mr. Benjamin's association on a fifty-three hour basis. In the first place, some of the agreements contain a sort of "most favored nation" clause, under which those manufacturers who settled with the union at an earlier stage of the strike are entitled to share in the benefits secured by their competitors who held out longer. Moreover, many of those who settled earlier are contractors for the manufacturers affiliated with Mr. Benjamin's association, and the terms of his proposal, which was accepted by the strikers, extend to the contractors as well as to the manufacturers themselves.

But the resources of the strikers had given out, and this was the best settlement they could make under the circumstances. The terms of this settlement compare very unfavorably with those which were secured by the strikers in the cloak industry in 1910. The strikers in both branches of the garment industry were of the same racial stocks: Most of them were Jewish and Italian immigrants, with a sprinkling of Russians and Poles. The duration of both strikes was the same, about nine weeks.

Until the sham settlement by President Rickert of the United Garment Workers, after the eighth week of the strike, few, if any, of the strikers had returned to any shop where the strike was on, and notwithstanding very poor picketing there were scarcely any strikebreakers to be had. The strikers gave a remarkable exhibition of firmness of purpose and perseverance in the face of want bordering on starvation. Why then was the outcome of the strike in the men's garment industry so different from the outcome of the cloakmakers' strike?

There is, in the first place, the purely objective fact that the men's garment industry is more concentrated than the cloak industry. Men's garments are more uniform and lend themselves far better to standardization, which is indispensable to production on a large scale, than women's garments with their greater individuality of style. As a result, there are few very rich manufacturers in the cloak industry, whereas the leading manufacturers of men's garments are millionaires, who can afford to lose a season, if necessary, in order to reduce their employes to the status of mere "hands." Still, it will be remembered that the woolen mills of Lawrence are controlled by multi-millionaires, popularly known as the "woolen trust," and yet they were forced to yield to the unskilled strikers who could presumably have been replaced by strike-breakers. Concentration of capital alone would therefore seem to be insufficient to account for the failure of the strikers in the men's garment industry to gain the principal demand for which they held out to the last—recognition of the union.

The reason why the strikers were unable to break the feudal attitude of the lords of the clothing industry must be sought in the poor organization of the strike. Ostensibly the strike was conducted under the flag of the United Garment Workers. In reality, however, hardly ten per cent. of the strikers had been affiliated with that organization previous to the strike. The tens of thousands of workers who obeyed the call to strike and stayed out to the last were unorganized. It was the obvious duty of those who assumed the leadership of the strike to organize the unorganized masses of the strikers. That was not done. Various strike committees were created from time to time, but they had a purely nominal existence; they were seldom, if ever, consulted on any subject, and the management of the strike was assumed by President Rickert, who was especially imported from Chicago, and a few national officers.

It is not my purpose to discuss the advantages of centraliza-

tion in war time, although there are good military authorities who emphasize the importance of individual initiative in modern warfare. However it may be, it is plain that the most successful strike is bound to turn into failure without an organization of the workers ready to preserve the fruits of victory. For this reason alone, if for no other, the leaders ought to have kept in close touch with the masses of the strikers. But President Rickert surrounded himself with an air of mystery befitting the Mikado, forgetting that nine-tenths of the strikers owed him no allegiance, not being even nominally affiliated with his organization. The following incident is characteristic of the attitude maintained by Mr. Rickert and his aides:

About the middle of February, Mr. Rickert made a settlement with one of the largest manufacturers upon terms unsatisfactory to one of the local unions involved, and ordered the strikers back to work without so much as submitting the terms of the proposed settlement for their approval. The officers of the union, dissatisfied with Mr. Rickert's action, called a conference of representatives of various labor organizations not involved in the strike and of other "prominent citizens" (of whom the writer was one), to devise some plan how to approach President Rickert and gain an audience with him. The conference elected a committee of benevolent strangers to wait upon President Rickert and to use their good offices in order to induce him to give some form of recognition to the officers of the unions affiliated with his national organization. It was a regular case of "mediation" between a "boss" and the officers of the union.

So grotesque did the situation appear to me, that I rose to inquire of the chairman of the conference whether Mr. Rickert was an autocrat ruling by divine right, or a mere elected officer subject to recall or impeachment for cause. But the prevailing sentiment was in favor of "harmony" at any cost, for fear lest an open revolt against the national officers might hurt the strike. Subsequent events proved that the revolt could not be avoided, but was only postponed; and the damage to the cause of the strikers would have been far less had Mr. Rickert been told to go before he had the opportunity to make the settlement with Mr. Benjamin.

The trouble with Mr. Rickert was that he did not understand the people whom he undertook to lead. The native American trade-unionist is mostly a highly-paid skilled mechanic with middle class habits of life, unwilling to forego his customary comforts for any length of time. He shuns a protracted strike,

and is ever ready for a compromise. The Jewish, the Italian, and the Slav immigrant, on the other hand, has been hardened in the school of privation at home, and can starve, if need be, in order to win a strike. You have here a practical demonstration of the difference between the Epicurean and the Stoic view of life. Mr. Rickert, judging the fighting qualities of the foreign strikers by his experience with native American trade-unionists, honestly believed, I take it, that he was serving the best interests of the strikers by a policy of humility. Had he, at least, had the good sense to do as the leaders of the Lawrence strike did, *viz.*, to submit every proposed settlement for the ratification of the strikers, or at least, in urgent cases, of an elected strike committee, it is very likely that after a thorough discussion his arguments might have carried. But his dictatorial manner aroused resentment and distrust among the strikers.

In American trade unions the dictatorship of the president is accepted as a matter of course. In fact, boss rule is universal in all American institutions, be it a political party, a reform convention, a fraternal order, a professional association, or a scientific society. But those "ignorant foreigners who do not understand the spirit of American institutions" have a naive conception of democracy as a government by the people. They regard an elected officer as a mere delegate accountable to his constituency, and they want to have a final say in all matters affecting their vital interests. They can be led, no doubt, but they would not be driven.

Still Mr. Rickert can be excused for misunderstanding foreign strikers. This excuse, however, will not avail the *Jewish Daily Forward*, which assumed the leadership of the Jewish strikers and supported Mr. Rickert through thick and thin, until the strikers rebelled against his settlement and incidentally smashed the windows of the *Forward* building with stones.

That the reader may understand this outbreak of the strikers against "their own" paper, it should be noted that at the inception of the strike, Mr. Rickert appointed the president of the *Forward* Association organizer for the United Garment Workers. This appointment gave the *Forward* the leadership of the strike, and incidentally advanced its circulation. These relations between the *Forward* and Mr. Rickert closed its columns to any criticism of his conduct.

On February 28, Mr. Rickert accepted the terms of settlement offered to the strikers by Mr. Benjamin. The latter would not deal directly with Mr. Rickert, but addressed himself to

Mr. Marcus M. Marks, and appointed him one of a commission of three to fix the hours of labor. Mr. Benjamin did not deem it necessary to accord a place on his commission to any man regarded as a representative of labor. It was said that these terms had been offered to the strikers a couple of weeks before, but had been rejected by them. The acceptance of such terms by Mr. Rickert, without a preliminary consultation with any of the local officers of the union, was clearly an act of usurpation. No attorney would settle a case without first submitting the terms of the proposed settlement to his client. But the *Forward* endorsed this usurpation of authority by Mr. Rickert and advised the strikers to return to work. Stone throwing is, certainly, no argument in a free discussion. Unfortunately, however, this "sermon in stone" was the only criticism that could find its way to the *Forward*.

It was but natural that the repudiation of Mr. Rickert's settlement by the strikers should have hurt his feelings, yet his subsequent conduct was indefensible, to put it mildly. He aroused public opinion against the strikers, representing them as rebels against duly constituted authority. Mayor Gaynor's order to Commissioner Waldo to disperse the pickets of the strikers was clearly the result of prejudice created by the utterances of Mr. Rickert.

Considered from any point of view, his letter to Commissioner Waldo showed poor logic. The Mayor said in effect that inasmuch as the strike was over, picketing and violence should no longer be tolerated. Now, it is plain, that the police, as guardians of the law, must not tolerate violence whether a strike is on or off. A malicious person might infer from the Mayor's letter that prior to Mr. Rickert's settlement the police had winked at acts of violence committed by the strikers. Likewise, if picketing is an unlawful interference with an employer's business, then it should have been suppressed during the strike as well as after the strike had been called off by Mr. Rickert. If on the other hand, peaceful picketing is perfectly lawful, it is an invasion of personal liberty to interfere with it, strike or no strike. At all events, the Mayor is not vested with the power to declare a strike off.

For reasons of expediency, the leaders of the strike refrained from giving out any public statement in reply to Mayor Gaynor's letter. But they appointed a committee (of which the writer was one) to wait on the Mayor and present to him their side of the case. As spokesman for the committee I endeavored.

in the most courteous language, to present to the Mayor the reasons why his order against picketing should be recalled. But Mr. Gaynor was hostile to the committee from the very beginning. He was seated at his desk; there were a few chairs in his room, but he did not ask us to be seated.

"My letter referred only to the bums and ruffians who commit violence," interrupted he gruffly my argument.

"We do not represent them," said I, "we represent the strikers, and we maintain that under the laws of this state, as interpreted by the Court of Appeals, peaceful picketing is permitted."

"If any one of those fellows who come with the intention to commit violence will hang around the factories, they will be arrested. The police know them all." (This from the champion of the Duffy boy who was "mugged" by the police under Mr Bingham.)

"But," I inquired, "how will the police distinguish a peaceable picket from one who comes with the intention to commit violence?"

The Mayor suggested that the strikers should issue identification cards to the pickets. That our pickets might not be harassed by the police, we were willing to submit to the Russian passport system about to be inaugurated by the Mayor of the City of New York. The object of our interview was accomplished. But the Mayor still wanted to talk:

"I tell you, the strike is over," said he.

"This is a matter of opinion," I answered, "but the men are out."

"What is the use of having leaders, if you don't want to abide by the settlement they have made?"

"Mr. Rickert had no authority to settle the strike. He exceeded his authority. . . ."

"You people don't recognize any authority over you," blurted out the Mayor. "I tell you, if you don't want to obey the law, you had better go back to the countries you came from, and the sooner the better."

I attempted to say something, but Mr. Gaynor interrupted again:

"Why don't you go to arbitration?"

"The manufacturers have refused to go to arbitration," said I in reply. "They rejected the offer of the State Board of Mediation. We did want to go to arbitration."

The Mayor took from his desk a memorandum containing the terms of Mr. Rickert's settlement and asked:

"What are your wages?"

I referred him to the secretary of the District Council of the U. G. W., who was one of the committee.

"They are varying," replied the secretary in embarrassment

Anyone familiar with the clothing industry knows that this question cannot be answered with any degree of accuracy. There is a wide division of labor within the factory. Some occupations require a high degree of skill, others can be learned in a short time. There are week workers and piece workers; in busy times the earnings of the piece workers vary according to skill; when work is scarce, the weekly earnings decline. These conditions are by no means peculiar to the clothing industry. Statisticians know it and fight shy of "average wages." But the Mayor pressed his question, and the secretary of the District Council ventured a guess:

"Some get \$12, some \$14."

"You fellows are damned tricky," burst out the Mayor in an angry mood. "Why didn't you answer my question at once? It was a simple thing. You could have said that before."

He was visibly losing control of himself, and after another insulting remark of his we left.

Fortunately, the Mayor had no opportunity to vent his spleen on the strikers. The strike was settled the next day.

To go back one week, after repudiating Mr. Rickert's settlement, the officers of the Brotherhood of Tailors immediately called a conference of representatives of labor organizations to devise ways and means for continuing the strike until a more satisfactory settlement could be reached. The conference elected a committee to confer with the commission named by Mr. Benjamin, and as the result of the negotiations the manufacturers granted a reduction of one hour a week during the current year, and two hours thereafter, and recognized Meyer London as a representative of labor. Meagre as these concessions may appear, they are an improvement upon the terms secured by Mr. Rickert. Withal, the strikers were willing to hold out for their original demand of fifty hours a week, provided they were assured that those who had returned to work in the smaller shops on a fifty-hour basis would keep them from starving. But the men in the smaller shops had themselves been out several weeks. Their resources were exhausted. Moreover, there was no adequate organization for collecting the money

which the workers who were back in the shops had pledged for the support of the strike. At a conference of the officers of the unions of the striking garment workers with representatives of other labor organizations, it was therefore unanimously agreed to recommend to the strikers the acceptance of the terms offered by the manufacturers. A committee was selected to call shop meetings of the strikers and submit the recommendations of the conference to a vote. The strikers voted in favor of the recommendations, and returned in high spirits to their machines.

The work of building up a permanent organization of the tailors must now begin. If they are to profit by the lesson of this strike, they must rid themselves of boss rule—if need be, by cutting loose from the national organization. The strike clearly demonstrated that the benefits derived by the tailors' unions of New York from their affiliation with the National Office are, at best, speculative, while the disadvantage of being dominated by a machine is very real.

The Pragmatism of Marx and Engels

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING.

[The "pragmatism" referred to in this article is discussed at length in the author's forthcoming book, "The Larger Aspects of Socialism," of which the present article constitutes a chapter. It is the pragmatism of John Dewey, in contradistinction to that of William James and Henri Bergson.]

How does it happen that the pragmatism of John Dewey, which I consider to be the modern Socialist philosophy, did not come from the Socialist movement? I do not mean to imply that we should expect all the elements of Socialist thought and all the features of a Socialist society to come from the Socialist movement, for my main contention is that Socialism is constantly assimilating new elements from all quarters, and it is just as significant if science and philosophy evolve toward Socialism as it would be if Socialism itself should produce the scientific philosophy. What I mean is that, since Marx and Engels made a decided beginning in the direction of pragmatism more than half a century ago, we might have expected that the Socialist movement would also produce the socially radical philosophy of the present day.

But we have only to apply the Socialist conception of history and society to philosophy to see that the formulations of Marx and Engels, even in the Socialist view, must necessarily have been so limited by the science and the society of their day as to make them unavailable in a twentieth century philosophy and society. The chief formulations of modern Socialism were written from 1848 to 1875, a full generation before the first appearance of present-day pragmatism. In spite of this Marx and Engels undoubtedly had a firm grasp on some of the chief elements of the new philosophy; broadly speaking they were pragmatists, but they missed some of the most basic and essential features of the new philosophy.

The radicalism that followed the French Revolution, and the republican revolutions of 1848, produced not only new social theories, but also new philosophies, some of them astonishingly free from the prejudices of the science of the day. This is true to a large degree of several of the German social philosophers, but especially of Marx and Engels. For, in their general philosophy, they were influenced even more by a revolutionary social theory (which has proved of lasting value) than by the natural science of their time or the theory of evolution just gaining possession of the world in the period in which they wrote. It is fortunate that their philosophical, like their social, conceptions were, as a matter of fact, based on studies of the history of man, and not on biological evolution.

Engels has given a far more elaborate expression to the philosophical aspects of Socialism than has Marx, and his point of view is in most striking accord in many points with that of the present-day pragmatists. He taught that if one proceeds with scientific investigation from the evolutionary standpoint, then "a stop is put, once and for all to the demand for final solutions and for eternal truths; one is firmly conscious of the necessary limitations of all acquired knowledge, of its hypothetical nature, owing to the circumstances under which it has been gained."

But while Engels is opposed to those philosophies that demand final solutions and eternal truth, he is equally opposed to those that deny the possibility of knowing such practical truths as are required for human purposes. Against the view of Hume and Kant, who "dispute the possibility of a perception of the universe, or at least of an exhaustive perception," Engels is in complete reaction:

"The most destructive refutation of this as of all other

fixed philosophic ideas is actual results, namely, experiment and industry. If we can prove the correctness of our idea of an actual occurrence by experiencing it ourselves and producing it from its constituent elements, and using it for our own purposes, into the bargain, the Kantian phrase, 'Ding an Sich' (thing in itself) ceases to have any meaning."

"Before there was argumentation," says Engels elsewhere, "there was action. And human action had solved the difficulty long before human ingenuity invented it. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. From the moment we turn to our own use these objects, according to the qualities we perceive in them, we put to an infallible test the correctness or otherwise of our sense-perceptions. If these perceptions have been wrong, then our estimate of the use to which an object can be turned must also be wrong, and our attempt must fail. But if we succeed in accomplishing our aim, if we find that the object does agree with our idea of it, and does answer the purpose we intended it for, then that is positive proof that our perceptions of it and of its qualities, *so far*, agree with reality outside ourselves. And whenever we find ourselves face to face with a failure, then we generally are not long in making out the cause that made us fail; we find that the perception upon which we acted was either incomplete and superficial, or combined with the results of other perceptions in a way not warranted by them—what we call defective reasoning."

And again, referring to Kant's celebrated unknowable "things-in-themselves," Engels says:

"But one after another these ungraspable things have been grasped, analyzed, and, what is more, *reproduced* by the giant progress of science; and what we can produce, we certainly cannot consider as unknowable."

Here we have the pragmatic and realistic view. It is, to be sure, only what the common sense of the majority of scientists says to-day, and has said for many years. But it is only recently, or in these early cases of Marx, Engels, Stirner and others, that such a standpoint has been elaborated into a philosophy. And this philosophy is as much needed and as practically valuable as the vastly important concrete labors of science.

Engels claims that the Marxian philosophy of history is in itself a philosophy of science and life. Whether this claim is entirely justified I have discussed elsewhere. However, whether the Marxian philosophy of history has reached this goal or not, it has certainly proceeded far in that direction.

In his sketch of "Feuerbach," Engels not only gives his own views, but also some notes of Marx's, written in 1845. Feuerbach's being the leading materialist philosophy at the time, the notes of Marx concerning him give in the briefest possible way Marx's general philosophical position, which is very similar to that of Engels:

"The chief lack of all materialistic philosophy up to the present, including that of Feuerbach, is that the thing, the reality, sensation, is only conceived of under the form of the object or perception, but not as human sense-activity, practice. . . . Feuerbach is willing, it is true, to distinguish objects of sensation from objects existing in thought, but he conceives of human activity itself not as objective activity. He, therefore, in the 'Wesen des Christenthums,' regards only theoretical activity as generally human, while practice is conceived and fixed only in its disgusting form."

Engels expresses himself at greater length in the same volume:

"As regards all philosophers, their system is doomed to perish and for this reason, because it emanates from an imperishable desire of the human soul, the desire to abolish all contradictions. But if all contradictions are once and for all disposed of, we have arrived at the so-called absolute truth, history is at an end, and yet it will continue to go on, although there is nothing further left for it to do—thus a newer and more insoluble contradiction. So soon as we have once perceived—and to this perception no one has helped us more than Hegel himself—that the task thus imposed upon philosophy signifies that a single philosopher is to accomplish *what it is only possible for the entire human race to accomplish, in the course of its progressive development*—as soon as we understand that, it is all over with philosophy in the present sense of the word. *In this way one discards the absolute truth, unattainable for the individual, and follows instead the relative truths* attainable by way of the positive sciences." (My italics.)

Here the words italicized again show an exact parallel to Dewey—that all philosophy must ceaselessly evolve, just as science does.

Discussing Feuerbach as a typical materialist, Marx says:

"Feuerbach does not see that religious feeling is itself a product of society, and that the abstract individual whom he analyzes belongs in reality to a certain form of society.

"The life of society is essentially practical. All the mysteries which seduce speculative thought into mysticism find their rational solution in human practice and in the comprehension of this practice.

"The highest point to which perceptive materialism attains, that is, the materialism which comprehends sensation not as a practical activity, is the perception of the isolated individuals in 'civil society.'

"The standpoint of the old materialism is 'civil' society; the standpoint of the new is human society, or associated humanity."

Similarly, Engels sketches the history of philosophy as being explicable only on an economic basis:

"Parallel with the rise of the middle-class went on the great revival of science; astronomy, mechanics, physics, anatomy, physiology, were again cultivated. And the bourgeoisie, for the development of its industrial production, required a science which ascertained the physical properties of natural objects and the modes of action of the forces of Nature. Now up to then science had but been the humble handmaid of the Church, had not been allowed to overstep the limits set by faith, and for that reason had been no science at all. Science rebelled against the Church; the bourgeoisie could not do without science, and, therefore, had to join in the rebellion."

So much for the eighteenth century. Coming now to the nineteenth, Engels writes:

"The materialism of the preceding century was overwhelmingly mechanical, because at that time, of all the natural sciences, mechanics, and indeed, only the mechanics of the celestial and terrestrial fixed bodies, the mechanics of gravity in short, had reached any definite conclusions. Chemistry existed at first only in a childish, phlogistic form. Biology still lay in swaddling clothes; the organism of plants and animals was examined only in a very cursory manner, and was explained upon purely mechanical grounds; just as an animal was to Descartes nothing but a machine, so was man to the materialists of the eighteenth century. The exclusive application of the measure of mechanics to processes which are of technical and organic nature and by which, it is true, the laws of mechanics are also manifested, *but are pushed into the background by other higher laws*, this application is the cause of the peculiar, but, considering the times, unavoidable, narrowmindedness of French materialism.

"The second special limitation of this materialism lies in its incapacity to represent the universe as a process, as one form of matter assumed in the course of evolutionary development."

The advent of biology to the center of the stage, and the theory of evolution, are the new scientific developments on which Engels laid emphasis. To-day, on the contrary, anthropology, psychology and sociology are the sciences which are most rapidly modifying our philosophic outlook. (*To be concluded.*)

Concerning Historical Materialism

By PAUL LAFARGUE.

(Translated by Richard Perin).

II. IDEALISTIC PHILOSOPHIES OF HISTORY.

History is such a chaos of facts, which are beyond human control, which advance and retreat without visible cause, act and counteract upon one another, appear and disappear, that we might almost believe it impossible to classify them and to group them into series the evolutionary and revolutionary causes of which could be discovered. The failure of the attempts to systematize history has created a doubt in many thoughtful men, such as Helmholtz, "whether it is possible to formulate a law of history that would be confirmed by reality." This doubt is so general that the intellectuals of to-day no longer expose themselves, like the philosophers of the first half of the nineteenth century, to the danger of constructing great and comprehensive systems of history; but it is also the echo of the economists' disbelief in the possibility of controlling the forces of production. But should the difficulty of the historical problem and the failures of those who sought to solve it, lead us to the conclusion that its solution lies entirely beyond the range of the human mind? If so, the social phenomena would form an exception and would be the only ones whose determining causes we are unable to arrange in a logical series.

Sound common sense has never admitted such an impossibility; on the contrary, men of all times have believed that all their joyful and sad experiences are part of a plan devised by some higher being. Man proposes, God disposes—this is an historical axiom of popular wisdom, and it contains as much truth as the axioms of geometry; everything depends, however, upon how we interpret the word "God."

Each of the cities of antiquity possessed a city divinity, as the Greeks called it, which watched over its fate and dwelled in the temple dedicated to it. The Jehovah of the Old Testament was a divinity of this sort; the Israelites installed him in a wooden chest, which they called the Ark of the Covenant and in which they transported him when the tribe changed its abode. When two cities declared war upon each other, the divinities took part in the battle. The Bible relates with pleasure of the exploits of Jehovah, who took the quarrels of his people so to heart that he exterminated the men, women, children and cattle of their enemies. The Romans, as superstitious as they were crafty politicians, took the divinity of the conquered city and brought its statue to the Capitol, so that it should cease to protect the people among whom it no longer dwelt.

The Christians acted upon these heathen beliefs when they destroyed temples to drive out heathen gods, and when they prayed to their God to lead them to victory over the divinities of the heathen, the demons who provoked to heresy, and Allah who opposed the Crescent to the Cross.*

The civilized Christian nations still retain the heathen tradition, for although they all pray to the same God, each begs him to destroy its enemies; they ascribe victory to him and give him thanks by singing a *Te Deum*; the President of the United States recommends public prayers. The belief in the divine interposition in human quarrels is not simulated by statesmen to satisfy the crude superstitions of the ignorant masses; no, they share it; the intimate letters which Bismarck wrote to his wife during the war of 1870-71 show that he believed that God spent his time in the affairs of Bismarck, his son, and the Prussian army.

It was upon this belief that Bossuet constructed the plan of his Universal History: The heathen peoples slaughter each other to prepare for the coming of Jesus, and the Christian nations kill each other to assure the greatness of France and the fame of Louis XIV. The historical movement, as God directed it, leads up to the *roi Soleil* (sunlike monarch). When he expired darkness covered the world, and revolution, the work of Satan, as Joseph de Maistre called it, broke out.

* The first Christians believed as firmly in the heathen gods and their miracles as in Jesus and his miracles. Tertullian in his "Apologetics" and St. Augustine in the "City of God" report as undeniable facts that Aesculapius raised the dead, whose names he actually gave, that one vestal virgin had carried water from the Tiber in a sieve, that another had towed a ship with her girdle, etc.

Satan triumphed over God, the city divinity of the Bourbons and the aristocracy. The bourgeoisie, the class that took little account of God, possessed itself of power and guillotined the King by the grace of God; the natural sciences accused by him triumphed, and produced for the bourgeoisie more wealth than the King and the nobles had been able to give their favorites. Reason, which he had muzzled, dragged him before its judgment seat. Satan's rule began. Romantic poets sang of him; he was the great martyr, the comforter of the oppressed; he symbolized the bourgeoisie in its revolt from the aristocracy and its God. But the victors dared not make him their city divinity; they patched up the old God, damaged by reason, and restored him to his dignity. Since, however, they had lost faith in his omnipotence, they surrounded him with a staff of semi-divinities: Progress, Justice, Civilization, Humanity, Liberty, Patriotism, etc., the office of which was to watch over the fate of the nations that have been freed of the rule of the aristocracy. These new gods are Ideas, powerful conceptions, imponderable forces; Hegel sought to trace back this polytheism of ideas to the monotheism of the Idea, which, like the God of the Christians, is a copy of the *Nous* (mind, thought) of Anaxagoras and created the world and history for its diversion.

Bossuet and the deists, who conferred upon God the dignity of a conscious agent of history, after all only adapted the role of the divinity to public opinion, while the free thinkers, who substituted for him forceful Ideas, utilized historically the current opinion of the bourgeoisie. Every member of the bourgeoisie pretends that his private and public acts are dictated by Progress, Justice, Humanity, Patriotism, etc. To be convinced of this, one has only to read the advertisements of the manufacturers and merchants, the prospectuses of financiers, the speeches of politicians.

The ideas of progress and evolution are of modern origin; they are a transcription of the idea of human perfectibility in history, which was fashionable in the eighteenth century. The bourgeoisie of necessity regarded its conquest of power as a social advance, while the aristocracy saw in it retrogression. Since the French Revolution took place more than a century later than the English, under matured conditions, it placed the bourgeoisie so abruptly and so completely in the position formerly occupied by the aristocracy that ever since the idea of progress has become firmly implanted in the public opinion of the nations ruled by the bourgeoisie. The European bourgeois consider

themselves the authorized representatives of progress. Their habits and customs, private and public morals, family and social organization, industry and commerce were declared by them to be in advance of everything that had gone before. The past was merely ignorance, barbarism, injustice, stupidity; finally, and for the first time, exclaims Hegel, the Idea begins to rule the world!

But one historical fact, even when it is so full of significance as the accession to power of the bourgeoisie, does not of itself suffice for the construction of a theory of progress. Bossuet made God the only motive force in history; the historians and free thinkers among the philosophers discovered that in the past, also, Progress had not been a slothful God. During the Middle Ages he had been preparing the triumph of the bourgeois by organizing them, enriching them and giving them intellectual culture, while the offensive and defensive powers of the aristocracy were wasting away, and stone after stone in the stronghold of Catholicism was crumbling. After the idea of Progress, that of Evolution necessarily entered into the conception of history.

To the bourgeoisie, however, evolution only progressed as far as it contributed to their victory. And as the historians can trace their organic development only about a thousand years back, they lose hold of their Ariadne's thread so soon as they venture forth in the labyrinth of earlier history; they then content themselves with relating isolated facts and make no attempt at all to group them in progressive series. Since the goal of progressive evolution is to invest the bourgeoisie with power, therefore progress ceases to progress when this goal is reached. Indeed it is believed by the bourgeoisie, who regard their conquest of power as an advance unique in history, that it would signify social retrogression, a return to barbarism, were they to be displaced by the proletariat. The conquered aristocracy had exactly the same idea. The instinctive and unconscious belief in the cessation of progress held by the bourgeois masses is consciously and deliberately reflected in the works of the bourgeois philosophers. Hegel and Comte, to name only two of the most famous, declared that their philosophic systems closed the series and were the crown and end of the progressive evolution of thought. Thus political and social institutions and philosophies progress only in order to attain to their bourgeois form; having accomplished that, progress comes to a dead standstill.

The bourgeoisie and its most intelligent intellectuals indulge

themselves still further, they erect insuperable barriers against advancing progress and suppress social organisms of essential importance to the activity of progress. In order to prove that the individual form of property and the patriarchal form of the family cannot be changed, the economists and ethical philosophers declare that they have existed for all time. They make these absurd assertions in spite of the fact that researches conducted during half a century have brought to light the primitive forms of the family and of property. They are either ignorant or they affect ignorance.

During the early years of the nineteenth century, when the bourgeoisie was still intoxicated with its political victory and the remarkable development of its economic riches, the ideas of progress and evolution were in extraordinarily high favor; philosophers, historians, novelists and poets dipped their writings in the sauce of advancing progress, which Fourier alone, or almost alone, derided. But toward the middle of the century they were obliged to curb their enthusiasm; the appearance of the proletariat upon the political stage in England and France aroused in the bourgeoisie uneasiness over the eternal duration of its rule; progress lost its charm. Finally the ideas of progress and evolution would have ceased to be current in the phraseology of the intellectuals, had not the scientists adopted them. At the end of the eighteenth century they had seized upon the evolutionary idea disseminated in bourgeois circles, and now they utilized it to explain the origin of the worlds and the organization of plants and animals. They gave it such scientific validity and such popularity, that it became impossible to conjure it away.

But to establish the progressive evolution of the bourgeoisie for a certain number of centuries no more offers an explanation of this historic movement, than, by observing the curve which a stone thrown into the air describes in falling, we can learn the causes of its fall. The philosophic historians assert that the causes of this evolution are found in the ceaseless operation of forceful ideas, especially Justice, the strongest of all, which, according to an official academic philosopher, "is unchangeable and omnipresent, although its realization takes place only gradually in the human mind and in social acts." Thus bourgeois society and bourgeois thought are the last and highest expressions of justice, and in order to raise herself to this pinnacle this lady has been at work in the underground passages of history.

But let us inspect the said lady's credentials in order to inform ourselves as to her character and morals.

A ruling class declares that to be just which serves its economic and political interests, and that to be unjust which is opposed to them. Justice, as conceived by it, has been done when its class interests are served. Hence the interests of the bourgeoisie serve as the guide to justice; with unconscious irony it represents justice with a bandage over her eyes, doubtless in order to prevent her from seeing what miserable, base interests she is covering with her shield.

Hence, the feudal and guild organization was unjust, because it barred to the bourgeoisie the road to political power and hampered its economic development. It was destroyed by the immanent justice of history, for—say the moralists—she could not witness with folded arms the robberies of the feudal barons, who knew only this means of rounding off their estates and filling their money bags. Nevertheless this honorable and immanent Justice favors with mailed fist the thefts which the peaceful bourgeois cause to be perpetrated in the barbaric countries of Asia, Africa, and Oceanica, without risking their own skins or risking their own persons. Not as if this kind of theft were pleasing to the virtuous lady; by right she only approves the economic theft, which alone she invests with all legal privileges, that theft which the bourgeoisie daily commits upon the wage workers without any use of force. The economic theft is so agreeable to the temperament and character of Justice that she constitutes herself the watch-dog of capitalistic wealth, which indeed represents an accumulation of thefts that are as legal as they are just.

The bourgeoisie, which arranges everything to suit itself, attaches to its social order the ornamental designation of Civilization, and to its method of treating human beings that of Humanity. It undertakes colonial expeditions for the purpose of carrying civilization to the barbaric peoples and of improving their miserable living conditions. To be sure, its civilization and humanity manifest themselves as alcohol poisoning, compulsory labor, plundering of the natives and exterminating them. But it must not be believed that it is partial to the barbarians and that it does not pour out the benefits of its civilization and humanity upon the working classes of the nations under its rule. Its civilization and humanity must be measured by the multitude of men, women and children who, destitute of all property, are condemned to compulsory labor day and night, except when they are locked out, and who fall victims to alcoholism, tuberculosis

and rickets. They must be measured by the increase in misdemeanors and crimes, the multiplication of insane asylums, and the development and perfection of the penal system.

Never before has a ruling class claimed for itself so many ideals, because never before has a ruling class been obliged to clothe its transactions in so much idealistic twaddle. This ideological charlatanism is its surest and most effective means of political and economic dupery. This annoying contradiction between words and deeds, which only a blind man could deny, has not prevented the historians and philosophers from holding ideas and principles to be the sole motive forces of the history of bourgeois nations. Their monumental error, which is really an honest one although it exceeds the measure of the intellectually permissible, is itself an undeniable proof of the influence exerted by ideas and principles and of the rascality of the bourgeoisie, which has known how to cultivate and exploit them, so that they bring her a high rate of interest.

The financiers fill their prospectuses with patriotic principles, with civilizing ideas, humanitarian feelings and with investments at from six to ten per cent. for the fathers of families. That is an infallible bait with which to hook the money of the gullible. Lesseps was able to realize that imposing Panama scheme of the nineteenth century and to appropriate to himself the savings of more than 800,000 humble people, only because that "great Frenchman" promised to add a new leaf to France's wreath of glory, to extend the civilization of humanity, to enrich his contemporaries, etc. Ideas and principles are such infallible decoys that there is no political program, no financial, industrial or commercial advertisement, no announcement of a new alcoholic drink or of a drug, but is made attractive by them. Political treachery and economic deceit fly the flags of ideas and principles.*

* Rappaport, Vandervelde and other comrades are annoyed by my irreverent and "extreme" manner of exposing the eternal ideas and principles. What profanation it is, cries Péguy, to call justice, liberty, patriotism, etc., metaphysical and ethical harlots, which lend themselves to the support of academic discussions, political programs and the rights of man! If these comrades had lived in the time of the Encyclopaedists they would have directed their blazing indignation against Diderot and Voltaire, for they took the ideology of the aristocracy by the throat and dragged it before the judgment seat of their reason, they scoffed at the truths of Christianity, the Maid of Orleans, the blue blood and the honor of the nobility, the authorities, divine right, and many other things. And these comrades would condemn "Don Quixote," this incomparable masterpiece of romantic literature, to the stake, because it pitilessly exposes the knightly virtues to ridicule, those virtues that are sung in all romances and poems intended for aristocrats.

The historical philosophy of bourgeois thinkers was condemned to remain a tasteless and indigestible word-jugglery, since they could not see through the charlatanism of bourgeois ideology and did not become aware of the fact that it used principles merely as a signboard, behind which it could hide the changing secrets of its deeds. Their lamentable failures do not, however, prove that it is impossible to discover the determining causes of the organization and evolution of human society, particularly now that the chemists have discovered the manner in which atoms arrange themselves in compound bodies.

"The social world," says Vico, the father of historical philosophy, "is without doubt the work of man, from which it follows that we can, indeed must, find the underlying principles in the modifications of human intelligence itself. . . . When we reflect over it, is it not surprising that the philosophers have sought earnestly to understand the natural world, which was created by God and the knowledge of which he has reserved to himself, and that, on the other hand, they have neglected to reflect upon the social world, the knowledge of which is possible to men since they themselves have made it."

The failures of the historians and philosophers teach us that, in order to further the knowledge of the social world, we must use methods other than those employed by them.

THE WIND AND THE SEA

By Louise W. Kneeland.

The wind and the sea they follow me, follow me, follow me ever,
they rest nevermore,

The wind and the sea they hollow me, hollow me, hollow me,
wailing, a grave far from shore.

"Oh, whose is the voice in the wind's endless moan,
And whose is the voice in the cry of the sea?"

'Tis the voice of my dear one, who wanders alone,
'Tis the voice of my dear one, that calls unto me.

Beloved and lost, I'll follow thee, follow thee, follow thee swiftly,
we'll part nevermore,

The wind and the sea they hollow me, hollow me, hollow me,
wailing, a grave far from shore.

The Teachers' League: A New Movement

By BENJAMIN GLASSBERG.

Many and various are the associations of teachers, but their purpose heretofore has been only one—salary protection. On February 28, 1913, the Teachers' League was organized in New York. Now, for the first time the purpose is the protection of the cause of education, the school, and the rights of teachers.

Systematization and standardization, these two evil geni of large institutions, have reduced the teaching force of New York City to the level of automata. Thinking, on the part of teachers, is looked upon with decided disfavor. Uniformity is the ideal. To obey without questioning is one of the chief requisites of the teacher. Pupils may question and even disobey with impunity, but teachers must not question.

Our schools are supposed to turn out strong, self-reliant, thinking boys and girls. And this is expected to be accomplished by teachers who must repress whatever initiative or ideas they may have possessed when they entered the system, by teachers who find it to their advantage to flatter their supervisors, whose every act and movement is marked out and limited by a principal. Is it any wonder that no such boys and girls are turned out?

Through their unions craftsmen have a voice in determining the conditions under which they shall work—the hours of employment, the rate of wages, the hygienic conditions of the factory, and the kind and amount of work they shall do. But the teacher who performs what is universally acknowledged as the most important function of society—the training of those who will be the fathers and mothers of the nation, who deals with human beings during the period when they are most susceptible to external influence, has no such privilege. He must teach his pupils according to a syllabus and methods that are determined for him. Throughout the city, the same subject matter, in the same amount, at the same time, and in the same manner must be taught, whether the children come from the East or the West Side, whether they are immigrants or native-born, with absolutely no regard to difference in the condition, environment or experience of the pupils, and without giving the teachers the right to modify the syllabus to the needs of the pupils. And so we have the anomaly of one course of study and

one syllabus for a city with the most cosmopolitan population in the world, with all possible varieties of economic and social conditions. A French Minister of Education is credited with having said, "I can tell what is being taught in any school of France at any moment of the day." We may boast of the same proud distinction.

What a comfort it is to turn to the methods adopted by the London schools. We find the following among the regulations: "The only uniformity of practice that the Board of Education desires to see is that each teacher shall think for himself, and work out for himself such methods of teaching as may employ his powers to the best advantage and be best suited to the particular needs and conditions of the school. Uniformity in detail of practice is not desirable even if it were attainable. No teacher can teach successfully on principles in which he does not believe."

What rank heresy this would be if uttered by a New York City teacher. To fight for such privileges the Teachers' League has been organized. In the call issued for the organization meeting the following demands were made: "Teachers should have a voice and vote in the determination of educational policies; teachers should have seats in the Board of Education, with the right to vote; teachers should have a share in the administration of the affairs of their own school as the only practicable way for the preparation of teachers for training children for citizenship in a democracy; there should be serious study of the problems of the size of schools, size of classes, salaries and rating of teachers."

Such in brief are the most important items in the program of this new league. Such as it is, it is the most radical movement ever begun among teachers in the East. For the first time some among the 17,000 teachers of the city have decided to cease being dumb, driven cattle. For the first time teachers have begun to take an active interest in their rights, in spite of the advice of one District Superintendent of Schools to leave the question of rights to the Board of Education, and of another superintendent who advised the teachers not to unite against their employers.

Vigorous and determined agitation will undoubtedly result in securing these elementary rights. Thus an important step will be made towards the democratization of education, with the consequent increase in the social efficiency alike of teachers and of pupils.