

SEPTEMBER 1913

Ten Cents

The
New Review

A-MONTHLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

Binghamton: Who Cares? *P. L.*
Agrarian Discontent in Canada *Gustavus Myers*
The Status of the Negro in the United States . . . *Mary White Ovington*
The Woman Suffrage Movement in England *Theodore Rothstein*
Story of the Putumayo Atrocities
 III. Under Two Flags *W. E. Hardenburg*
The German Social Democracy and the Military Bill . *Hermann Wendel*
Concentration, Monopoly, Competition: A New Economic
 Trend *Louis C. Fraina*
The Problem of Knowledge. II. (concluded) *Paul Lafargue*
The Pale Laugh *K. E. Primus-Nyman*
Whirling Wheels *Louise W. Kneeland*
Max Eastman's Two Books *Grace Potter*
"Use of Troops in Civil Disturbances" *Naboth Hedin*

150 Nassau Street

New York

The New Review

Published Monthly

by the

New Review Publishing Association

150 Nassau Street, New York City

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

Herman Simpson, *Editor*

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

One Year, . . . \$1.00 Six Months . . . \$.80
Canada 1.20 Foreign 1.50
Single Copies, 10 cents

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

NEW YORK READERS

Please take notice!

We beg to inform our readers in New York and vicinity that beginning with August 25th, 1913, The NEW REVIEW will be for sale regularly on all the newsstands of the Manhattan and Bronx Subway System. The New Review can also be had at all the stands of the Elevated System in Brooklyn

Circulation
Department

The NEW REVIEW

The New Review

Vol. I.

SEPTEMBER, 1913

No. 20

Binghamton: Who Cares?

After the Triangle, Binghamton! "Deplorable!" groan in chorus the respectable hell-fearing citizens as they peruse the seething editorials of their newspapers. Each similar catastrophe produces its after-birth of moral awakening, and out of gallons of ink we splash irrefutable demonstrations of the obvious!

But who really cares?

Does the Governor care? From the ashes of Binghamton he makes a juicy mud-pie to spatter on Murphy's face. Do the Fire Commissioners care? All the laws were complied with. With an easy conscience of duty well done they can blow the fumes of burning flesh from their nostrils, and give themselves up to the exercise of their instincts for compassion and human sympathy. Does the Legislature care? It is so weary from the task of investigating itself. The weather is sultry. Anyhow, did it not give the public long ago a rational, a safe, Fire Protection Law? Let the Public say what it wants. An election will soon be coming. Three hundred sharp legislative ears are always pressed to the ground to catch the most distant rumble of the trend of public opinion. Meanwhile . . . the weather is sultry! Does the Public care? Oh, this poor Public! When it's not roasted on one side it's frozen on the other. While it watches the Legislature in front, the cost of living swats it behind the ear. If it turns on the capitalists, the Legislature picks its pocket. Bless the suffering Public! It has troubles of its own! A tearful "Too bad!" is all you can expect from it.

Does the proletariat care?

The proletariat is still learning the A B C's of human life. How long will it tinker with the ancient program? Doubtless Binghamton has delivered a solid bump on the public consciousness. For a few weeks, the Public will now be delivering

OUR STANDING OFFERS

	Regular Price	Our Price
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	\$2.00
The Larger Aspects of Socialism. By Wm. English Walling	1.50	
	\$2.50	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	\$2.30
Socialism As It Is. By Wm. English Walling	2.00	
	\$3.00	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	\$1.50
The Masses, 1 year	1.00	
	\$2.00	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	\$1.50
The Inter. Socialist Review 1 year	1.00	
	\$2.00	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	\$1.90
"Comrade Yetta." By Albert Edwards	1.35	
	\$2.35	
The BUNDLE RATE of the New Review is 6c. per copy		

Become a Shareholder

IN OUR PUBLISHING BUSINESS
NOT TO MAKE MONEY

BUT

TO MAKE SOCIALISTS

The publication fund of the NEW REVIEW has been raised from the sales of shares. Many men and women prominent in the Socialist movement are stockholders. They have contributed liberally in order to start the enterprise. Additional capital is required to continue the publication until it is self-supporting. Several thousands dollars worth of stock is yet to be sold. Common shares are \$100 each and preferred shares \$10 each. You may become a part owner of the NEW REVIEW by purchasing one or more shares of either class. Payments may be made in installments.

NEW REVIEW PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION

Kindly Mention the NEW REVIEW When Writing to Advertisers.

repeated bumps on the Legislature and on the Executive Department, bumps progressively diminishing in violence, and in any case much softened by fat cushions of dollar bills. All we know is that by the time the bump of public opinion comes to jar impossible laboring conditions, it will have become so tenuous, so extremely tenuous, that the capitalist will feel scarcely a tickle.

And we too come back to the obvious.

It is obvious that if a hundred girls were sizzling in that Binghamton hell-pot, it was because the working class as a whole still consents to work in such hell-pots. If they worked in a fire-trap, it is obvious that the working-class as a whole consents still to work in such fire-traps. This is the fact of the case as well as the law. Did they not "assume the risk," willingly or unwillingly? Were the fire-escapes inadequate? It is obvious that the poor working girls, eager to find work and bread, condoned the inadequacy.

The only essential law that has been violated in this case is the law of intelligent self-interest in the workingmen. If the workers do not know what is safe, the capitalists will surely let them scorch and stew till they take the trouble to find out. If they know what is safe and do not insist on getting it, capitalistic society will surely fry them into a consciousness of their own power. Benevolent bourgeois, working through the State machinery, will give some slight reform to prop up the tottering capitalistic system. Here and there a few enlightened organizations of laborers require greater fire protection than the law demands. Workers in general have yet to come actively to realize that they have the power to put fire escapes on hen coops.

Pretended patriots will mourn for Binghamton as a blot on the State. Revolutionary workers have no inclination, as they have no right, to let their horror for such holocausts stop at mere tears. Every such catastrophe calls for an awakening in the workers to the sense that they must overthrow the social order that cannot even safeguard the lives of its humble and industrious slaves!

P. L.

Agrarian Discontent In Canada

By GUSTAVUS MEYERS

The first faint beginnings of middle-class antagonism to concentrated great capitalist power are in evidence in Canada. Antagonism properly describes the situation; it would be far-fetched at the present time to magnify the movement as one of any intrinsic revolutionary character, even as middle-class movements go. Nevertheless, considering the long prevailing quiescent, submissive attitude that nearly all elements in Canada have taken toward capitalist rule, the agrarian agitation now commencing has its social and economic significance.

To understand this, it is only necessary to review the conditions hitherto and still prevailing in Canada, the land of strange contradictions, where, drugged by theological dogmas, dominated by church, saturated with ancient traditions, enslaved by political formulas and destitute of original or even borrowed intellectual thought, the mass of the people are only now beginning to wake out of their stupor to find that without their realizing it a great economic revolution has been going on. They see to their alarm that the Trust system is here in all its power, that mighty concentrations of capital have taken place, that vast fortunes have been created.

In other words, Canada presents the phenomenon of having almost reached the apex of modern capitalist concentrated rule, yet unlike the United States, this rule has come about without having to encounter a single serious middle-class revolt. True, there were laws passed aimed at preventing combinations, but nothing more was done. Such acute middle-class revolts as the Greenback-Labor party, the Farmers' Alliance, the Populist party and Trust investigations and prosecutions as have succeeded one another in the United States have been unknown in Canada. All of those stages of aggressive middle-class resistance to accumulating Trust supremacy which have so markedly characterized the economic struggle in the United States during the last forty years, have been absent in Canada.

The sudden apprehension of the middle-class elements is, indeed, pathetic and in this category there must be included the whole of the professional class and large numbers of the working class.

Perhaps nowhere in the world are the skilled workers, as a whole, so bourgeois in thought, attachments or views as the native English-speaking workers in Canada, particularly in Eastern Canada. Large numbers of them own their own homes, or at least have the nominal title subject to mortgage, and their views are essentially those of the small property-owning class. With some exceptions, their ideas of unionism are those of the obsolete and decadent British trade unionism of thirty years ago. For decades they have been content to move along the narrow lines not only of an old-time compromising economic action, but also of ancient theological thought.

Inexplicable as this may seem, it is easily explained in a country where the Church has the same bigoted dominance as it had in the United States a century ago. The entrenched hold of the Protestant churches in Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick is still powerful and militant; the clergy are looked up to as the ordained of heaven and earth, and preach their dogmas and demand obedience without fear of contradiction. Those stages of free inquiry or critical analysis which were common in France before the French Revolution and epidemic in the United States fifty years ago, have never reached Canada. Even the stages of "higher criticism" within the Church itself, are still to come; the simplest questioning of the divine inspiration of the Bible calls forth the fiercest denunciation, and it is considered that there is no greater opprobrium or justification of ostracism than to be an "infidel". Hence the skilled, property-owning worker too often seeks above all things to be held in esteem as being thoroughly pious and respectable, like the church-going shopkeeper or the silk-hatted business man, Bible under arm.

As for the Province of Quebec, the theologic and economic hold of the Roman Catholic Church seems in more than one respect like a weird chapter from the period before the French Revolution; many of the educated Catholics become atheists or agnostics, but the proletariat are kept under control of the priests; there the proletariat is a literal one, since the Church encourages large families, and it is seldom that a French-Canadian family with few children is seen.

Everywhere the churches teach obedience to authority and submissiveness to masters. These teachings might not be effective were there a general tendency to read real and thought-stimulating serious works, but the native Canadians as a whole are in a more prejudiced and backward stage as regards the great

currents of modern thought and the developments of science than even, one might almost say, the rustics of some obscure New England village. Their one unfailing source of information is the Canadian newspaper, and this is almost invariably dull and provincial, and their one invariable source of relaxation is trashy fiction or inane, foolish, so-called serious reading.

But this supine state of affairs happily is being upset by a new factor in Canadian thought, at least—which the Church is powerless to control. This new factor is the tremendous economic pressure. Even higher than in the United States is the increased cost of living in most Canadian cities. The professional classes feel the pinch intensely. The shopkeeping and small factory middle class look with vast uneasiness upon the great and arrogant power of the Trusts. The skilled laborer not only has to face the increased expense of livelihood, but to his amazement he is suddenly drawing out of his caste shell to find that even his craft is being abolished by automatic machinery. The farmer is becoming disgruntled because of the high taxes, high cost of necessary tools, and the clutch that the railroad, Trust and bank magnates have upon him. Discontent is rife; smug complacency is being discarded. It is a slow transformative process, but a deadly sure one.

The rapid concentration of wealth was shown recently in an article in the Canadian *Monetary Times*. From January, 1909, to January, 1913, there were 56 industrial mergers in Canada. The total authorized capitalization, including bonds, of these mergers, was \$456,938,266. The 56 amalgamations absorbed 248 individual companies. The aggregate capitalization of 206 of these individual companies was approximately \$167,289,182, which amount was in various ways increased upon amalgamation.

Compared to the United States, these figures may not seem impressive, but it is to be remembered that Canada's population does not exceed 8,500,000.

Against this concentration of capital, the farmers are the first to protest. The periodical *Farm and Dairy*, a weekly published in Eastern Canada, thus recently commented: "While we farmers have been occupied by our efforts to increase the productiveness of our farms, other people have been devising methods by means of which they would be enabled to so control the production and distribution of staple products, that we, as well as the rest of the community, would be forced to pay them higher prices for all such articles. Success has attended both lines of effort, improved methods of agricultural practice are enabling us to pro-

duce more for our farms to-day for a given amount of labor, than we ever could before. At the same time, we have more combines in Canada than our country, hitherto, has known. In consequence, we are paying higher prices for many necessities, and thus we are losing the benefit of the increased productiveness of our farms."

Then followed an exposition of latter-day middle-class economics. "Not all combines are bad," the editorial went on. "Many are positively good. Combines that have for their object the elimination of waste in the processes of manufacture by such means as the installation of expensive modern machinery or the reduction of operating expenses, are commendable and should be encouraged. Especially is this the case when the savings thus effected are shared with the public. When, however, the men behind these combines and mergers use questionable methods . . . in order that they may crush out the competition of weaker concerns, control production and advance prices to the consumer, they become dangerous and require to receive the attention of the public."

Other extracts might be reproduced from a large number of similar double-leaded editorials and articles in the same periodical, thus showing that the farmer is giving evidence that he feels economic pressure. No longer is the capitalist magnate hailed as a sort of demi-god; that worship, at any rate, is beginning at last to be questioned.

In Western Canada there is the same agrarian agitation. The *Grain Growers' Guide*, published in Winnipeg, has been pointing out what it declares to be the great danger of centralized wealth. In a recent conspicuous article it announced that 42 men controlled \$4,000,000,000, or more than one-third of Canada's total wealth in railways, banks, factories, mines, land, and other resources. "Democracy is in danger," it shrieks in large type.

Its special objective is denunciation of the "great Special Privilege" by which the railways have obtained 56,000,000 acres of land grants and hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies from the Dominion government. By the same "great Special Privilege," it agitates, the manufacturers of Canada have been enriched by the protective tariff. What is the remedy? it asks. It demands free trade, public ownership of utilities, banking reforms and—publicity! "We do not wish to see the manufacturing industries destroyed, we wish to see them thrive and multiply," it says. "And for reasons which we have previously

set out in these columns we believe that legitimate industries, suited to this country by climatic conditions and natural resources, would benefit rather than suffer by Free Trade."

These are a few of the many typical expressions of agrarian unrest. It is, as is obvious, wholly middle class, in favor of the continued exploitation of the industrial and agricultural worker, and, of course, has nothing in common with any movement to overthrow capitalism. In the United States such agrarian movements developed in the crude infancy of the Trusts; in Canada, the agrarian agitation is just beginning when the power and machinery of the Trusts are already superfinely organized to snatch the proceeds of the farmer. Where in the United States the Trusts came *after* the land had all, or nearly all, been settled or at least appropriated, in Canada they are in concentrated, unmolested operation *before* much of the land, both in the East and in the Northwest, has been settled. Undoubtedly this means that, once started, agrarian movements in Canada will go through much more rapid stages before their decay, and the same, no doubt, applies to industrial middle-class movements. Meanwhile, although small in numbers, the Socialist movement is energetic, and if it does not allow itself to temporize with middle class uprisings for the sake of votes, it will stand out as a revolutionary party to face concentrated capitalism after the middle-class agitations have come and gone.

The Status of the Negro In the United States

By MARY WHITE OVINGTON

During the controversy over the status of the Japanese in California, a wave of patriotic emotion swept through our newspapers and magazines. One heard, as an echo from the past, of the inalienable rights with which men are endowed, and one listened to the righteous wrath of those who believed that the rule of one group in the population over another spelled despotism. The sight of a race in the United States denied the franchise by the federal government, and later prohibited from acquiring property by a state, called forth a genuine expression of old-time patriotism.

But while popular periodicals have discussed their country's despotism toward the Japanese with liberty-loving hearts, they have failed to-day and for years past to mention the despotism practiced daily toward a far larger element in the population, the Negro element. With a few notable exceptions, no notice is taken in newspaper or magazine of the inalienable rights of the American colored man. And yet these rights have been denied him month by month and year by year, and are now being legally wrested from him almost as swiftly as their property rights were wrested from the California Japanese.

What civil and political rights has the Negro to-day in the United States?

Under the Constitution he is awarded the full rights of a citizen. The Fourteenth Amendment provides that all persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens of the United States; and that no state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges of these citizens. And the Fifteenth Amendment declares that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. These amendments were declared in force in 1868 and 1870, respectively, and were followed in 1875 by Charles Sumner's Civil

Rights Bill which provided against discrimination against Negroes in inns, public conveyances, and theatres; and prevented Negroes from being disqualified as jurors.

Thus by legal enactment the Negro by 1875 was placed on an equality with the white; and in the northern states he has, to a considerable extent, enjoyed this equality. In the South, however, he has steadily lost the status given him by the Constitution, and has become a disfranchised alien in a democracy.

In 1883, the first great legal blow was dealt him when the Supreme Court of the United States declared the Civil Rights Bill unconstitutional in the states. It did not declare it unconstitutional, however, in the territories, in the District of Columbia or on the high seas.

From the days of the Ku Klux Klans on, the white voters of the South by intimidation and by fraud prevented a great mass of Negroes from registering their votes. Nevertheless, the Negro was a power and was counted an important political factor during the eighties and early nineties—the time of the Farmers' Alliance and the Populist party. Bargains were often made with Negroes for their votes; as in Atlanta, Georgia, when in 1885, the Prohibition party secured a majority of the colored votes on the promise of a new school house for colored children (the last school to be built for Negroes in this wealthy southern city). All the bargains were not of so pleasant a complexion, but wise or foolish they represented political power. They were therefore stopped by legislative enactments which were initiated in Mississippi in 1890, and later imitated in South Carolina, Louisiana, North Carolina, Virginia, Georgia and Oklahoma.

Disfranchisement was accomplished in various ways. State constitutions were amended or new constitutions adopted which provided property tests, the payment of poll taxes and educational qualifications. Then, seeing that these qualifications, if enforced, were disfranchising nearly all the whites as well as the blacks, some of the states passed "grandfather" clauses which gave the right to vote to an old soldier or the descendant of an old soldier. As the most of the soldiers in the southern states had fought against the Union, this legislation presented the delightful anomaly of authorizing men to vote for President and Congressmen *because* their fathers had fought to destroy the United States government. The Negro vote was soon so reduced as to be inappreciable; and the twentieth century found no Representative in the South with a Negro constituency.

The white men in the state legislatures represented white men only, and were there to advance the interests of their white constituents; and when the new, liberty-loving Progressive party at its noble convention refused to seat delegates sent by Negroes from the states where disfranchisement was in force, it but proclaimed to the whole country that southern rule is the rule of the white alone.

After disfranchisement, came, as with the Japanese, the seizure of property rights.

At first this was accomplished by intimidation and violence. A man who became unpopular with his neighbors because he was worth too much, or didn't know enough to know his place, was driven out of town. The Atlanta riots seriously affected the colored property holders of that city, for the rioters, avoiding those parts of the town in which the criminal Negro resided, attacked the lives and property of industrious, often well-to-do, artisans. But again as in the case of the franchise, violence is giving way to legalized confiscation. The Negro, by ordinance, is losing control of his property.

It is done in this fashion. In Mooresville, North Carolina, a colored carpenter started to build a house on a piece of property which he had owned for four years. The residents of that section forbade his building. He continued at his work and the city then passed an ordinance prescribing the part of the city in which colored people might live, and providing a penalty if they attempted to break through the limit. The carpenter had to desist from building and his property remains unimproved.

For three years Baltimore has tried to enforce a segregation ordinance, and the question of its constitutionality is now before the Supreme Court of the state of Maryland. The ordinance defines "colored blocks" and "white blocks", and imposes a penalty for permitting a colored person to live in a white block or a white person in a colored. It affects property owners, and thus far the whites have been the chief pecuniary sufferers; but if it is declared constitutional it will have a profound effect upon the Negro's property rights, especially in those states in which he is deprived of all participation in the government. The poorest sections of the city can then be assigned to him, and these sections can be left in a state of neglect, physical and moral. And if the city may legally prescribe where he shall dwell and acquire property, why may not the country districts

as well? One sees before one whole vistas of comfortable confiscation by the whites of fertile, Negro-owned lands. If anyone doubts this, let him study the history of our dealings with the Indians.

The federal Civil Rights Bill for which Charles Sumner worked so doggedly, and which was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, gave the Negro the ordinary privileges of a resident in any country—the right to stop at a hotel and get a meal and a bed, to enter a theatre or concert hall and hear the entertainment provided, to ride in the street car and on the railroad. All these rights have been taken from the black man in the South except the last, and he may not ride in street or railroad car save segregated in an equally expensive, but distinctly inferior, seat. But in the District of Columbia, the territories, and on the high seas this law has been technically in force. It has not prevented discrimination, but it has modified it. Negroes have not been segregated in street cars or in many public places. This June, however, the Supreme Court of the United States has declared the law unconstitutional everywhere. This has called forth a flood of bills in Congress designed to segregate the Negro of Washington. The negro-phobist is rampant, and black men and women in the nation's capital may soon be subjected to every indignity that the ingenuity of a senator from Mississippi can devise.

But who cares whether a colored woman in Washington can sit in a vacant seat in the forward part of a street car, or must stand in the rear while a white rowdy, lolling comfortably, blows his smoke in her face? Who is troubled when the black man is ordered out of the railroad restaurant and goes hungry on his travels? Who is concerned whether the state of South Carolina gives the colored children their equal share of the school funds or allow them one-fourth of what it allows the white child? Who bothers when the police in Atlanta or Birmingham or New Orleans arrest each Negro who is out of work as a vagrant; or who troubles himself when the court sends the vagrant to the chain gang where he is vilely housed and debauched and beaten? Who, among the many that have been filled with sympathy for the fifty thousand yellow people in California, is stirred at hearing of the segregation of eight million black- and brown- and white-skinned Americans, all conveniently classed as Negroes? Who cares?

There are two organizations in this country that have shown that they do care.

The first is the Association for the Advancement of Colored People. This organization is made up of white and colored men and women and is pledged to oppose the segregation of the Negro and to strive for the enforcement of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. It appeared before the Supreme Court of Maryland on the Baltimore Segregation Act, and it expects to appear before the Supreme Court of the United States in October in a case to test the constitutionality of the "grandfather clause". It is in the anomalous position of a society espousing an amazingly unpopular cause and finding its stronghold in the United States Constitution. The Association carries on a vigorous publicity campaign through its organ, the *Crisis*, of which Dr. Burghardt Du Bois, a contributor to the *NEW REVIEW*, is the editor.

The second organization that attacks Negro segregation is the Industrial Workers of the World.

When it looked as though William D. Haywood and the organization that he represents would be recognized at the National Socialist Convention at Indianapolis, Haywood turned to the delegates and said: "Now I may go back to tell the millions of women and children and the eight million Negroes that you stand with them." The I. W. W. has stood with the Negro. The Brotherhood of Timber Workers in Louisiana has fraternized with black men and together the two races have battled against their exploiters. Only one familiar with the South can appreciate the courage of this position, and the bravery demanded of both races. Mixed locals have been organized despite the fact that there is a law in Louisiana prohibiting public gatherings of black and white. The common enemy has obliterated the color line.

I wish I might cite the Socialist party, the party I so love, as the third force to stand aggressively for the Negroes' full rights. In some Southern states, notably Oklahoma, the white Socialists have supported the blacks in their manhood struggles. In Louisiana and Texas, on the other hand, they have, at times, shown a race prejudice unexcelled by the most virulent Democrats. But it would not be just to judge the party by the action of a small group in the South. We need to note the position of the national body. This body in 1901, passed a noble resolution expressing its sympathy with the Negro in his subjection to lawlessness and oppression, and inviting him to membership and fellowship in the world movement for economic emancipation. This was in 1901, but there has been no word since.

At the last National Socialist Convention, while the delegates spent hour after hour in frenzied talk over amendments to amendments of motions which no one remembered, no word, save that of Haywood's, was uttered in appreciation of the existence of this most exploited race. One Negro delegate was present, but he was not given the opportunity to speak. To this convention, the United States Negro, composing one-fifth of all the workingmen in the Union, did not exist.

And yet the color problem is not one that we can dispose of by saying, as did many at the Socialist convention, that it is economic and will be solved by the coming of Socialism. Our goal is still far off; we are on the road, and we must beware of the forces that will be used to retard us. Among these forces is race discrimination. The creation of a segregated class in our democracy, a class without a ballot, without civil rights, poorly educated, with a low standard of living, will seriously retard the coming of the Co-operative Commonwealth. So we must watch each effort that is made to prevent black men and white men from meeting on equal terms.

For decades, Negroes and whites have been working side by side in the various departments in Washington, but since the coming in of the Democratic administration they have been separated. In some rooms screens have been placed about the colored men that they might not be seen by their white co-workers. This screen is not only an outrageous insult to the black man, it is also a barrier that prevents men in the same economic class from meeting and working for the incoming of a genuinely Democratic government. The segregated black laborer will learn to believe that his cause is antagonistic to the cause of the white laborer. Increasingly he will serve the capitalist—to whom, indeed, he will alone owe any possible loyalty—and he will logically become a means for building up privilege and increasing the power of the few.

The screen that the present administration is placing between black men and white men, and between black women and white women, we are assured, is needed to preserve the integrity of the races—which simply means that under no circumstances shall the white race assume any responsibility for the consequences of its immoral acts. It is time that we tore down this screen of hypocrisy, and that we faced the awful fact: the fact that we starve our workers; and that those who are black, as they turn homeward, their long day done, we afterwards stone.

The Woman Suffrage Movement In England

By THEODORE ROTHSTEIN (London)

There has never been a movement which has so much gained the ear and the lips and so little the mind and the hearts of the public as the woman suffrage movement in England. With that true instinct which is prompted by a mind congenial to the social and intellectual atmosphere in which it operates, the women have understood to perfection how to keep the attention of the sensation-loving public centered upon their movement. They, the gentle sex, the symbol of weakness, modesty, grace, and gentleness, have taken to street demonstrations, to assaults upon the police, to attacks upon the House of Commons and individual Ministers, to window-smashing, to hatchet-throwing, to bomb-laying, to arson, to hunger-striking, and a thousand and one other means having but one end in view—to keep the public talking of their grievances and their movement. The latest exploit has also been their most sensational. A Miss Davison, who had already gained considerable notoriety before by having spent a night in the hot-air shaft in the House of Commons, threw herself among the Derby horses in order to stop the race and was trampled by the King's colt to death. It is not to be supposed that this act of martyrdom was premeditated; it was simply a case of misjudging the action and its effect. Its object, however, was to spoil the race, or at least to prevent the King's horse from running, and thus make all the newspapers and all the sporting public (which in this case is identical with the "nation") talk of the movement.

And yet, as I say, there never was a movement which in spite of its large command of public attention has so little impressed itself upon the public mind. The public talks and runs to see the demonstrations, but is captivated neither by its arguments nor by its martyrdom. It judges it much in the same way as it judges a new craze in cinemas or rag-time song, but it forgets it so soon as it disappears from its gaze. Let the movement—or rather the Women's Social and Political Union with which the

movement is chiefly identical—slacken in its efforts to supply and to invent ever more exciting sensations, and no one in England will remember it for another fortnight. This is a fact which the women themselves are aware of, otherwise there would not have been those frantic efforts to invent always something new and more "striking," which characterises the movement.

The reason for this undoubted indifference to the essentials of the movement as distinguished from its forms is not far to seek. This woman suffrage movement has no object: it pursues no social aim and has no social program. It, therefore, attracts nobody. Political rights are not the object of inborn desires and of immediately-felt needs. They are conceived at a late stage of social development as the necessary means to an end which is social and primordial. When the banner of political enfranchisement is unfurled, it can only exercise an attraction when it responds to the social aspirations of a certain class or certain classes (sometimes of the entire community) and stands for their realization. So little, however, is the conception of the present suffragists of the female sex as a class true that when they raised the banner of women's franchise they found no special, distinct, and antagonistic social interests to place behind it, and the banner remained floating in the air with no visible support. At first, indeed, an attempt was made to appeal to the interests of the working women by representing the woman's vote as a necessary, or at least, most efficient means of combatting sweating and prostitution. The Lancashire mill-girl was specially appealed to in this connection, partly because Mrs. Pankhurst and her daughters had been Socialists and worked in Lancashire, and partly because the movement was anxious to assume the air of a popular cause. An agitation, by means of meetings and placards, was carried on in factory towns, calling upon the female workers to obtain the parliamentary vote in order to abolish the social ills to which the female sex is specially subject. Trainloads of factory girls would also be brought over to London for special demonstrations, so as to make the latter appear more "democratic." These efforts, however, to endow the movement with a social meaning did not prove very fruitful and lasting, and they were soon abandoned. Henceforth the movement remained purely political, with no visible social object and, consequently, without any social driving force and without any social attraction.

Of course, the movement is not a fortuitous or artificial movement, merely engineered by a handful of resourceful

women. It certainly has a social basis and appeals to the interests of a certain *section* of the female population. Between the time when the idea of woman's suffrage was championed by a Mary Wollstonecraft and later by John Stuart Mill and our own, when it has been taken up by tens of thousands of women and men, a profound social change has come over the female population of England—or, rather, England's bourgeoisie. Partly through vast emigration which by draining the male population of the islands has created a surplus of females, but chiefly through the stress of competition and at the same time diffusion of wealth and its comforts among the bourgeoisie, which have had a deleterious effect upon the marriage-rate and the marriage-age, a growing number of daughters of bourgeois families have found themselves condemned to independent spinster life and therefore thrown upon their own resources in order to live and to enjoy life. They began knocking at, and have ultimately forced, the door of various professions and economic pursuits, and have in the course of time formed a considerable group of middle-class earning women, independent, self-reliant, and on the whole well-off. It was natural that they should gradually drift into social and then political work of an unofficial or semi-official character, and that having taken part in the work they should want to regularize their activity by participating in the open political life of the community. First admitted to local bodies and local work of a State-charitable character, they soon demanded and obtained admission to administrative bodies and administrative work, after which it was but a step to claim the parliamentary vote. It must not be supposed that they actually want to take direct part in the legislation of the country. With all their courage and their employment of violent means they still repudiate the idea of going to Parliament and there taking their seats alongside of men. Not so long ago Mrs. Pethick Lawrence openly declared at a big meeting, in reply to a question as to whether women wanted to get into Parliament: "They had never dreamed of asking to go into Parliament—they were asking only for the elementary right to vote." This does not betray a great boldness of thought, but no doubt it will come later on when the women will have secured the vote. At any rate the demand for the latter is very natural, and having once been raised, it was bound to find an echo among the innumerable middle-class earning women.

But though the movement thus responds to the aspirations

of a section of the female population, it by no means represents a *distinct social need* of that section. The middle-class earning women form part of the great bourgeois class, and their interests are as faithfully represented by their fathers, brothers, sons and husbands as they would have been by themselves. It is an illusion to think that because the latter are men they lack adequate knowledge of the needs of their womenfolk. It is not the needs based upon the special physiology and psychology of women, but the *social* and *economic needs* of the entire class, which form the object of legislation and generally of the activity of the State, and of these men are as good judges as women, and vice versa. It is true, that even these social and economic needs sometimes bear a specific sexual character necessitating special treatment. But who is so naive as to think that men do not know them or, if they do, are less inclined to deal with them? These men are fathers, brothers, and husbands of women, and they know just as well as the latter that, for instance, strenuous work in the later months of pregnancy or in the first weeks after confinement is harmful. If, in spite of this knowledge, factory legislation is everywhere defective on this head, the fault lies not with the man-ruled Parliaments, but with the *bourgeois*-ruled Parliaments, and would have been precisely the same if our Parliaments had been ruled by bourgeois-women instead of by bourgeois-men. We then arrive at the same conclusion that women have no other social and economic interests than those of the class to which they belong, and will act in respect of them in precisely the same fashion as the men.

It is the willful ignoring of this elementary truth—I say willful because the women know very well the experience of all countries where women's suffrage obtains—which lends to the suffragist movement in England a certain air of pretentiousness and hypocrisy which is repelling to every honest and clear-thinking man and woman. When we hear Mrs. Pankhurst extolling "the courage of the women who have struck a blow for freedom," or Mrs. Pethick Lawrence assuring that "she knew of no men's movement that could find fifty persons ready to go to prison for their principles," we, without even impugning the accuracy of these statements, are at once inclined to ask: What freedom, what principles? And because we can find no particular "freedom" and no particular "principles" in the vote to which these women aspire, we feel the same disgust and indignation, mixed with amusement, which was felt by the old Chartists when they heard the Cobdenites shrieking that Free

Trade was Peace and Love—nay, was Jesus Christ! And because of this feeling we do not even experience the same sympathy towards their “martyrdom” as we would in other cases. To go to prison, to be forcibly fed, to go on a hunger-strike—certainly all this shows an amount of courage and persistence, which is above the average, but because the object of the movement is so small and the hollow pretensions which are imported into it are so great, we do not feel moved by this courage and are apt to ascribe it more to sport and to a sort of collective hysterics than to any real inspiration by the grandeur of their ideals. In the last number of the “Suffragette,” the organ of the W. S. P. U., devoted to the memory of Miss Davison, one of the prominent leaders of the movement writes *a propos* of the Derby incident: “In the Light Brigade there were six hundred—even at Thermopylae there were three (hundred)—but she, one, alone, the Quintus Curtius of our cause, has thrown herself into the gulf to set her sisters free. Is this nation of sportsmen going to allow this fellow-sportsman to be sacrificed without avail? Will they still look on unmoved while the slow murder of that other sportsman, who is offering up her life inch by inch, is consummated?” The writer, Mrs. Hertha Ayrton, has unwittingly revealed to us the difference between the heroes of Thermopylae or Curtius and the heroine of the Derby race: Leonidas or Curtius were not sportsmen in what they did, but we know not whether the whole women’s agitation, with its various escapades including the attempts at arson in lonely places, may not be largely a sport, in which, of course, one must sometimes also take a broken head into the bargain.

And there is yet another difference between the Hertha Ayrtons and the heroes of the Thermopylae or (to take an instance nearer home) of the Russian revolution. Neither, of course, relish prison and other punishments *per se*, and so far as treatment is concerned both insist with justice on being allowed the status of political offenders and other privileges. But while the Russian revolutionists, male and female, accept the punishment as part of the business and as the inevitable incident in their activity, the women in England are surprised each time the punishment is meted out to them. The attitude usually taken up in these cases is one of unfeigned amazement at the audacity of the law and the judges in inflicting upon them a punishment which they have hitherto regarded as being proper only for women of the lower classes and for

men. “Take me gently!” was the famous cry of a “suffragette” in Parliament square during one of the conflicts with the police when one of the latter, having been struck in the face, rather roughly seized the offender. It is this scandalized feeling at what they regard not so much as a punishment as an insult which is largely responsible for their preferring prison each time they are fined. “Will not the people of England be shocked at this impropriety of our being sent to prison?” this seems to be the idea in their mind underlying their refusal to pay the optional fine. When once Mr. Churchill, in his usual exuberant rhetoric, compared them in course of a public speech with Hottentots and children at school, what was the reply of the suffragettes? “In the days of chivalry,” declared Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, “if a woman received an insult, it was considered honorable for her nearest relative to wipe it out by means of corporal punishment. Did Mr. Churchill think that the four hundred women who had been treated so shamefully had no husband, brother or son ready to avenge the insult?” This appeal to the days of chivalry is characteristic as showing the world of ideas in which these women move. It is a world peopled by ladies and gentlemen, ever ready to insult the men and women below them, but regarding themselves as immune from all punishment and all insult. Two such ladies, Miss Pease and Miss Gargett, once wrote in the public press describing the hardships which they had had to undergo while in prison (in default, of course, of payment of fine). It appeared that Miss Pease had felt very cold in her cell and rang to have a hot-water bottle filled which was done. Next morning she called “for the presence of all officials,” and was moved to another cell. In the hospital “there was a mouse.” Miss Pease demanded a cat, and it was supplied. She complained to the Governor that “we were sitting too near the ordinary prisoners in chapel,” and she and her friends were removed from them. Miss Gargett on her part complained that “she found an insect in her cell, and there was a cricket that kept her awake all night.” She also had “to use the crockery which was in the cell left over from a former prisoner.” It all sounds ridiculous, but it also has a serious meaning: the ladies feel themselves as middle-class women, women of the same class as the legislators and judges who make them suffer, and, in addition, as ladies who are entitled to respect and gentle treatment by the men. Small wonder that they are astonished at the “brutality” which is meted out to them, and expect each time that humanity

will be staggered if they choose to undergo it. This naive notion—naive to us, but in a measure justified, as experience has shown—is but the product of the class position which these women occupy and which they are trying to assert. They are middle-class women and want to be treated as women of that class expect to be treated by their men.

Whatever aspect of the movement we may take, its bourgeois character meets us everywhere. Is it necessary, then, to speak of its program? That program was laid down for it long before its more democratic phase arose by the influx of elements which though bourgeois in their social position and aspirations are proletarian in their economic dependence, such as nurses, teachers, and so forth. It was laid down for it by the Liberal men and women who once worked side by side with Mill and Dilke and who, though few in number, wielded a considerable social and political influence. The more democratic elements had to range themselves in line with them if they wanted to preserve the unity of the movement, and as a result a restricted franchise "on the same terms as the men" had to be inscribed on the banner. Whatever vicissitudes the watchwords have had to undergo since then under the stress of the parliamentary situation—at one time the desired franchise had to be reduced to the municipal franchise, which is below the terms enjoyed by the men, and at another time it was thought fit to proclaim adult suffrage—the principle "on the same terms as the men" has remained practically the ruling principle of the movement. But the "terms" enjoyed by the men only enfranchise the owner, the occupier, and the independent lodger, and would, in the case of women, exclude the married and include, among the unmarried, chiefly women of the middle and comparatively well-to-do class. By no amount of statistical jugglery and special "local inquiries" can this fact, so obvious to every one, be got over: a bourgeois movement can only pursue bourgeois reforms.

After all that I have said above what remains of the movement? Nothing but a "principle." It is this principle which has justified the movement in the eyes of Mrs. Pankhurst and Mrs. Despard and other women who regard themselves as Socialists and which has so attracted the leaders of the Independent Labor party, above all Keir Hardie and Snowden, that they have not hesitated to put themselves into opposition to the International and have ultimately prevailed upon the Labor party to pledge itself to vote even against full manhood suffrage

so long as women remain without a vote. This principle is the enfranchisement of the female sex. Even, it is said, if only a handful of middle class women were to receive a vote, that would establish the revolutionary principle of women's political rights, would break down the usurped monopoly of men, and would ultimately lead to the enfranchisement of the entire female sex. What a vain, what a childish illusion! One might think that England is leading the world in the matter of political emancipation of women and is the advance-guard in the cohorts of women assailing the fortress of man's political domination! That "revolutionary" principle has already been successfully asserted in a number of other countries, and even in England the monopoly of men has been broken down in every position except Parliament. The Jericho whose walls are to fall under the trumpet blasts of Mrs. Pankhurst and her friends has long been taken by the women's army, and no revolutionary effect is likely to follow the entry of the English detachment. If anything, the effect will rather be the reverse. Precisely the same glorification of the "principle" was heard in England in 1832 when the bourgeoisie had succeeded in frightening the aristocracy, by the spectre of a popular revolution, into surrendering to her the parliamentary forts. Then as now it was said that the capture of those forts by ever so small a section of the unenfranchised constituted a revolution and was ultimately bound to lead to the entry of the whole of the unenfranchised masses. We know what the result was: a whole generation had to elapse before a further extension of the franchise took place, and to this day England still remains without universal suffrage. The usual reply made to this argument from the past is that the masses never made the necessary effort to force the gate of the aristocratic-bourgeois fort; but this, in the light of the Chartist movement, is simply not true, and constitutes, moreover, a proof how much more formidable the *united* bourgeois-aristocratic resistance has been than the single resistance of the aristocracy ever was before. It cannot be otherwise in the case of the present women suffrage vote. If it should lead to the extension of the franchise to the bourgeois women only or mainly, the difficulty of getting the proletarian women admitted to the vote will be *pro tanto* increased.

It is precisely for this reason that Social Democrats cannot but oppose the present movement. They are, of course, in favor of adult suffrage. They are in favor of universal manhood

suffrage as part of the equipment of the proletariat in the struggle of classes. They are also in favor of universal womanhood suffrage—not on general ground of so-called citizenship, justice, and the rest, but because it will add to the political power of the proletariat. But short of this double universal suffrage they will not and cannot accept anything in the matter of woman suffrage. Especially in the England of to-day where, as the working class has yet to learn to make use of the vote it has, universal suffrage does not by far possess the revolutionary importance it had in the Chartist days or had in Germany in the sixties or may still have in Prussia to-day, and Social Democrats are in consequence rather slack in their agitation for adult suffrage—in England, I say, this attitude of hostility to the present suffragist movement has often been apostrophised as that of the dog in the manger. Fully knowing, it is said, that adult suffrage is at present out of question and even making little exertion themselves towards obtaining it, the Social Democrats would not allow the women to obtain what little they can. That looks a formidable reproach, but it is based on a misconception of the Social Democratic attitude. The Social Democrats oppose a restricted franchise not because it will redound to the advantage of but few, but because these few will increase the power of the ruling bourgeoisie and thereby render more difficult not only the general struggle of the proletariat, but the ultimate victory of the very cause which the adherents of the present movement claim to have so much at heart.

THE DIFFERENCE

By LOUISE W. KNEELAND

Hast thou seen what the weak in their weakness do worship?

It is power.

But the strong—give their hearts for a star,

Or a flower.

Story of the Putumayo Atrocities

By W. E. HARDENBURG

III.

Under Two Flags

In a preceding article, attention has been called to the fact that the ownership of all but the southern portion of the great territory of the Putumayo was in dispute between Peru and Colombia, with Ecuador also claiming a share. It has also been shown how, by one means or another, the Arana Company had succeeded in obtaining possession of the principal Colombian establishments in "The Devil's Paradise," which had previously been under the jurisdiction of Colombia.

By 1907, all the Colombian posts had been absorbed by the Peruvian Arana Company, except three small posts on the Caraparaná, known as La Union, La Reserva and El Dorado. And for reasons that will be outlined later in this article, wherever the Arana Company extended its inhuman domain, there waved the flag of Peru. Public opinion in Colombia became aroused at this steady and ominous advance of the flag of the rival Republic in the disputed territory. To add to this patriotic resentment, reports of the atrocities practiced by the Peruvian firm upon the helpless Indians began to filter through. Although Colombia was at a serious disadvantage, owing to the difficulty of access to the Putumayo region from the north, nevertheless the situation began to take on a most serious and threatening aspect.

As was to be expected, Arana was not slow to perceive the danger to himself and his gang of a possible Colombian occupation of "The Devil's Paradise." The tenor of the statement of the Colombian Minister of Foreign Affairs, quoted in the first of this series of articles, sufficed to indicate to him what consideration he and his gang of cut-throats might expect if Colombia once regained possession of the scene of the atrocities. So, with the shrewdness of a Morgan or a Rockefeller, Julio C.

Arana went to London and proceeded to transform his butcher business into an English limited liability company, capitalized at a million pounds and bearing the name of the Peruvian Amazon Company. A few Englishmen subscribed for shares in the company and three of them lent their names to the board of directors, probably in total ignorance of the real character of the business they were backing. But Arana and his brother-in-law, Abel Alarco, retained control of most of the shares and continued to manage the business between them as before.

Thus was the criminal syndicate of Arana and his relatives insured against any possible contingency. For if the Colombians should take forcible possession of "The Devil's Paradise," there was the British flag, backed up by all the forces of "the empire upon which the sun never sets," warning them not to interfere in the slightest degree with the vested interests of a powerful British company. And on the other hand, Arana and his gang, although a British company, nevertheless held under the protection of Peru. So long as Arana took possession of the disputed territory in the name of that Republic, he well knew that the government in Lima would never interfere with his "patriotic" labors, merely to succor a few thousand Indian "animals."

There was but one step to take—a small one, too—and the Peruvian Amazon Company would then be in the exact position Arana desired. This step was to eliminate the Colombian firms of Ordonez & Martinez, Serrano and González, owners of La Union, La Reserva and El Dorado respectively, and to annex their estates. These men had long been a thorn in the side of Arana, not only because they offered a refuge to the Indians, who, horrified and helpless, fled from the haunts of the assassins, but also because their holdings, although small, were rich and profitable. Moreover, it must have been extremely annoying to an individual of Arana's temperament to observe the wasteful and extravagant methods these firms employed—*i. e.*, their failure to exploit the Indians so thoroughly and brutally as Arana was doing.

In a previous article we have shown the tremendous influence of the Arana gang with the authorities of Iquitos. It should now be explained that nearly the whole of trans-Andine Peru is included within the limits of the Department of Loreto, the capital of which is Iquitos. The executive of this vast territory is known as the Prefect, and owing to the great distance of Iquitos from Lima and the difficulty of communication, he has

very wide powers, including the absolute control of the military and fluvial forces within the Department.

Under these circumstances Arana adopted a shrewd course. If his desperados murdered the Colombians, the Colombian government would undoubtedly, when it became aware of the murder of its citizens, demand from the Peruvian government the punishment of the murderers, and there would be, at least, a certain amount of undesirable publicity, if nothing worse. But if he could induce the public forces of the Department of Loreto to do this dirty work for him, the deed would then partake of the character of a frontier dispute, instead of a crime committed by one private individual against another. And, further, it would be less expensive to the company and safer for the company's property and gun-men.

This scheme, apparently with the full co-operation of the Prefect, was duly carried out early in 1908. Saldana was not deceived, however, and in the last issues of *La Felpa* laid bare the entire plot and its ramifications, as will be seen from the following extracts:

"Gabriel Martinez, the Colombian Police Inspector, was encamped upon the banks of the Yubinet, a stream that enters the Upper Putumayo, with some forty Colombian *caucheros*, and, as he needed more men, he began to enter into relations with some Indians of the Sabuas tribe. He finally succeeded in getting some fifty of these unfortunates, who are murdered and tortured shamelessly by the employees of Arana, to accompany him.

"Learning of this fact, Loayza, the agent of the Arana Company, in order to promote the interests of his masters, sent a message to the head office in Iquitos stating that a large force of Colombians under the command of two generals was descending the Upper Caquetá, declaring that they were going to take possession of El Encanto and La Chorrera. He also added that this force, of some 300 or 400 men, was bringing a cannon.

"Naturally, the chief of the Arana Company communicated this intelligence to the political authority, for it is only in this way that we can explain the Prefect's action in sending there the eighty-five soldiers of the Loreto garrison that we had here, not even leaving enough to mount guard.

"As soon as those soldiers entered the Putumayo, Zumaeta (a brother-in-law of Arana) embarked with fourteen men from the Yubinet to capture the Colombian, Martinez, who had dealings with Indians who, the Arana gang cynically said, belonged

to them. By means of a deception, he captured Martinez and seven men, all of whom were taken to El Encanto.

"In this state of affairs, the Colombians of La Union were notified to send all their rubber down to El Encanto at once or the Liberal (a company launch) would go up and bring it down by force. As is logical, this angered the Colombians and they replied that they could and would defend themselves against the aggressions of the company.

"The departure of the pirates of Arana was not delayed; Loayza armed his men, embarked in the Liberal and in company with the government forces (on the government gun-boat Iquitos), on the afternoon of January 11th, set out for La Union, which they reached the next morning. As soon as the Colombians saw the Liberal they began to take up their positions. Their leader, Prieto, held in one hand the flag of his country, while he and Ordonez told the assaulting party not to land.

"As a consequence of the assault, the firing began. . . . This fire lasted about ten minutes, when the La Union people retired from the field, and the crews of the assaulting vessels disembarked. And it was here that the most savage and repugnant part of this act of piracy took place.

"Five corpses and two wounded men lay stretched out on the ground: one of these was Prieto, who had been wounded by a bullet in the right leg and was crawling towards the forest. . . . Behind this man came a negro, an ex-sergeant of the garrison, and he, in the presence and with the approval of all the rest, shot Prieto twice in the head and then stepped up to the other man and killed him also.

"The dead were robbed of everything they had on them, and Loayza searched eagerly among Ordonez' papers for his correspondence. All this, as well as the 23,000 kilos of rubber, was taken abroad. Meanwhile the employees of Arana were searching the forest for the unhappy women of the fugitive Colombians, and, as soon as they were discovered, these fiends, after satisfying their bestial appetites, conducted them to the Liberal."

This accounts for Ordonez & Martinez and illustrates how their estate* came into the hands of the Peruvian Amazon Company. The following extract from a Brazilian paper, *O Jornal*

* In 1910, owing probably to representations made by the Colombian government, Ordonez was paid a small sum by Arana for this property, seized in 1908.

do Commercio, shows the fate that befell Serrano and González about six weeks later:

"We have just been informed by the Colombian Consul that a horrible hecatomb has occurred at a place called La Reserva, situated upon the left bank of the River Caraparaná, a tributary of the Putumayo.

"Zumaeta and Flores, employees of the Peruvian Amazon Company, accompanied by their followers, made a raid on La Reserva, where they captured Serrano, the owner of the estate, with his employees. All these men were put in chains and then murdered most barbarously, their corpses, horribly mutilated, being thrown into the river. Previous to this operation, they had been obliged to reveal where they had put their money.

"Serrano's house and all it contained was burned to the ground. David Serrano had been established there eight years and had domesticated a tribe of Indians called the Yabuyanós, who are to-day enslaved by the syndicate.

"Not satisfied with these murders, they committed another, equally horrible and atrocious. Ildefonso González, an intrepid Colombian, had resided eighteen years on the Caraparaná and, during this time, had cleared up a small estate; as this man was one of the chief obstacles to the usurpation of the disputed territory, he was warned to withdraw.

"González obeyed and started to embark downstream in a canoe, but on the way received a discharge that felled him to the ground, mortally wounded; still not content, the Peruvians finished him with a club and threw his body into the river. A wretch named Olaneta, a chief of a section of the Arana Company, superintended this crime."

Arana had again triumphed. The three Colombian estates, La Union, La Reserva and El Dorado,* which he had coveted so long, at last passed into his hands. And no matter what happened, he was safe, for in the first place, the Peruvian Amazon Company was a British concern, and in the second place, the Peruvian Government itself having participated in the murder of the Colombians, had virtually assumed the responsibility for these cold-blooded crimes.

But Arana was destined to meet with an unpleasant surprise. Involved in the series of tragic events that culminated in the murder of the Colombians, were the writer of this and his friend

* Arana does not claim to have paid for these estates. Both of the owners having been murdered, they could not press their claim as did Ordonez, and their heirs received nothing for these properties.

and companion, Mr. W. B. Perkins, who in this way observed enough of the methods of the Arana syndicate to lead them to believe that they merited further investigation.

Leaving Colombia, we had descended the Putumayo in a canoe and, after a pleasant and interesting journey of about two months, had, on January 1, 1908, reached La Union, the post of Ordonez & Martinez. A few days later, we arrived at La Reserva, where we were hospitably received by Serrano. Perkins stopped here, while I, accompanied by some Colombian friends, pushed on to El Dorado. During our stay here, we saw the Liberal and the Iquitos ascending the river, en route as we learned afterwards, to commit the horrors of La Union, so well described by Saldana above. Two days later, while ascending the river to La Reserva, we met with the two pirate vessels returning from this sanguinary scene. We were fired on and captured by the detachment of Peruvian soldiers on board the Iquitos. Later we were transferred to the Liberal, where we found Perkins also a prisoner. He had been captured at La Reserva, where the "patriots" broke into and burglarized the house, Serrano and his men having fled to the forest at their approach.

We were then taken to El Encanto, where we were detained for several days awaiting the disposition that Loayza should make of us. At last, having succeeded in impressing this individual with the idea that it would be inexpedient to "remove" us, we were told that we might proceed to Iquitos. As our baggage, however, remained at La Reserva and we did not care to leave it at the mercy of the cut-throats of the company, it was decided that Perkins should stop at El Encanto until it was recovered, while I went on to Iquitos.

While not witnessing any actual atrocities during my involuntary stay at El Encanto, I observed numerous indications that led me to believe that they were of frequent occurrence. Thus the unfortunate Indians who loaded and unloaded the vessels that stopped at the port were so weak and scarred and debilitated that they could, in many cases, hardly walk. It was a pitiful sight to see them, practically naked, their bones almost protruding through their skins, and all branded with the infamous "*marca de Arana*" ("the mark of Arana"—the scars on their backs from floggings) staggering up the steep hill, carrying upon their doubled backs enormous weights of merchandise. Still more pitiful was it to see the sick and dying lie about the house and in the adjoining forest, unable to move and without anyone to aid them in their agony.

This belief on my part was still further strengthened by the narrative of Perkins, who subsequently rejoined me at Iquitos, without having been able to recover the baggage. Perkins thus describes some of the scenes he witnessed:

"One morning, while a company of soldiers was lined up in the yard for inspection, a party started from the house to a camp in the woods, carrying provisions on the backs of Indian porters. All of these Indians were in a state of starvation, and one poor devil was too weak to carry his load, about seventy pounds. After falling down repeatedly, he was told to fall no more; and as he began staggering and looked as if he were going to fall, one of the Peruvians shot him in the back, and he died.

"Indians were frequently tied to stakes driven in the ground and whipped on their naked backs until the flesh was a quivering jelly-like mass, and then turned loose. In a few days, if the Indian was not already dead, he was generally shot, because the maggots in his back, together with his stench and the improbability of his further usefulness, made him an undesirable."

These facts induced me, during my stay of some sixteen months in Iquitos, to investigate still further the conditions in the Putumayo. At the end of that period, having obtained sufficient data, I went to England, in an endeavor to arouse public opinion there.

The German Social-Democracy and the Military Bill

By HERMANN WENDEL
Member of the Reichstag

When at the beginning of this year the German people was astounded by the most monstrous military bill that a government had ever dared to offer to a country—it demanded an increase in the army of not less than 136,000 men—the Social-Democratic party, faithful to its traditions, assumed a distinctly hostile attitude toward this most recent extravagance of militarism. In the interest of the world's peace, of popular liberty and of popular welfare, it fought to the bitter end militarism in general and the new military bill in particular, and won a number of

brilliant moral victories. For by courageous criticism and by exposure of all the foul characteristics of the present military system it has aroused the masses and has dealt a telling blow to the authority of the militaristic idols. But the struggle of the Social-Democratic party inside as well as outside of the parliament was unable to prevent the passage of the military bill, for the Socialist party stood entirely alone, hence in the minority. There have been times when even bourgeois parties, such as the Clerical and Liberal, made strong resistance to new military demands and persisted so stubbornly in their refusal that the result was, as in 1893, a dissolution of the Reichstag. But of these times we may say: It was long, long ago. All bourgeois parties, from the Right to the Left, have now surrendered themselves, body and soul, to imperialistic world-politics, and hence are saturated to the bones with the militarist spirit. That no other reason than the imperialistic lust of conquest of the ruling classes stood at the cradle of the new military bill, appears clearly and plainly from a jubilant article in the chief organ of the National Liberals. On the day following the passage of the military bill it declared: "Now Germany is in a position to pursue its world-political purposes in Africa and in Asia."

But if the fight of the Social-Democratic party against the strengthening of the army was a battle in which from the very beginning it was impossible to hope for victory, it was otherwise with the struggle over the bill providing the necessary funds. The ruling class, nobility and bourgeoisie, has hitherto, by means of indirect taxation, saddled upon the propertyless masses the cost of its expensive naval and military policy. Indirect taxation was Bismarck's ideal ("because the individual does not suspect that he is paying taxes"), and by indirect taxes and assessments all the expenses of the military, naval and colonial policies have been met in the glorious era of Wilhelm II. Thereby all the food articles and the absolute necessities of the great mass have been gradually raised in price to the extreme limits of the endurable. The burden of the German people through indirect taxation amounts to-day to twenty-five marks (six dollars) per person. That is to say, a working class family of four persons (father, mother, two children) having an income of 1,000 marks pays out 100 marks, or 10 per cent. of its income, in indirect taxes! The last great plundering of the people through indirect taxes was accomplished in 1907. As is well known, the Social-Democratic representation in the Reichstag

decreased in the elections of 1907 from 81 to 43. The reactionary parties thought to make use of this opportunity and they put through a "financial reform" with new taxes amounting to 500,000,000 marks (about \$125,000,000), which were obtained almost exclusively by indirect taxes upon brandy, beer, tobacco, matches, etc. The Social-Democratic party has always opposed vigorously all attempts at new indirect taxation and has several times sought, though without success against the bourgeois majority, to carry through its taxation program providing for direct and progressive income, property and inheritance taxes throughout the empire. Thus far the direct taxes have been reserved for the federal states, where they are under the jurisdiction of reactionary parliaments—witness Prussia!—and hence can be assessed according to the will and desire of the possessing classes. The bourgeois parties, chiefly the representatives of the great land-owners and of mobile capital, have feared, as the devil fears holy water, to hand over by an imperial income and property tax "the pocket-book of the possessors" to the Reichstag, elected by universal and equal suffrage.

If the great land owners and the owners of mobile capital had had their way, the immense cost of the monstrous military increase would now also have been saddled by means of indirect taxes upon the propertyless masses of the people. But meanwhile the wind had changed. The people, embittered by the taxation robbery of 1909, had cast four and a quarter million of Socialist votes in the Reichstag elections of 1912, and in the parliament were seated 110 Socialists who could not be utterly ignored. Hence the first great result of the Social-Democratic victory of 1912 was this, that the government proposed to raise the gigantic costs of the military increase mainly by taxation of the rich—these costs should amount to a lump expenditure of 1,000 millions of marks and a permanent annual expenditure of 200 million marks. Without the four and a quarter million Social-Democratic votes and without the 110 Socialists in the Reichstag the government would never have thought of such a thing.

But in its details the government's finance bill was far from evoking satisfaction on our part, for still it amounted to a favoring of the rich. The lump expenditure of 1,000 millions was to be financed by a military fund formed by the assessment of a tax of one-half of one per cent. upon all fortunes over 10,000 marks, without distinction as to size. The small farmer, the small employing artisan who had invested 10,000 marks in

his business, but who only received an income of from 1,000 to 1,200 marks (hence led a thoroughly proletarian existence) was, therefore, according to the government's desire, to pay a tax of one-half of one per cent., that is, fifty marks; the rich capitalist with a fortune of a million was also to pay only one-half of one per cent., that is, 5,000 marks. The incomes of people who were without investment of capital were to be exempt from the tax up to the sum of 50,000 marks. Hence a lawyer earning 49,000 marks annually was not obliged to contribute a penny to the military fund, in contrast to the poor artisan with a "property" of 10,000 marks. But the permanent annual expenditures of 200 million marks were to be raised by the federal states by means of the so-called proportional payments. That is to say, the federal states were to effect an increase in the income and property taxes and then, according to the population of each state, to divert a corresponding sum to the Empire. The assessment of these taxes was thus left to the discretion of parliaments that, as a rule, are far removed from universal and equal suffrage. Once more the "pocket-book of the rich" was to have been protected, and the lion's share of the military fund as well as of the annual expenditures of 200 million marks would have come, if not from the workers, at least from people in humble circumstances, the petty bourgeois of small means.

And on this question the Social-Democratic party threw its 110 votes decisively into the scale.

Nothing would have pleased the reactionary parties better than if the Social-Democratic party—dogmatically applying the principle: "Not a man nor a penny for this system"—had stood passively aside and left entirely to the majority of the Reichstag the framing of the finance bill. The Conservatives and Clericals even sought to impose upon the government the condition that the military bill and the finance bill should be passed by one and the same majority. That would have meant the entire elimination of the Social-Democratic party, for under no circumstances could it have voted for the increase of the army. But after the army increase was no longer to be avoided, it could well take part in the framing of the finance law in a manner according with its principles and also with the contents of the joint manifesto issued March 1, 1913, by Social-Democratic representatives in the German Reichstag and by the Socialist representatives in the French Chamber of Deputies, namely: That the delegations on both sides of the Rhine were determined, in case the

resistance against the military bills in the two countries should be unsuccessful, to see to it that the new burdens should fall upon the rich.

Therefore in the first reading in committee, and mainly through the active participation of the Social-Democratic party, the military assessment assumed the form of a graduated tax upon property and incomes, and the graduation was of such a nature that a storm of indignation swept through the circles of the great capitalists. A military assessment was to be paid by an income of

	Per cent.
from 50,000—60,000 Marks.....	4.5
" 60,000—70,000 "	4.8
" 80,000—100,000 "	5.4
" 100,000—200,000 "	9.
" 200,000—500,000 "	11.4
over 500,000 "	14.

Property was subject to a tax up to one and one-half per cent. In this sort of taxation capitalist circles saw nothing less than the first step toward a confiscation of the middle and great fortunes of the bourgeoisie, as it was expressed in a wail issued by the Chamber of Commerce of Duisburg. In fact, at the second reading the committee was more pliant, especially in regard to the income tax rates: from then on the highest rate for incomes over 500,000 marks was no longer 14 per cent., but only 8 per cent. The Social-Democratic party's demand in this sort of taxation is shown by a motion made by the Social-Democratic representation during the discussion of the military tax in plenary session. It read:

The tax upon incomes shall amount with an income of from 5,000 marks to 10,000 marks to one per cent. of the income, of the next partial or complete

10,000 Marks.....	3 per cent. of the income
50,000 "	6 " " " " "
100,000 "	9 " " " " "
500,000 "	12 " " " " "
1,000,000 "	15 " " " " "

This motion was naturally lost, but in the form in which the military assessment was finally passed it reached deeply enough into the money bags of the rich. The tax upon property begins at a property of 10,000 marks only when there is at the same time an income of at least 5,000 marks, otherwise not until 50,000 marks, and it rises from 0.15 per cent. to 1.5 per cent. for properties of more than five million marks. For incomes the tax begins with 1 per cent. for 5,000 marks, and rises to 8 per cent. for incomes of 500,000 marks. That even compara-

tively small incomes of between 5,000 and 10,000 marks were drawn upon for the defence fund, had an educational purpose, for these are the incomes of all those elements of society, such as school principals, judges and retired officers in the army and navy societies, who are the loudest shouters for military increases, but who had never before been called upon to open their pocket-books. But the main portion of the military assessment falls upon properties of between 100,000 and 1,000,000 marks. The 255 tax payers in Prussia each of whom is assessed upon more than 10 million marks, must together pay 81 million marks. The richest armament manufacturer in Germany, the husband of Bertha Krupp, will have to pay a round six millions for his share alone. That will surely have a cooling effect upon the overflowing military enthusiasm of these circles of society.

But also in the framing of the permanent taxes the Social-Democratic party did its best. Here was effected the taxation of property increases, which indeed is not entirely satisfactory for the reason that it bears harder upon industry and city than upon the great landed estates and open country, but it nevertheless carries within itself the germ of a property tax. The tax upon property increments enters into force when the increase in value of a property of 20,000 marks exceeds 10,000 marks in three years. This tax is also graduated, and with an increase of from 10,000 to 50,000 marks it increases 0.75 per cent., with an increase of from 50,000 to one million marks, 1.35 per cent., and with an increase of more than one million, 1.5 per cent. But this tax rate is raised according to the property already in existence, rising from 0.1 per cent. for a property of from 10,000 to 20,000 marks to 1.0 per cent. for a property of ten million marks and over. Therefore, whoever possesses ten million marks and in three years acquires in any manner whatsoever one million in addition thereto pays 1.5 + 1 per cent., that is, 25,000 marks in property increment tax.

The Conservatives offered violent resistance to these property taxes, but the votes of the Social-Democratic party were necessary in order to pass the law. It would have been remiss in its duty to the working class had it allowed this opportunity to pass without imposing upon the rich a portion of the burdens entailed by a policy pursued solely in the interests of the rich.

But the Social-Democratic representatives, after mature reflection, also voted in favor of the military assessment, although it would have passed even had they voted against it. This affirmative vote arose from the circumstance that the military

assessment represents the first step toward a taxing system corresponding in principle to the demands of the Social-Democracy.

It makes no difference that the military assessment and property increment tax contain many defects, such as the tax exemption of church property and the restriction of the reigning houses to voluntary contributions. Nor is it necessary to emphasize the fact that, as before, the Social-Democratic party condemns the purpose for which the sums obtained from the rich are to be used. As before, we hold to the principle: "Not a man and not a penny for this system!" But in this case, after the man had been granted by the capitalist majority, it was solely a case of having the penny paid by the capitalist class alone. That is in nowise contradictory of Socialist principles.

Nor can the attitude of the Social-Democratic delegation be belittled by the fact that, as some critics say, the property taxes are paid out of surplus-value only, which is squeezed out of the working class, and that the capitalists will take pains to reimburse themselves for that which they contribute by a more concentrated exploitation. Both statements are correct to a certain extent, but if the question is put whether the capitalist class shall enjoy its surplus-value untaxed and the working class be bled by means of indirect taxes, or whether the capitalist class shall pay heavy taxes from their stolen surplus-value and the working class be protected from an increase in the price of necessities, there can, for a Socialist, be no doubt as to the answer.

There is certainly no ground for excessive jubilation, and it would also be a mistake to speak of the dawn of a new era in the policy of taxation, for at the very next opportunity the ruling class will again seek by means of indirect taxes to shift the burdens of its policies to the shoulders of the working class, but the Social-Democratic representatives in the Reichstag may be certain of the approval by the masses of their attitude toward the taxation laws, for what they did was done in the interest of the working class, since the property taxes for military purposes will have a dampening effect upon the capitalists' craze for armaments, and will also act in the interest of world-wide peace.

Concentration, Monopoly, Competition: A New Economic Trend

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

Critics hitherto indicted monopoly in the name of competition. Small capitalists in their despair assailed all forms of concentration. Chimerical schemes to curb monopoly were evolved. Monopoly, however, readily evades government dissolution decrees, the Standard Oil and Tobacco Trust "dissolutions" being monumental proof thereof. Attorney General McReynolds now holds that no trust can be adequately dissolved by a pro-rata distribution of the stock of its disintegrated parts among original stockholders, a community of interest being bound to exist. The new plan is to force ownership of disintegrated trusts into new hands—a problem of such magnitude as to defy governmental accomplishment. Nor is the accomplishment economically or mathematically possible. The scheme would be feasible if only a few trusts were concerned, and not the trust system as a whole. Considering the magnitude of trust-capital and the scattered, small-bulk nature of non-trust capital, the process of forcing ownership of all disintegrated trusts into new hands would ultimately resolve itself into the identical centralized ownership which now exists. While the merger of Union Pacific and Southern Pacific has been severed, a new merger has actually resulted—the practical merger of Union Pacific and Baltimore & Ohio. Prior to the dissolution, Union Pacific held \$32,334,200 B. & O. common, and \$7,206,400 preferred. Under the dissolution plan, U. P. bought about \$40,000,000 of the Pennsylvania's holdings in B. & O. The net result is that U. P. now controls the B. & O. policy. Indeed, the rumor prevails that with this new control and its considerable holdings in Vanderbilt roads, Union Pacific contemplates a trans-continental system. Simultaneously with this bankruptcy of government action, monopoly, or monopolistic centralization, is being indicted from a new source, from within monop-

oly itself; talk of restoring competition has virtually ceased, the new indictment being based on the "scientific" ground of efficiency.

The new economic trend aims not at disintegration or destruction, but at the *readjustment* of centralized capital, of the trust system.

This form of trust indictment developed immaturely a few years ago in the Insurgent movement, typified by La Follette—an indictment made by powerful capitalists against the still more powerful capitalists of monopoly. The Insurgents aimed to restore a competition measured in terms of million-capitals. Judge Gary's testimony a few months ago at the preliminary hearing in the Steel Trust dissolution suit illumines this competition. Discussing with J. P. Morgan the contemplated organization of the U. S. Steel Corporation, Gary stated that fair and reasonable competition, (competition between powerful aggregations of million-capitals such as prevails in the steel industry to-day) was a healthy stimulus, but that ruthless, destructive competition was not only foolish but ultimately reacted upon the competitors.

The Insurgent movement, inevitably, coalesced around Roosevelt. La Follette hostilely concentrated as much as plutocracy; his program was disintegrative and not readjustive. Roosevelt wishes to penalize monopoly's abuses and monopoly itself, but to encourage concentration; his ideal is the steel industry, wherein Trust and "independents" harmoniously cooperate, enjoying the good in concentration and free from the evil in monopoly. This new economic trend is not of political origin, however. Its stimulus is economic, hence it controls politics.

President Mellen's retirement from control of the New Haven transportation system was the first tangible result of this new trend. Mellen was a Morgan-Hill man, loyally supported in all his acts by that combine. Mellen was a disciple of Morgan and his faith in centralization. Morgan sustained Mellen against all attack. But since Morgan's death and the realization in financial circles that his financial satrapy must be cast aside, interests identified with the Morgan group attacked Mellen, and met only with Mellen's individual defense. The attack in financial circles was general. And Mellen was thrust aside. Not Brandeis and public indignation caused Mellen's downfall, but the indifference and opposition of his former friends in Big Business. The New Haven system is now in

process of readjustment, retaining the good in concentration, rejecting the evil in monopoly.

This economic trend is being accelerated from many sources. Secretary of Commerce Wm. C. Redfield, himself a large capitalist, addressing the American Cotton Manufacturers' convention at Washington, April 9, 1913, said:

It is alleged that the trusts are necessary for our industrial efficiency. There has been discussion altogether too brief, on the other hand, as to whether the trusts are as a matter of fact industrially efficient or not. A good many years ago the late Edward M. Shepard said to me that he believed the trust form of organization carried within itself the seeds of its own decay; that its economies were more apparent than real, and that the serious difficulty of obtaining the men who could manage efficiently with firm grasp and thorough control, these great organizations, would itself result in ultimate segregation. We are dealing with the trust in a sense as a national menace, whereas the fact may be that it menaces chiefly itself and the people interested in its securities.

The argument is sound, made against monopoly; unsound, made against concentration. Monopoly does largely depend upon One-Man control. With the passing of financial giants such as Harriman and Morgan, the walls of the Jericho of monopoly threaten to fall.

One-Man control, necessary in monopoly, is a menace in another way. Trust officials use their power for personal profit. This is why economies are often "more apparent than real". Under the head, "Do Trust Officials Secure Indirect Profits?" the *New York Journal of Commerce* of May 22nd last, quoted an authority as saying that a "large mill found that it has been robbed of more than \$200,000 in the purchase of dye-stuffs". There was extravagance in the purchase of practically all other material. "If a dominating executive of a company has a personal interest in concerns that sell supplies to his company, stockholders have not the slightest chance of receiving proper dividends." Concerning a large industrial company whose stock was selling below par, this authority said:

What is needed to secure a change is the selection of a board of directors, who will look after the affairs of the stockholders and will not be content to merely approve arbitrary acts of the president, who has entire control even to the smallest details.

This strikes at the very root of monopoly, at the system of interlocking directorates through which the Morgan interests built up their intricate and gigantic monopoly. Interlocking directorates are inefficient, unwieldy. They are effective, and

even then only temporarily and in a limited sense, when vitalized and integrated by the personality of a Morgan. Interlocking directorates promote industrial inefficiency, are an industrial menace. Their only justification lies in financial control, in monopoly.

Since monopoly does not promote industrial efficiency, its only value lies in ultimate control of prices. Until that control actualizes, industrial efficiency and profits are sacrificed. That was the Mellen-New Haven policy. In his efforts to monopolize New England's transportation, Mellen sacrificed and lowered dividends, acquired control of competing water lines, bought up trolley systems, grasped connecting railroad lines far beyond his field of operation, and paid exorbitant prices for virtually useless properties; a process that, as one financial paper phrased it, "can only be justified in the event of monopoly being established to an extent that will permit monopolistic rates to be charged". Recent events have shattered this dream of monopoly. We are at the threshold of a period when the federal government will regulate rates and prices. This regulation is welcomed by much of Big Business. Says *Financial America* (July 10, 1913): "Were it possible to substitute to-day the authority of the federal government over interstate carriers exclusively, it is an almost certain conclusion that few, if any, railroad officials would offer protest".

In the Minnesota rate decision, the United States Supreme Court held that "the authority of the state to prescribe what shall be reasonable charges of common carriers for intrastate transportation unless it be limited by the exertion of the constitutional power of congress, is state-wide". The federal government is supreme:

If this authority of the state be restricted, it must be by virtue of the paramount power of congress over interstate commerce and its instruments; and in view of the nature of the subject a limitation may not be implied because of a dormant federal power, that is, one which has not been exerted, but can only be found in the actual exercise of federal control in such measures as to exclude this action by the state which, otherwise, would clearly be within its province.

Many of the men in Big Business are in favor of government regulation of prices. Mr. Gary of the Steel Trust has repeatedly favored such regulation.

The era of monopoly, of monopolistic centralization, was typified by J. Pierpont Morgan. Upon his death, expressions were

general that with him died the Morgan policy. The *Journal of Commerce* of April 7, said:

A firm believer in centralization, he (Morgan) was probably the last of the old school of financiers who refused to bow to public opinion or to recognize the power behind public opinion to curb monopoly and centralization. . . . There is no jealousy in the feeling that exists in some large banking circles that a successor to J. Pierpont Morgan is not needed.

Moody's Magazine expressed itself thus: "The era of Morgan—that period from the final close of the Civil War, down to within the past year or two—is completed history".

The identification of Morgan with the monopoly now being indicted is illuminating. Morgan was a financier; he neither directly created nor built up any great industry, such as Rockefeller did in Standard Oil. An analysis of the Morgan era in the light of monopoly, an analysis of monopoly in the light of the Morgan era, jointly illumine the new economic trend.

Centralization is financial, the financial unity of many capitals. Centralization may precede concentration, develop concentration, and be itself in turn developed by concentration. Centralization plays an important part in capitalist development. "The world would still be without railroads if it had been obliged to wait until accumulation should have enabled a few individual capitals to undertake the construction of a railroad. Centralization, on the other hand, accomplished this by a turn of the hand through stock companies." (Marx, "Capital", Vol. I, Chap. XXV, Sec. 2.) Centralization accelerates economic expansion, breaks new ground and paves the way for systematic exploitation and development.

Centralization in America built great railroad systems and opened the West to exploitation. Centralization forged the tools which tapped great natural resources, and drew the whole of our continent into the circle of capitalist exploitation. Centralization gave impetus to new industries and supplied the means with which to build up new industries. If this process was accompanied by concentration and economic efficiency, that was partial and incidental—technically inevitable, but subjectively incidental. The primary object was grab, speculation, get-rich-quick. Monopoly was the necessary outcome of this process. The history of Morgan, Vanderbilt, Jay Gould, Harriman, Rockefeller, *et al.*, is a history of grab, speculation, monopoly. New fields of endeavor invite these methods.

The magnates of the Morgan era accomplished mighty results in despite of their methods, the vast natural wealth of America practically compelling such results. Relatively, foreign capitalists, the Germans, for example, accomplished much more. There was small effort to systematize business, or create foreign trade; indeed, America's foreign trade, considering her advantages, is a bagatelle.

In the capitalist scheme of things, this process performed mighty, effective work. Speculative centralization accomplished with almost lightning rapidity what plodding, systematic effort would have by now barely started. But this period is over, the pioneer work done. The extensive or expansive exploitation of the Morgan era is being succeeded by readjustment and intensive exploitation. In a world of superabundant natural wealth, Morgan *et al.* could acquire huge fortunes without considering efficiency or ultimate results. Now, with conservation in the air and the get-rich-quick conditions dead, efficiency and system are to have their inning.

The decline of Wall Street speculation is a symptom of this trend toward systematizing and readjusting the methods and tangled results of the Morgan era. Conditions described in Lawson's "Friday the Thirteenth" are things of the past. Repeatedly of late have financial papers expressed the idea that Wall Street should become, in fact is fast becoming, purely an investment centre. Speculation on a huge scale died with the Morgan era.

Another symptom is the "industrial efficiency" movement. With system and readjustment, intensive methods are to be adopted, and the human unit in production is seen to possess hitherto undreamt of sources of surplus value. And, be it noted, the Steel Trust was a pioneer in this movement.

This readjustive trend in no way contemplates destruction of concentration, rather aims to promote concentration. Senator La Follette's bill to amend the Sherman anti-trust law, introduced in the special session of congress, and defining a trust or "unreasonable restraint" of trade as control of 30 per cent. of the business in the United States in any commodity, was bitterly attacked by interests and papers active in the readjustive move. And Senator Hitchcock's graduated tax amendment to the tariff bill, introduced at the instigation of Attorney General McReynolds and which in practice would tax Big Business out of existence, met with such a storm of opposition that the Senate Democratic caucus was compelled to reject the

amendment. While there is to be a readjustment at the top, industrial concentration must not be interfered with. Tariff reduction and the Democratic threat to investigate and expose concerns trying to recoup their losses by lowering wages will undoubtedly stimulate concentration as the only way to meet new competitive conditions.

How will competition function under the new conditions? Competition will prevail within ever narrower limits. Competition is not dead, nor can original competition be restored. The new competition is between million-capitals. The dissolution of the Tobacco Trust stimulated competition, but the competitive concern immediately organized, the Tobacco Products Co., was capitalized at \$40,000,000. A competitive steel concern, the Southwestern Steel Corporation, incorporated in May this year, was capitalized at \$30,000,000. Recently, trade conditions stimulated production of crude petroleum, and a large number of new concerns were incorporated; but the capitalization almost uniformly exceeded \$1,000,000. Independent oil interests in California, aiming to compete against Standard Oil in refining and marketing light oils, were compelled to organize themselves into an association, thereby limiting untrammelled competition. On June 23, the Pierce Oil Corporation incorporated with nominal capitalization, plans being for an ultimate capitalization of \$40,000,000. Behind this concern are said to be the Rothschild interests who are credited with preparing to start a competitive war on Standard Oil. The Pierce incorporation was preceded early in June by an invasion of the California field by the Rothschild interests.

The steel industry is most typical of concentrated capital. The organization of the Steel Trust was not attended by the vicious and criminal practices of Standard Oil, nor did the Steel Trust attempt to crush its rivals and secure a monopoly. The Steel Trust and independents maintain friendly relations and co-operate. To-day the steel industry is undoubtedly the most efficient concentrated industry. The readjustive process aims to establish similar conditions in all industry: concentration, but not monopoly.

One of the objects of readjustment is to secure harmony between large producers and the end of cut-throat methods. Commenting on certain evidence in the government suit against the United Shoe Machinery Co., *Financial America*, a consistent apostle of concentration, said in its June 7, 1913, issue:

Here, if the conversations are true, we have a concrete illustration of the trust or monopoly in its most blighting and baneful aspect. . . . First, we have an offer by the trust to buy out the offending competitor; second, a threat following the refusal of the trust's terms; third, the "horrible example" of the perverse Parsons person, who rejected the trust's terms; fourth, a delicate reminder that the "blue sky" will be the only covering left to the haughty independent when the trust gets through with him; and, fifth, the reference to the "wheel" upon which the trust breaks its victims. Could anything be more graphic, more persuasive, more deadly convincing of the fate in store for the independent marked out for slaughter? Nothing mealy-mouthed about such "stand and deliver" tactics; not a single wasted word. When one reads such testimony as this, his holiest desire should be a devout longing to see the men responsible for such intimidation contemplating a patch of "blue sky" from a barred cell window; while his every aspiration should be a prayer to strengthen the government's arm in its attempt to strangle monopoly.

Roosevelt years ago sensed this spirit. In an *Outlook* article, more than two years ago, on "The Trusts, The People, And the Square Deal", Roosevelt said:

The letters from and to various officials of the Trust (Tobacco), which were put in evidence, show a literally astounding and horrifying indulgence by the Trust in wicked and depraved business methods—such as the "endeavor to cause a strike in their (a rival business firm's) factory," or the "shutting off the market" of an independent tobacco firm by "taking the necessary steps to give them a warm reception," or forcing importers into a price agreement by causing and continuing "a demoralization of the business for such length of time as may be deemed desirable" (I quote from the letters). A Trust guilty of such conduct should be absolutely disbanded, and the only way to prevent the repetition of such conduct is by strict governmental control, [Roosevelt has since demanded "administrative control"] and not merely by lawsuits.

In an address at Newport, July 2 last, Roosevelt said that "in dealing with big corporations, as in dealing with all business, it is an absolute necessity for us to abandon the utter folly of discriminating against them on the ground of size instead of on the ground of conduct." Roosevelt wishes to penalize the abuses of monopoly, and not concentrated industry itself.

Roosevelt advocates a regulation which would encourage concentration, but eliminate the unfair tactics pursued by plutocrats against lesser rivals. It is not accident that Roosevelt has repeatedly praised the Steel Trust; for this trust practices the Roosevelt idea—harmonious relations with its independent competitors. That is the relation Roosevelt would institute and enforce through "administrative control" of all business. Instead of business centralizing in a Morgan group, or any other private group, business is to centralize in the government through

State Socialism and the control of an administrative despotism. Hand in hand with this goes government regulation and dictation of labor conditions, the chloroforming of proletarian action, and perhaps the legal prohibition of strikes.

The Roosevelt Progressive party program aims at the unity of capitalist interests, the strengthening of capitalist despotism, the crushing of the proletariat. And the economic facts favor that course.

With this political program, based on the new economic development, and the creation of a middle class of stock and bond owners in concentrated capital, all hope of assistance for the Revolution from the bulk of the middle class falls flat. While the conditions make political action on the part of the working class more imperative, seeing that economic issues will assume more and more of a political nature; even more imperative becomes the task of organizing the proletariat into the revolutionary army of integrated Industrial Unionism.

The Problem of Knowledge

By PAUL LAFARGUE

(Translated by Richard Perin)

II.

(Concluded)

The sophistic criticism of the false and variable impressions of the senses has not been refuted and cannot be refuted; every day it is confirmed by countless striking proofs of the unreliability of our senses. It is approved in the popular saying, "There is no disputing about tastes and colors."

Hardly two years ago, Blondot, the famous physicist of Nancy, discovered the N-rays, the presence of which could be ascertained by a bright spot upon a phosphorescent screen; numbers of European and American scientists, as expert experimenters as himself, also saw this bright spot; and yet they finally had to admit that these rays were an optical illusion of the observer. Every man sees the sun shining in brilliant light; those skilled in optics maintain that if an aeronaut could pass beyond the earth's atmosphere, the sun would appear black to him. In order to show that the same object produces different

impressions upon different individuals, a professor of psychology had a clown enter the lecture-room suddenly, turn three or four somersaults and as suddenly withdraw. The professor asked his audience to state what they had just seen, without conferring with each other; no two statements agreed in respect to the movements and the clothing of the clown. The legal testimony of eye and ear witnesses is contradictory unless it has been previously agreed upon; thus in the Steinheil trial ten witnesses, among them six policemen, accustomed to making investigations at the scenes of crimes, gave varying testimony in regard to the position of Steinheil's body; his servant and a neighbor saw it stretched out upon the floor; four policemen found him kneeling and leaning against the door, the fifth saw him with his back turned toward the wall near the washstand, etc. When an historian has but a single piece of evidence, he will make positive statements in regard to an event; but if several documents are in existence, he will be uncertain as to details and often as to the whole. Where is the historian who could untangle the Dreyfus case, which is obscured by so many different kinds of statements? History is not an exact science.

The conceptions of Pure Reason, which to Plato appeared incontrovertibly true, are necessarily erroneous, since they are sense-perceptions transmitted through the brain, when the senses transmit only imperfect impressions to the latter. Pure Reason, to which Kant ascribed all certainty, appears so uncertain that we must examine its conclusions in the light of experience, which, in the judgment of Poincaré, the mathematician, is the only source of truth. Common sense corrects the judgment of Pure Reason. The senses deceive the mind, which in its turn deceives the senses. Therefore Charron wrote triumphantly: "See, how marvellously far man can go with his insight and certainty when the inner and outer world are equally filled with errors and defects, when reason and the senses, the chief tools of science, are mutually misleading."

Public opinion and common sense, which Socrates and Pyrrho in ancient times, Thomas Reid and Royer Collard in modern times, took as their guide, are unreliable also. Both consist primarily of perceptions, which may be deceptive; thus because our vision deceives us as to the size and the path of the sun, public opinion and common sense declared that the sun revolves about the earth, that the earth is the centre of the universe.

The Sophists maintained that different impressions are received by each individual, hence we can create no objective

science. And in reality a science founded only on sense impressions would have a limited validity, it would necessarily be purely subjective, and would vary not only with individuals, but also with the changes which age effects in the senses.

But since, as Le Dantec says, we are still living and our species has not become extinct, the latter must have possessed a more or less perfected and certain minimum of knowledge in order to adapt itself to the natural and social conditions to which it was subjected. This minimum of knowledge must have general validity, since the men of the most various races and countries established state and family institutions, forms of property and methods of production which resembled one another and which were evolved from one another. As the popular proverbs show, which in Vico's opinion always contain the same kernel in different shells, common sense is essentially the same everywhere. But in order that such a similarity in social and economic evolution could occur among all the peoples of the earth, this minimum of knowledge must have increased to the extent to which man broadened his experiences.

This similarity also extends to the animals, and among them leads to the same consequences, for, as Charron says, "there is close relationship and affinity between man and the higher animals." Apparently the supposition, shared also by the Sophists, is correct, that the pupilled eyes of certain vertebrates and the compound eyes of insects, as well as the eyes with arched cornea and strongly convex lens of the short-sighted, see the same objects differently from the eyes of the far-sighted, which are provided with flattened cornea and lens; but that does not prevent them from obtaining a similar knowledge of the outer world, which is exact to the extent that they know how to procure the means of existence, to protect and defend themselves and to rear their progeny. Since they are formed of the same substance, present the same cellular structure, and, in order to sustain and reproduce themselves, must undergo an unlimited number of experiences which are more or less alike, men and animals must have had the same sense impressions and attained to similar knowledge. Hence, for example, it is more than probable that the animals have mastered the first principles of mathematics; a donkey, says Diogenes, knows as well as a mathematician that a straight line is the shortest path to the manger or the water-trough; pigeons do not begin to set until the female has laid two eggs, as though they knew that $1+1=2$; the sheep know the time of day with-

out having learned the conception thereof from Pure Reason, they know as well as the shepherd does when the time has come to return to the stable; chickens have a certain idea of space and prove it by their reluctance to mount to a roost higher than that to which they are accustomed. This idea of space is not inborn with the animals, that is, it is not instinctive; we may, for instance, observe how puppies acquire it. Hence we must admit that in spite of the diversity of the impressions produced among men and animals by the same things, more or less similar ideas are formed by both, since both are made of the same substance. Hence if it is impossible to deny to men and animals a certain minimum of knowledge, we must, with Freycinet, acknowledge "the peculiar approximation (*adéquation*) of the outer world and the intelligence," which Parmenides defined when he said: "The possible alone can be conceived, and the consequence of that is that our art of computation and its various combinations, in other words the language of mathematics, as the human intellect created it, is wonderfully adapted to express the processes of nature. . . . Formulas that had been invented for theoretical speculations proved subsequently to be in exact conformity with natural phenomena, indeed they often express them best." Who could have thought that the proposition: "Spherical surfaces are in direct ratio to the square of their radii" would ever serve as well for the decrease in gravity and in radiating forces; that the series of odd numbers would represent the distances covered by a freely falling body during the separate and successive moments of its fall; that the curves produced when we cut a sphere through planes which have different inclinations to its axis (a discovery made by Apollonius of Perga more than two thousand years ago) would serve Kepler as the basis of his astronomical system? To this Freycinet adds: "It is difficult to see merely a remarkable coincidence in these facts and to ascribe to accident alone so many concurrences. I see therein proof that the human mind and nature obey a definite plan, which in a marvellous fashion enables the mind to understand nature."* Freycinet's plan, which presupposed a God as creator, can be nothing other than the universal composition of matter in the universe, which is everywhere the same; hence animate and inanimate substances are composed of the same elements, and therefore man can understand the world. Berkeley says with justice: "The mind,

* De Freycinet, "*Essai sur la philosophie des sciences*" (1895).

as an immaterial being, cannot perceive material things," but matter endowed with intelligence can perceive them.

This knowledge, even though a minimum, which we cannot deny to man, is not yet science, but merely a preliminary step toward science; if, in order to know the outer world, man had availed himself of his senses only, this knowledge would hardly have advanced further than that of the animals, whose senses are far more perfect, with the exception of the sense of touch, which has been extraordinarily developed by the use of the hand.

Thus, for instance, geometry would not have come into being if man had not invented the rod to measure the length and breadth of fields, instead of estimating them with the eye. The rod used by primitive peoples to measure arable land, which every year was partitioned anew among the families of the gens or of the village, was of such great utility to them that it assumed a mystical character: the peasants of the Russian Mir (village community) called it the "Holy Rod" and kept it in the church; the Egyptians chose the ell, the unit of measure for the division of arable land, as the hieroglyphic symbol of truth and justice; everything measured by it was just and true.

A piece of wood, a rod, takes the place of one of the senses: from that time on the length and breadth of a field was no longer a mere perception of the eye, uncertain and variable according to the individual; that which it measures is true and just, and there is no further occasion for disputes as at the time when it was estimated by the eye.

We know the properties of things by the impressions which they make on us: it is through sense impressions that we first come in contact with the outer world, and during childhood they form our only means of knowing things. The savages use them almost exclusively, hence the superiority of their senses. But the properties of things exert an influence not only upon our senses, but also upon inanimate bodies. The weight of a thing makes itself perceptible upon the scale as well as in our hands; its hardness, its temperature, its luminosity, etc., affect inanimate bodies as well as our animate bodies; hence we may define the properties of a thing as its inherent power of exerting an influence upon animate and inanimate bodies.

The sensitiveness of inanimate bodies is even more delicate than that of animate bodies; thus the former are caused to vibrate by the Hertzian waves of wireless telegraphy, which we cannot notice at all; we would be unable to distinguish the degrees of hardness of the various kinds of steel if we merely

used our senses and not the Brinell measuring apparatus in Keep's drill. The result is that we can avail ourselves of the sensitiveness of inanimate bodies in order to learn the properties of things: a column of quicksilver, for instance, to measure the temperature, litmus paper to ascertain whether a liquid is acid or basic, and so on. Hence, Kant and the Neo-Kantians are guilty of a grave error when they assert that we know, and can know, the properties of things only through the impression of our senses.

Therefore it is no longer the uncertain and variable perceptions of men which form the basis of our knowledge, but the certain and invariable influence upon inanimate bodies; although formerly it was impossible to know the temperature of the air with exactness, as long as we were limited to the uncertain and variable impressions upon human senses, we have been able to ascertain it exactly since the sensitiveness of quicksilver indicated it to us. Two astronomers who observe the same star will make different drawings of it, while the photographic plate, the "retina of scientists" as Jansen calls it, presents an exact picture. Since photography has the advantage over the eye of eliminating all subjectivity and of preserving faithfully the imprints of the impressions acting upon it, it is replacing to an ever increasing extent observations by the naked eye. Maneuvrier's little apparatus, which is based on the fact that electrical resistance is proportional to the aqueous contents of a mixture, reveals to us far better than the tongue of the most experienced gourmand whether a wine is diluted or not. Analysis by freezing enables us to determine exactly, by the amount of ice formed, how much water has been added to milk, and to diagnose the state of health of an unseen milch cow, which would be impossible to the most skilled veterinary. Man has only learned the tone of his own voice since the invention of the phonograph, and even then he does not recognize it, for he hears it, as others hear it, without the resonance of his head.

The exact knowledge, universally valid because always the same, which we gained by the substitution of inanimate nature for our senses, enables the physician to diagnose disease by its aid, the psychologist to employ it in the study of the psychical properties of the ego. Socrates said: "Know thyself!" and modern man adds: "with the aid of inanimate matter."

Wherever possible science is substituting inanimate things for the senses of the scientists. In many sciences this substi-

tution has been completed: the chemist employs none of his senses to learn the properties of the sulphuric acid or other bodies which he analyzes or combines; we could endow him with a new sense or deprive him of one of the old ones without altering his scientific knowledge, for this is not based upon the perceptions of the senses, which are subject to errors and variations, but upon the knowledge of matter through inanimate matter, which is subject to no errors and variations.

Industrial production, which at one time was in advance of science, must now follow limping after: as long as its control was dependent upon human senses it was unreliable; in spite of the most thorough training there was often no plausible explanation at all of false or poor manufacture. Reliability was not attained until we had recourse to every possible kind of recording apparatus, from the simplest (thermometer, manometer, etc.) to the most complicated (voltmeter, amperemeter, pyrometer, calorimeter, etc.).

The substitution of the sensitiveness of matter for human impressions, which enables us to learn temperature by the degrees upon the column of quicksilver, tone by the number of acoustic vibrations per second, etc., transforms that which is quality for men into quantity with respect to matter. This transformation enables us to replace phenomena by numerical proportions, and alters the nature of our knowledge. The qualitative knowledge of a thing is knowledge of it in respect to men; the quantitative knowledge of it is knowledge with respect to other things. The principle of subjectivity, the starting point of the subjective philosophy of the bourgeoisie, is replaced by the principle of objectivity.

Even when they do not mislead us, the senses only furnish us with an extremely limited knowledge of things, revealing to us only some of their properties; for instance, the eye does not perceive one-tenth of the solar spectrum; its receptive power is far below that of inanimate matter; where the eye of the astronomer is unable to penetrate the darkness in the empty space which Herschel described as a "coal-sack," the photographic plate reveals new constellations and scattered cosmic matter; the more sensitive photographic plates become, the more extended does astronomic knowledge become, knowledge of even the most secret depths of the heavens.

The limits of the sensitiveness of matter are unknown to us; that of scientific instruments is restricted, and yet it becomes finer from day to day. The thermometer, which could hardly

measure 100 degrees, left us in ignorance in regard to phenomena which the bolometer has made plain to us; this instrument, which is based upon the electrical resistance of metals under the influence of heat and which can indicate the millionth part of a degree, showed us that the solar spectrum is much more extensive than was supposed. Scientific knowledge does not advance in proportion to the perfection of our senses, but in proportion as the methods for utilizing the sensitiveness of inanimate matter become more general and as the apparatus of research and control become more numerous and more sensitive.

However, the knowledge of things will always be incomplete, on account of the lack of perfection of our senses and of the instruments which replace them, and on account of the methods which we must employ in our investigations.

No object is entirely independent of the outer world; it is determined by the coincidence of an infinite number of conditions and accompanying circumstances; it never remains the same; influenced in an infinite variety of ways by its environment, it is in a state of constant change; in order to study it, we must regard it as entirely independent of its environment, as invariable, and must test its properties one after another. The abstract sciences have all struck out along the same road: it was possible to obtain the objects of their studies, the point, the line, the surface, numbers, only by separating them from their environment and depriving them of their physical properties, in order to transform them into imaginary entities, devoid of objective reality and only existent in the mind of him who conceives them.* For this reason the theoretical deductions of mathematics, which do not depend upon the senses, are not subject to the errors of the senses, and since they are logically constructed they have universal validity, because they correspond to the universal laws of human reason; hence the geometries of Euclid, Lobatschewsky and Riemann, although they are mutually contradictory, are accepted as true by mathematicians, for their propositions form strictly logical systems.

The natural sciences, which substitute instruments for the senses, are as universally valid as the abstract sciences, since

* Savages do not distinguish between object and number; they consider number to be a property of the object, just as civilized men consider heat, electricity and light; later on number becomes separated from objects, so that it becomes an abstract, imaginary being, which is treated like an object. Point, line and surface are in the same manner separated from the body of which they are properties; the point is deprived of three dimensions, the line of two, and the surface of one.

the scientist does not analyze his impressions; he studies the actions of things, not upon his senses, but upon other things; he records them and classifies them in order to deduce from them theoretical conclusions and possibilities of practical utilization; he examines the influences of things, not upon his senses, but upon other things. Knowledge was subjective as long as it was based upon the results of the perceptions of our senses, it became objective so soon as it was based on the facts furnished us by the objects. The incisive and incontrovertible criticism of the Greek philosophers, who undermined the foundations of subjective knowledge, cannot affect objective knowledge.

The Sophists, the pitiless destroyers of subjective knowledge, with an incomprehensible inconsistency took men, whose knowledge they denied, as the measure of all things, and abandoned the old objective natural philosophy, in order to found the subjective philosophy of the bourgeoisie. The men of science who created the objective knowledge of nature, thus returning to the philosophy of the ancients which was despised by the bourgeois philosophers, are to-day working toward a new and grandiose natural philosophy.

The Pale Laugh

By K. E. PRIMUS-NYMAN

How vividly can I yet remember the first time I read Leonid Andreyev's "The Red Laugh". I was but a child then, but the Red Laugh became part of my imagination; it became the Great Drama of Life that I wanted to see and to study and to feel. The horrors of the Red Laugh did not frighten me, they struck me by their intense power, and they appealed to my mind by their melancholy.

* * *

I had plenty of chances both to see and to hear the Red Laugh. Each time I witnessed its violent outbursts I was forced to rejoice at the volcanic powers that lay hidden at the bottom of the human soul and that could burst out when you least expected their appearance. For there is no more impressive scene than when a human soul is set aflame, and when it knows not its owner, nor time, nor surroundings. No acting, no painting, no music is greater than wild, unconscious Life.

But I saw laughter that I could not hear, laughter that I could

not understand, laughter whose inner meaning for a long time remained a mystery to me.

* * *

The Pale Laugh.

The first time I gave it this name I was brought as a prisoner through a large gallery in a Russian prison. Many of my unhappy comrades, working in the gallery, watched me closely with their eyes. They were not allowed to say a word, or even to make a sign, but as I passed them their lips formed something that resembled a smile. That resembled. . . For it was only the muscles in their white faces that were distorted into a ghastly smile.

The Pale Laugh. . . It was a greeting of a prisoner, nay, the greeting of all the prisoners. . . A greeting that meant pity, mockery, and pride.

The first prisoner I met smiled at me in this way. I had never seen him before, nor did he interest me, but I felt how my lips formed like his. Evidently I smiled too.

The Pale Laugh. . .

* * *

One night I was strolling around in one of London's darkest slums in East End. It was a narrow lane between two rows of grey, mouldy houses. Here and there the way was barred by old, broken furniture or rags that had been thrown out into the street. And there at their side sat dark, human figures, praying, moaning, cursing. . . They had had no money to pay for their filthy, little dens, no more furniture or other belongings of any value to pawn, no power to resist. . . It was a late autumn evening, and a damp, frosty wind whistled through the lane, causing the people to seek shelter behind old corners or barricades of furniture. And there they were sitting in the darkness, their teeth chattering, and talking in low whispers. But the wind carried their moanings with it, and at the end of the street it seemed to me that I was listening to a hymn, arising out of the lowest depths. . .

It was hideous to listen to that hymn, it was hideous to view all the misery of that lane, but at its end, quite close to the river, where a yellow mist rose like an impenetrable wall, the very worst sight met my eyes. Leaning against a red brick wall sat a thin, disfigured woman, trying to shield a weeping baby under her ragged shawl, too small even to give her herself shelter against the cold. All her belongings were stowed down in a box,

besides which she only possessed the three-legged chair, upon which she was sitting.

I had expected she would beg for a coin as I passed her by. She said not a word. She only drew the shawl closer round herself and her baby. It seemed to me as if she wanted to show that they stood alone in this world. . . . And when I laid down a silver coin in her meagre, bony hand she only stared at me for a few seconds. Perhaps she tried to speak—it is difficult to say,—but her lips were drawn into a smile, disdainful and appalling, although she only tried to express her thanks.

It was a yellow, sickly smile—it was the Pale Laugh. . . .

* * *

We sat, one evening, a few buoyant youths, at one of London's gayest variety theatres. From our side table we had a good view of the "Promenade", where the stars amongst London's swell demimondes walked to and fro. I do not remember how long we sat there, criticising the extravagant dresses, the swinging ostrich feathers, the gaily colored stockings, and the small satin shoes of the demimondes, when one of them suddenly crawled up to our table. She was dressed like the others, extravagantly, tastelessly. But she had not red lips like them, and her cheeks were white. Red paint would only have shown off her pale face with the deep, hollow eyes. At the first glance you could see that she was suffering from a dangerous disease.

It was evident that she wanted to join our table. But her look was appalling, and one of us cried out, scornfully.

"What do you want here? Go away! You are ill!"

She remained standing, and she reminded me of a whipped dog. Her lips moved as if in a whisper of defense, but when she saw our reluctant looks she burst out into a short, soundless laugh. It reflected, however, all the horror, humiliation, and submission to fate that must have dwelt at the bottom of her soul.

The whole evening that same sickly smile remained on her lips. It looked like the smile of Death, but it was only the Pale Laugh.

* * *

Many faces have I seen lit up by that devilish smile, but clearest of them all I remember one smile that never will go out of my memory.

It was early one morning at one of London's night restaurants. At a table some drunken people had been enjoying themselves since midnight. The clock was three when they moved. For three hours a sleepy waiter had been running to and fro be-

tween the tables, trying to do his best to please everybody. And he had come to this place directly from another restaurant, which closed at midnight. He had a family to support, and he worked bravely day and night for their daily bread.

But every time he passed that table, where the drunken people revelled, the little waiter was insulted by one of them, a big, fat, reddish man. And when they finally went, and the waiter was busy collecting the few coppers they had left, the fat man spat him in the face. I had expected a disturbance, but without a word of protest the poor, little fellow wiped his face. And when he nodded a last farewell to them, a tired, subdued smile still lay on his lips.

That time I understood the meaning of the Pale Laugh.

It is the laugh of the slave.

Whirling Wheels

By LOUISE W. KNEELAND

The whirling tire and the primeval forest; the cool insolence of the comfortable rich and the agonized shrieks of tortured rubber gatherers; the long tentacles of the octopus of capitalism, reaching into hitherto unexploited regions with fiendish rapacity and lust—these are some of the pictures brought before one in Comrade W. E. Hardenburg's account of his trip down the Putumayo.*

This is a book that fills one with terror for the wretched civilization that is not content with damning itself, but must reach out into every unprotected country and seize upon its helpless inhabitants to exploit them with unutterable cruelty and greed insatiate.

Forty thousand native inhabitants of the South American forest in the region of the Putumayo driven to their death by the most atrocious tortures and unremitting labor in rubber gathering. Ten thousand still in the toils of this modern business enterprise, bent only on the profit to be made out of human

* The Putumayo: The Devil's Paradise, by W. E. Hardenburg. T. Fisher Unwin, London. 10s. 6d. net.

flesh. Such is the record. What can one say under the circumstances but that it is better to have forty thousand dead and ten thousand living than that there should be forty thousand living and ten thousand dead.

Here is something more ghastly than even our tenements. These pages cry aloud to heaven. They cry aloud to all with any spark of pity or of shame for unheard of offenses committed against a helpless people. And yet this narrative is but one of many chapters in the long history of the ruthless enslavement of the masses by capitalism. Capitalist exploitation begins with the expropriation of the workers from their original means of subsistence, the soil, and a brutal exercise of power over the dispossessed. Whether in feudal Europe and England or in the wilds of South America the method is the same, first the worker is robbed of his means of subsistence, driven from the land, and then is bound a helpless victim to the whirling wheels of wage-slavery.

The atrocities committed in the Valley of the Amazon in the Putumayo district have their prototypes in those of England during those tragic centuries when the English tillers of the soil were dispossessed by the owners of the large estates and driven in ever increasing numbers to the towns to be ground into profits by the rapidly developing industry of the bourgeoisie. That the aborigines of the South American forests are utilized in the more primitive occupation of furnishing raw material is but an accident of time and place. They are dispossessed and enslaved by the same power that engulfed the working-class of England at the close of the feudal era, and the penalties in England in the sixteenth century for refusal to work are practically the same as those inflicted upon the Putumayo Indians on their failure to accomplish their allotted tasks, *i. e.* flogging, semi-starvation, chains, mutilation and death. Only the more hideous forms of torture were lacking and the absolutely diabolical delight in human suffering now found in the Putumayo. The pouring of kerosene over human beings and setting it on fire in order to enjoy the screams and agonized writhings of the burning victims is something which twentieth century capitalism has to its credit. The accounts of these terrible acts make frightful reading, but as publicity is one of the most effective weapons in the protection of these victims it becomes an imperative duty to acquaint oneself with these facts and to pass the knowledge on to others.

Comrade Hardenburg's clear and smoothly-flowing English,

however, is a pleasure in itself and leads one to hope that sometime in the future he will give us another book on a happier subject. His appeal at the close of his narrative is to the people of England (since English capitalists took part in this enterprise) to free the remaining Indians from their cruel bondage and to punish the authors of their sufferings. But the appeal should rather be made to the working class of the civilized world. It is they who hold the future in their hands. It is they who must free not only themselves, but also their helpless brothers of the Putumayo.

Max Eastman's Two Books

By GRACE POTTER

As a matter of theory many Socialists give joy its place in the scheme of things; we know it is the aim of existence. But there are so many paths of joy denied us! We necessarily think much about these denials of our happiness. We combat in word and deed every such denial; so only is society changed. But this combat has also, at times, other effects, not desirable. It develops in us a habit of ignoring the joy that lies under our very hands and eyes, waiting our acceptance. It develops in us a habit of ignoring the profound importance to our own development which all possible joy bears, and our right to this joy. In working for the happiness of others to-morrow we forget the happiness that belongs to ourselves to-day. So when we read in the preface to the "Enjoyment of Poetry",* Max Eastman's simple statement, "The purpose of this book is to increase enjoyment", it sounds unbelievably good.

The book fulfills its promise. It helps to get more beauty and more joy out of life. If you are a "practical" person do not let the book's title mislead you into thinking the book has nothing to offer you. If you have little time for literature, do not think that the enjoyment of poetry is not for you. By poetry Max Eastman means a certain attitude toward life. And in writing of this attitude he has really succeeded in putting into

* The Enjoyment of Poetry, by Max Eastman. Chas. Scribners' Sons, New York. \$1.25.

words a suggestion of the value of the spirit of adventure which can color and sweeten every life that opens freely to it.

The poetry of the commonest street scene, of a birth or a death, the poetry of all our emotions, of the simplest conversation, that it is to which these pages refer. Eastman believes that everyone has poetic capacity, even the most practical. What he tries to indicate is that the fully developed human being is poetic and practical, too. To be poetic is to love the quality of things, to enjoy experience for itself, not to be engaged in adjusting yourself to your environment, but in getting acquainted with it. Practicality is "to be controlled in your action by the consideration of ends yet unattained" Because the joy of doing is so often and so well eulogized, it is only lightly touched upon here, but the few paragraphs devoted to it give grace and balance to all the rest

Children are most poetic, and in bringing up a child Eastman cautions (it seems perfectly proper here to refer to the fact that the author is a father, not an inexperienced, meddling bachelor!) that the greatest pains should be taken to preserve the youthful capacity for "pleasure in every poignant realization" This capacity makes the poet.

They who turn all their time and mind to one intense realization, as drug fiends do, as well as those who have decayed into the "tickle-brain" condition which belongs to the ineffectuals who believe themselves endowed with the "artistic temperament," can know nothing of the joy that is the portion of them who "live variously as well as vividly in the present".

Because poetic appreciation is so largely a growth of leisure, the author believes that for the many it is a thing of the future. Few among the poor, except the best rebels, may attain it. A love of respectability is a bar absolute, for respectability is fearing the opinion of others. Freed from the common fetters of respectability, you may develop a mental-condition where poetic feeling is possible. There you may come into "realization" and be alive with your world to-day. And though that will mean pain as well as pleasure, it will mean to "increase enjoyment" in the sense of increasing your growth as an individual and giving you a fuller existence. Taste life, says Eastman, all mental, spiritual and physical states, "for that is what it is to be" Robert Louis Stevenson had in mind the value of poetic capacity and the futility of respectability when he wrote, "To know what you prefer instead of simply saying

amen to what the world tells you you ought to prefer, is to have kept your soul alive." Because leisure is necessary for poetry and respectability a menace to it, "they who cherish hopes of poetry", says Eastman, "will do well to favor in their day every assault of labor upon the monopoly of leisure by a few. They will be ready for a drastic redistribution of the idle hours."

Poetry has a practical value, too. When a man would influence others, a new power is given to his message if he can vivify his ideas poetically. The poet, John Reed, saw this when he conceived and carried out the colossal undertaking of the pageant of the Paterson strike in Madison Square Garden this summer. There on a stage before us, 1,000 of the Paterson strikers lived again the Paterson struggle. First we saw the mill, stretching its black stories menacing to the sky. Its windows were lit, its whistles blowing. We watched the still sleepy men, women and children, with their coat collars turned up to keep out the chill of the early morning—it was in February the strike began—we watched them swallowed, one by one, through the mill's hungry door. Then the unending whirr of iron-hearted machinery began. It seemed to us, waiting out there in the audience, that the machinery was grinding those workers to pieces. We thought of industrial accidents and diseases, of how the terrible toil sucked all life, all initiative out of the workers. They were dying inside that mill and worse than dying, and it was the same all over the world. We held our breath. And then—something happened. The machinery stopped grinding. A faint free cry rises slowly to deafening hosannas from a thousand throats as the workers rush from the mill. They wave their hands, they shout, they dance, they embrace each other in a social passion that pales individual feeling to nothing. They are a mad mob, glad and beautiful in their madness. They sing the Marseillaise. The strike is on! It is the carnage of oppression lifting itself at last to the heights. Here and there, from the balcony, the boxes, and the great main floor, the sound of sobbing that was drowned in singing proved that the audience had "got" Paterson. You will read in Eastman's book that "the madness of poets is the most efficacious state of being that this world offers. Madmen are strong. They mould history and the earth."

The rhythm in poetry is the effort to hypnotise into concentration upon the subject that is to be poetically treated. With the lulling wave lengths regularly recurring, with the periodically insistent rhyme too, perhaps, we are kept in a condition of

ecstatic appreciation, so that "to read in practical language is to be told, but to read in poetry is to learn by experience."

This is the beautiful epitome of the whole plea for the poetry of life with which the book closes:

"Man . . . has now learned that morals is not meant for a scourge and a dry medicine, and that joy is its own reason. Existence was not perpetrated in malice or benevolence, but simply is, and the end of our thinking is that here we are and what can we make of it. We have a planet to act upon, a sense of the drama. We will not squat and argue, nor balk and try to justify God, but we will make with high hearts of abandon our entrance and our exit before the congregation of the stars."

A former lecturer on logic and the psychology of beauty at Columbia University, editor of *The Masses*, which aims to be the artistic exponent of the practical Socialist movement, Max Eastman has blended these activities in a coherent whole in the two books he has published this year.

"Child of the Amazons,"* a collection of poems, seems to be much of it earlier work than the "Enjoyment of Poetry." There are in it passages of real beauty and also the large social vision without which to-day any artist's work seems tasteless.

The title poem symbolizes the feminist movement by revealing the struggle in the heart of a girl who is given the choice between a life of subjection with her lover, and a life of free activity without him. Of these alternatives she chooses the latter.

For if it is an excellence to bear,
Then it is a thing prior, more divine,
To be.

But she chooses with a protest against the necessity of such a choice and she prophesies the day when there shall be no conflict between the impulse to live and the impulse to love in a woman's heart. She prays she may help to

—lay the regal hand
Of man upon thy law to alter it;
To herald the far age when men shall cease
Their tyranny, Amazons their revolt,
Renouncing each a sad unnatural dream,
They shall go forth together to subdue
Unto their symmetry the monstrous world,
And with the night lie down in powerful union.

Man's love of life is an old theme of poets, but only one who sees that woman and man are equally human could have so voiced woman's feeling and thought about life:

* Child of the Amazons, and Other Poems, by Max Eastman; Mitchell Kennerley, New York. \$1.00.

O, I love to live!—

The task and the adventure, toil and rest,
And mirth, and the hot news of accident!
I love to live, impetuous, for joy
And woe, a life of action unto God!
Triumphantly I choose it! I renounce
My wish of love, my hope, my fruitful years!
For who would be the consort of a king,
Subduer of the earth, and be subdued?
Who would bring into this heroic world
A child, before she had gone forth to prove
That she herself was equal to the world?
Too long the heirs of man content themselves
With a divided portion. I will never
Be the idle ornament of time
Futile and pale and foreign to the earth,
Nor with a weak and fluent life dilute
The heritage of those bright heroes who
Shall yet subdue the world.

"Use of Troops in Civil Disturbances"

By NABOTH HEDIN.

In the lobby of the aristocratic Union League Club of Brooklyn is a piece of statuary, the base of which bears the following inscription, "Presented to the Union League Club of Brooklyn by the Twenty-Second Regiment N. Y. N. G., in acknowledgment of the courtesies extended to the regiment during the trolley strike of January, 1895."

The Union League Club is headquarters of the silk stocking Republicans of Brooklyn. On its list of members are the names not only of office holders and professional politicians, but also of the leading manufacturers of Brooklyn, and of the owners of the trolley lines on which the workers had gone on a strike. In short, it is one of the headquarters of the capitalist interests of the community.

The cold days of January, 1895, are recalled by all old Brooklynites as the time when the blood of the strikers ran freely through the streets of the "City of Churches and Homes". The men had gone on a strike for better wages and for their union. The usual thugs were imported to run the cars, and when the picketing strikers interfered, the State Militia was called in by the capitalist owners. The police force of the old City of Brooklyn was an independent body of men, and they were suspected of too much sympathy with the strikers to do the dirty work required by the railroad companies. It is not known that the clergy of the city raised their hands in protest.

In a few days the State Militia, "The Citizen Soldiers," had two murders on their consciences. A man named Henry Ahn was shot down in cold blood by a member of the "Swell" Seventh Regiment of Manhattan. It was given out as an excuse that the man had been caught in an attempt to cut down some telegraph wires in East New York. Instead of being arrested, if the charge had been true, he was just shot on the spot. The other victim of the "citizen soldiers" was Thomas

Kearney, whose offense was that, not daring to look out through the windows of his home, he had climbed up on the roof. A member of a Brooklyn Regiment, the Thirteenth, did the brave act of drawing a bead on his fellow townsman, shooting him dead. The excuse given out by the colonel of the regiment was that brick bats had been thrown from roofs at the brave soldiers so frequently that the mere appearance of a man on a roof justified killing him on the spot.

Much more recently the "glorious" Twenty-third Regiment of Brooklyn was sent on strike duty at Albany and Troy, where Anthony N. Brady, the same man that controlled the Brooklyn street railways, also owned the trolley lines. That was May 8, 1901, and it was not many days before the young soldier boys had committed a double murder. Perversely enough it was not two strikers that were shot down, but two substantial middle class merchants that had thought it safe to watch "the soldier boys" give it to the strikers from the doorways of their own shops. That of course was too bad, and there was talk of indicting the guardsmen for the deeds they had done in helping Mr. Brady put down the strike. But it would be a thankless job to commit murder for a capitalist that does not also control the judicial machinery of the place, and the indictment talk came to nothing.

The still more recent work of the state militia in the Lawrence strike is known to all. Instead of charging with murder the men who did the killing, the labor leaders, who had been nowhere near the scene, were locked up and rendered "immune" for the time being. The Buffalo strike, where a Supreme Court Justice took it upon himself to summon the militia, when the Governor of the State wouldn't do it (which indicates that after all the judges are the most reliable servants of the capitalists), is another object lesson of the "Use of Troops in Civil Disturbances."

The title borrowed for this article is one used in the first issue of the *Militia Journal* of New York State, that for November-December of last year. It is the caption of an article by Colonel C. H. Hitchcock of the First Infantry, N. Y. N. G., and by virtue of its frankness of tone and naivete generally this article by the brave colonel is truly delightful. It deserves a wider reading than it is likely to get through the *Militia Journal*, the publication of which was discontinued after the first number, as its founder, Adjutant General William Verbeck, the friend of Governor Dix, was unceremoniously displaced by Governor Sulzer.

"State troops are sometimes called upon in aid of the civil authorities during labor difficulties," writes Colonel Hitchcock, "and for this reason it is proper to invite attention to a few considerations of special application to such occasions. The authorities that have written on the subject of such duty have almost always assumed that something like a state of insurrection existed, or at least that a riotous mob bent on violence was to be attacked, subdued, and dispersed. This is not always, or even often, the case. Occasions when there is a necessity for the employment of actual force would be fewer still if the situations were better understood and handled with *tact and good judgment*."

"Our laboring people, particularly those of native birth, are as a rule as law-abiding and orderly as any class of our population. They do not lose these characteristics all at once when on a strike, if treated

with tact, moderation and strict and impartial justice. This fact is sometimes lost sight of in dealing with them."

This is quite a startling concession from the colonel of a state militia regiment. But he goes even further than that. He even admits that the people of a city where there is a strike have the right of free speech and lawful assembly.

"When important industries are involved," continues the article, "it frequently happens that a large number of people, accustomed to being busily employed, are all at once without occupation for their time. They naturally and inevitably frequent the streets and public places in large numbers. They have a common topic of absorbing interest to think about and discuss. It is so important to them and their welfare that feeling often runs high. It is natural, and not in itself in any way wrong, for them to meet in public places and discuss their interests, and to take such peaceable measures in concert as they think will conduce to the success of their cause. The great majority of the people concerned on these occasions are disposed to be orderly and law-abiding, and intend no acts of violence."

"There is, however, in every community a lawless and irresponsible element, small in numbers, but a potent factor for mischief. These persons are often in no way connected with the difficulty. They find in the public excitement and in the crowds that are easily gathered their opportunity, and are active in promoting disorder. Under such circumstances crowds are often formed that obstruct traffic and become disorderly without any intent to do harm or break the peace."

"It is a part of the psychology of a crowd that it is subject to sudden impulses,—the more if it is dominated by some strong common feeling of anger or sense of injury. It is very easy to convert such a crowd, or in fact any crowd on an occasion of public excitement, into a riotous mob capable of going to extremes, and that cannot be dispersed without difficulty."

There we have almost the whole cat out of the bag. One would think it was a labor agitator and not a colonel of a state militia regiment that was explaining the causes of so-called strike riots. But Colonel Hitchcock goes further. He even advocates that troops should be absolutely neutral in labor strifes, and on this topic it appears that his military conscience is far from clear.

"It is of the greatest importance that the true mission of the troops should be early and correctly understood [continues his article in the *Militia Journal*]. It will be found that the opinion is too common that the troops are summoned in the interest of the employer and against that of the employee. This idea is false and mistaken, *but circumstances lend it the color of truth oftener than they should*. The officer in command should at once do what he can to disabuse the public mind of any such theory. *He should studiously avoid even the appearance of taking sides with either party to the difference*. (Note, the word "strike" is not used once.)

"It is sometimes imperatively necessary to quarter the troops in the buildings or on the property they are to guard, but when tactical considerations and the weather permit they should be quartered in public buildings or under their own canvas on neutral property."

"Unless unavoidable, there should be no actual or visible dependence upon the employer for supplies or accommodations of any kind."

If necessary to use the buildings or grounds of the employer, or supplies furnished by him, there appears to be no reason why compensation should not be made to him the same as to one wholly outside the controversy. The entire actual and *apparent independence* of the military force may thus be secured *and the appearance of a partisan attitude avoided.*"

To Colonel Hitchcock's diplomatic mind it is evidently well that that little tell-tale piece of statuary, mentioned in the first paragraph of this article, is hidden within the walls of the Union League Club. If exposed in a public place, its inscription might put too many people "wise."

Colonel Hitchcock goes even further and recommends that militia men on strike duty consult not only the employer, but also the strikers. "In most of these disputes," he writes, "there is a responsible head, usually a committee in charge of the interests of the employees. The earliest practicable opportunity should be taken by the officer in command, in conjunction with the responsible civil officer, for a conference with this committee, and a full explanation of the neutral attitude of the troops and of their actual and proper mission in the preservation of order should be given. The men on such committees are usually men of keen intelligence who will appreciate the attention and what is said to them."

After making this liberal concession to the strike leaders' intelligence, Colonel Hitchcock even goes so far as to advocate civility towards the strikers. "Rudeness, incivility, and unnecessary harshness," he says, "will often bring about conditions which the military force is endeavoring to prevent and forestall. The operation of pickets, often employed, will sometimes come under the observation of troops; and sometimes there may be an importation of others to work, resulting in occurrences that may seem to complicate the situation for the military officer and for the soldiers under his command. But with these matters and with all others which are part and parcel of the industrial situation the troops have nothing whatever to do so long as either party acts within the law."

Instead of boasting of the number of murders committed by militia men on strike duty, Colonel Hitchcock points out that peaceful and orderly methods have their glories no less renowned than those of war. "An officer in command on duty of this nature deserves far less credit for putting down disorders by force," he writes. "There never can be any question over the ability of an armed and disciplined body of troops to overcome a mob by the force of arms. Force must at times be employed and should be employed without doubt or hesitation to any extent necessary to secure the supremacy of lawful authority; but the occasions for its employment will be extremely rare if methods of strict impartiality, justice and moderation are followed, and success by these means is far more praiseworthy and leaves nothing to regret."
