

A MATERIALISTIC CONCEPTION OF "GOOD WILL"

If good will alone could "make" a magazine, the NEW REVIEW would be self-supporting. The good will attests the merits of the NEW REVIEW; the fact that we are *not* self-supporting proves that our friends are not capitalizing this good will for us.

George Cram Cook, in the Chicago *Evening Post*, says of the NEW REVIEW: "The June number came with such live criticism—some hard-hitting, some penetrative—that I was reminded of the month-old announcement, and read it again with the mental comment: Perhaps they are going to 'make it indispensable.'"

Many of our readers are sending in expressions of praise and good will, succinctly summed up by Miss Sophia Christensen: "I don't want to miss a copy of the magazine."

You are convinced of the merits of the NEW REVIEW—*why not convince others of the merits*, and get them to read the "indispensable Socialist magazine"?

Capitalize your good will. Co-operate with us. Send us subscriptions. And do not forget financial contributions.

Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, the famous Feminist, has accepted membership in our Advisory Council. Mrs. Gilman's acute intellect and aggressive personality are a distinct asset to the NEW REVIEW.

The NEW REVIEW must be made self-supporting and permanent. One Dollar a month for one year from two hundred readers will help us "make good."

NOW WE'LL DIP INTO THE FUTURE.

A future holding in store a rare treat for NEW REVIEW readers—and which you should unselfishly share with non-readers by getting them to subscribe.

First of all, our August issue will contain a symposium on "Feminism," in which representative Feminists will discuss the many phases of their movement and philosophy. We are preparing to distribute this issue among the women's organizations: won't you help?

In the September issue appears another symposium—"Problems Which Confront the Socialist Movement." Charles Edward Russell has already contributed a very interesting article for the symposium; other men in-

vited to contribute include Eugene V. Debs, Victor Berger and Frank Bohn. And there'll be a wealth of other interesting material in these issues. *The NEW REVIEW is indispensable!*

We gave The Tinsely Co. a circular letter to multigraph for the Workers' Defense Conference which is fighting the Tanenbaum conviction; and The Tinsely Co. wrote us: "Will you accept the work from us as a contribution towards obtaining young Mr. Tanenbaum's release, as we are heartily in sympathy with your movement. If we can aid you further by such work in your efforts, it will be a pleasure for us so to contribute."

UP MUST GO OUR CIRCULATION.

There was such a small answer to this appeal printed in our last issue that we reprint it for the sake of emphasis:

We cannot succeed without *your* support—you are the arbiter of our destiny!

There are three ways you can help us in our circulation plans:

1.—If you are a member of a Socialist local, get the local to order a bundle of NEW REVIEWS monthly—if only for free distribution among the members. It'll pay! (Bundle orders six cents a copy, non-returnable.)

2.—Send in the names of friends and acquaintances, Socialist locals, economic and sociologic clubs, etc., for us to circularize.

3.—Best of all, get your friends to subscribe. *One subscription from each of you would double our circulation*, and start us on the way to Easy Street. You can get *four* yearly or *eight* six-months' subscription cards for *three* dollars. Cards are very easy to sell—and you supply us with much needed ready cash.

The NEW REVIEW must be made self-supporting and permanent. One Dollar a month for one year from two hundred readers will help us "make good."

One of our big plans is to get Socialist party locals to back us up. The NEW REVIEW is worthless to the movement unless its roots are planted deep in the soil of the movement.

LOUIS C. FRAINA,
Business Manager.

The New Review

Vol. II.

JULY, 1914

No. 7

CLASS LINES IN COLORADO

BY MAX EASTMAN

A single motion brought us all to the platform as the train pulled slowly past those ruins at Ludlow, and with incredulous eyes we saw the broken black acre of desolation that is a monument to the National Guard of Colorado. I think every heart was silenced for a moment there in presence of those ravaged homes. The naked violation of every private article of familiar life is so sharp a picture of sorrow. But it was not more than a moment. A voice out of a thin nose behind my ear so soon recalled us to our daily bread.

"What ta hell's the use comin' down here with soap and specialties—this territory's been *shot up!*"

Is there a person with more purity of purpose in God's golden world than the commercial traveller of America? Trinidad, he informed us, had been the best city for business, outside of Denver, in the State of Colorado, and at present you could sell more soap in a graveyard.

In another forty minutes we arrived at Trinidad and could verify his words. A paved, marbled, improved, modern city, shining with efficiency, ready for business, ready for a high time, a thoroughly metropolitan center. And yet the inhabitants seemed to be standing around the corners, idle and anxiously waiting for something to fall out of the sky. I have never seen humanity so stripped of pretence and cultural decorum, so bared to the fighting bone, as it is in Trinidad. They have been through a terror of blood. They have seen their government and their officers of peace evacuate, leaving the city to what seemed an army of revolution. They have either welcomed this army or moved to the cellar. There seems to have been no middle course. And whichever course they pursued, they pursued with the combined passions of a blood feud and a financial panic. Like my friend of the soap and specialties,

and with hardly more disguise, they have adopted into their breasts the hate or love which their financial necessities dictated, and those more highly wrought considerations of the intellect—justice, democracy, the golden rule, the respect for property, for constituted authority, the ideal of patriotism, etc.—those seem to have given way as though they were a little too fragile for service in a time of blood.

"I'm neutral," said Dr. Jaffa to me, "I take no sides. But this thing has spoiled my business. What do they want to inflict it on us townspeople for? Look at the merchants along here. Look at the saloon-keepers. They've had to close up their doors. They can't make enough to buy a coat! I just wish I was President of the United States for about ten minutes!"

Dr. Jaffa is a physician for the mining companies, and it is relevant to explain that one of the demands of the striking miners is for the right to choose their own physician.

"What would you do in that ten minutes?" I asked him.

"I tell you I'd do *something!* I might get hung for it, but I would find a way to get rid of these agitators who come in here and start all this trouble."

"But," I said, "I thought the trouble started long before that, when the mine owners brought in detectives to spot union men for discharge from the mines?"

"Now, it's just this way! If I'm running a business—if *you're* running a business, you aren't going to have other people step in and tell you how to run it. Why, Osgood, the President of the Victor American Company, told me if he had to beg on the street he'd never have dealings with a union."

"But look at it this way, doctor. Suppose the business you were trying to run happened to be the organizing of a union, you wouldn't want somebody to tell you how to run that either, would you?"

"Oh, I suppose there's right on every side," he answered. "I'm neutral. But I want to tell you if General Chase had been given a free hand down here there wouldn't *be* any strike now. He'd have said to these people that don't want to work, 'If you don't like the work here, all right, beat it! Anybody who stays around here, works—see?'"

Dr. Jaffa, acting as a health officer on the field of Ludlow, had a flag of truce shot out of his hand by the mine guards and militia—but still he is loyal to the side he serves.

It seems that just one branch of republican "officialdom" in that town has resisted the bribe of class interest, and stood for the whole people; that is the public school. I gathered that a majority

of the teachers were personally against the men on strike, but as teachers they were forbidden to mention the subject at all. The children were forbidden to discuss it. "Otherwise we couldn't have kept school," one of the teachers explained to me, and I judge he was right.

"You don't see any fellas come around a girl," I was informed by an authority of fourteen summers, "that the girl don't know which side they're on!" And that is the attitude of her big sisters. Perhaps in time, if the strike lasts long enough, intermarriages may occur!

Beyond the public schools, I could find no institution and no official of all that "democratic government," upon whom one would rely to represent the "common interests" of the citizens. The local executives had been so confessedly partisan that when the miners flocked into the streets of Trinidad armed, after the massacre at Ludlow, the Mayor discreetly fled the city and the police went home to bed. Persons appealed for protection to the union headquarters. The county jail was full of strikers, imprisoned without charge or warrant, carried to prison in the automobiles of their employers, and denied even the rights that officialdom has professed to defend since the days of Magna Charta. The county sheriff, who had sworn in 594 "special deputies" in six months, also fled the city at the approach of the miners. Nothing more need be said of him. The coroner is an undertaker under contract with the mining companies for the burial of dead miners—an incident whose gloom is not relieved by the report that the general manager of the company holds stock in the undertaking establishment.

As for the State of Colorado, and the legislative, executive, and military arms thereof, enough has been printed in the popular press to discover its class character to the blindest. That non-resident gunmen on the payroll of the mine companies were at the same time on the public payroll and clothed in a public uniform as soldiers of the commonwealth, is not an incident, but a summary of the whole situation in politics.

In what is called religion the alignment was more equivocal. A sweating effort at neutrality was made by the Jesuit priesthood of the Catholic church, an effort that always will be made, I suppose, in times of class crisis by the Catholic church. For the Catholic church is the Church of the Exploitation of the Poor, and it has its own gentle and peculiar mode of exploiting the poor and cannot afford to forsake them to others. The Catholic church has taken under her generously unprincipled wing every movement of history that she perceived to be inevitable, and you will hear her clucking to the Socialists yet.

In this struggle, however, it was only after a severe lesson that she perceived just where the inevitability lay. I was told by three or four different people that a Catholic priest had been virtually mobbed by the miners for preaching submission, and that he had hastened home in shreds and tatters of his dignity, and was put to bed by the priesthood. A Catholic father, however, told me that this misfortune occurred in another county and during a different strike. His account of what happened in the present strike I quote as he gave it.

"Every morning that I woke up in my bed," he had said, describing the eight days after Ludlow, "I thanked the good God that we were alive!"

"And what is it all coming to?" I asked him.

"Civil war," he answered, "war between labor and capital."

"And the church—can the church do nothing to save us from this?"

"Absolutely nothing!" he said. "If the people had *faith*, yes! But when they run and report the priest himself as a scab—Oh! Why, one of our brotherhood went among the strikers preaching the salvation of their souls. 'Idleness is the root of evil'—that was his text, and they reported him to the union headquarters and he had to stop preaching. 'Shut him up!' said the Superior to me, 'Shut him up. Don't let him speak a word!'"

This was amusing, and my friend laughed, as a man will who loves life better than his faith. He had learned his lesson well, too. He talked to me for a full hour, with the ease and freedom of a life-long candor, and yet never a syllable of his true feeling—except that childlike enjoyment of the humor of the situation—escaped him.

Of the seven Protestant ministers, five are hot little prophets of privilege. The other two feel that among the original causes of the trouble was the failure of the church to live up to her mission of teaching Christianity and other blessings of civilization to the miners. Just what Christianity would have done to the miners, unless it sent them back to work in the blessedness of the meek, was not explained by these ministers. But the Salvation Army leader made it perfectly plain that he considered the "preaching of contentment" to be his function in the mining camps. The gospel according to Marx!

The fate and feeling of the middle-class uplift-worker in such a crisis is quite according to Marx also. About the time that war was to be declared, or a little before, she went to Walsenburg with a charitable friend, feeling sore at heart that the miners' boys had no place to lean and loaf but at the bar of the village saloon. With

the sanction of the mine-owners, and being herself the wife of an editor in good standing with the companies, she essayed to start a recreation center. Visiting all the mothers in the mining camp she invited them to attend a conference upon the subject in a public hall.

"And how many women do you suppose came to that hall?" she exclaimed. "Just two—myself and the woman I took with me!"

"I tell you," she cried, "they are not only brutal and ignorant, but they are *satisfied!* They don't want anything better. They are nothing but cattle."

In this opinion that "they are nothing but cattle," she merely gave the countersign, as far as I could make out, which admits to social recognition in Trinidad. I have described in the *Masses* a tea-party I enjoyed with Trinidad's nicest ladies, but I want to quote here just one further sentiment upon which they agreed.

"Are there not a good many Jewish people in Trinidad?" I said.

"Yes, and the Jews have stood with the Christians right through!" said a mine owner's wife. "Mighty fine folks all of them!"

When the NEW REVIEW arrives upon the heights to which it is destined, I trust we may establish in connection with it a bureau of economic research. It would be worth much to revolutionary science, I think, to send a census-taker to a place like Trinidad, ascertain the alignment of classes and professions, the conduct and state-of-mind of persons and institutions in such a war. A little more verification, a little less assertion, would be so much to the health of the Socialist hypothesis. And these notes of mine, I am aware, have little value other than to suggest such a possibility.

It is needless to say that the newspapers stood at sword's point—the two prosperous and established papers with Associated Press wires, "fighting the mine-owners' fight from the very start," and "getting information only from that side," as one of their editors informed me, and the other paper flirting for a time with the cause of the miners, until finally it was leased and operated by the union. Nor was this antagonism confined to the editorial office, or even the press-rooms. The newsboys on the street were divided into two armies, and it was only by pressure of special friendship that a *Free Press* newsboy would call an *Advertiser* newsboy if it happened to be the *Advertiser* you asked for.

The tradesmen, the smaller ones especially, who rely for profit upon pay-day expeditions from the mining-camps, were with the strikers. They were so whole-heartedly with the strikers after Ludlow, indeed, as to convey an impression that the whole city had opened its doors to receive them. Miners told me that ninety per

cent. of the citizens welcomed them. But mine-owners told me that anybody who did not welcome them thought best either to stay at home or pretend that he did, and for that reason even a guess at the true percentage is impossible.

The demi-monde, while professionally neutral, is by natural sympathy tender to the union. The small farmers in the vicinity of Ludlow sheltered the strikers after the massacre, and fed them—for which service at least one ranch house was wrecked and looted at midnight by the militia, and a significant warning left on the wall:

"This is your pay for harboring union men and women. Cut it out or we call again.

"B. F.

"C. N. G."

The initials mean Baldwin-Feltz and Colorado National Guard.

We must not be too hopeful, however, upon the basis of these facts in Colorado. It is not a revolutionary strike. It is not a strike against capitalism but against feudalism. Moreover, the feudal lords are perpetual absentees; their pecuniary prowess is never displayed locally where it might awe the middle class into a consciousness of its beauty and divine right. And moreover, again, the methods of these absentee lords have been startling in their brutality, and the miners have been startling in their patient persistence and good nature. Therefore all those whose interests were not strongly engaged upon the one side or the other, being creatures of human blood, fell in unanimously with the injured. To quell a fight for liberty with unprovoked persecution, is to quench burning oil with water. That is, it only spreads the blaze.

For these reasons we cannot infer all that we might wish to from the Colorado alignment. But we can rejoice in a great many things—not least of which is the fact that some of those smooth delegates of the A. F. of L. that we call Labor Fakirs, folded their papers in this crisis, loaded up with shot and shell, and went out into the hills to do business. Revolutionary or not, the working class of Colorado were of one mind and one intention for the space of eight days at least!

Railroad men have been unanimous from the very off-go, conductors and all. Even last fall, before any cold-blooded killing or any massacres had occurred, the trainmen stepped off their trains and refused to carry reinforcements to the militia at Ludlow.

"They allowed they were afraid to go where the shooting was in progress," a brakeman told me, "but that's merely a way of speaking, you understand. There was plenty of 'em shouldered a gun and went out there with the miners."

The train load of reinforcements, he added, was taken out by the division superintendent and the train-despatcher, and the men who deserted were of course discharged. In the first case the union gave the company three days to reinstate them, and the company reinstated them on the third day. In the second case, after the massacre at Ludlow, the company reinstated the men within two days without need of a warning. When you realize the close subservience of the Colorado and Southern Railroad to the mines that feed it, you see that a significant little bloodless battle of the war was fought during those three days, and that labor was victorious.

But, however significant or not significant to the Marxian economist, the alignment in Colorado can certainly prove a strong point to the layman. It can prove that when the class line is once fightingly drawn, all other divisions of society sink into obscurity, and every man, woman, and child is compelled to take a militant stand. I suppose the line between mining capital and mining labor passed through the very middle of some people's lives. They had interests both ways. But they were forced to move. You cannot stand on a red-hot line.

Perhaps the most earnest effort to do so, the warmest approach to sympathetic neutrality, was made by the sisters of charity at the San Rafael hospital, nurses who stanching the blood for militia and miners alike. I talked with the leading sister of the order there, a gentle, vigorous and serene soul, with memories of the civil war, a woman who could mother both sides of a fight if anybody could.

"We have no opinion," she said, "we are for all men."

"I know you have no opinion," I answered, "but I wonder if you wouldn't just tell me what your opinion is!"

"Even in our minds," she said, "we form no opinion. But I can tell you that this has been a very terrible thing, and I am praying every night that they will recognize the union so that we may have peace!"

NEW PHASE OF THE CONTEMPT CULT

BY FREDERICK HALLER

[Before he joined the Socialist Party, Comrade Haller was an assistant district attorney of his home county, Erie, N. Y., for six years.]

The Supreme Court of the United States has at last put an end to the prosecution of Gompers and others for contempt of court. It took seven years to do it.

It also cost the Gompers following thousands upon thousands of dollars to drag their case back and forth through the courts. Yet the capitalistic newspapers sagely and solemnly assert that this case proves conclusively that "there is one and the same law for the labor leader and the corporation, the rich and the poor."

A pretty state of affairs this is with the one law for the rich and poor done up in prize package fashion! It costs so much money to buy a fling that it takes the combined efforts and contributions of hundreds of thousands to have one man sit in the game of prison-or-no-prison-garb.

This whole court business is most wasteful of the strength and resources of the workers. Here we have an instance. The workers of this country have been fighting for a generation for the right to boycott. The courts have been standing solidly against them and with the privileged classes; injunctions here, injunctions there; jail sentences here and jail sentences there for contempt of court in violating the injunction, for insisting upon the right to boycott.

Most ludicrous of all, the charge of contempt of court has always been tried by the offended party, the court itself, and that too without a jury. The court always gets on its dignity and blasts the contemner.

The many years of continual hammering by the workers drove the courts into a corner at last. Dignity had to do something to get out of the situation with a show of dignity. It had to find a way to save its face. But dignity's effort has been most undignified; in fact it has been clownish.

Labor has been kicking up a good deal of a rumpus of late. Besides, the Socialist movement has been growing apace, causing the sciences of economics and of government to be studied by thoughtful people.

So when the Gompers case came before the Supreme Court for final decision "something had to be did," a way had to be found to duck. It was too dangerous to send Gompers to jail by affirming his conviction. As David Harum would say: "Somebody hollered 'low bridge,' and then the court ducked."

The Supreme Court of the United States dodged the real issue in the case, the right to boycott. It did so by giving Mr. Gompers the judicial nod, just the same as if he were a banker. It let him out just the same as it would let out a capitalistic criminal, by saying that the offense charged against him had been outlawed. The statute of limitations, forsooth, had run.

Now in order to let itself out by invoking the statute of limitations, the Supreme Court of the United States had to decide first of all that contempt of court is a crime. That is a new one on the legal fraternity. It has never been regarded as a crime before.

This decision will have a far reaching effect unless the courts find some more new interpretations to help them out. If contempt of court is a crime, then under the constitution the defendant under such a charge has a right to jury trial. That right has always been denied in contempt cases.

It will be interesting to see if workingmen charged with contempt of court will after this be given the right of trial by jury.

A new aspect will also be put upon the old controversy over the right of a defendant in contempt proceedings to question the constitutionality of the injunction. Heretofore that right has also been denied him.

If the legislature passed an unconstitutional law, a defendant arrested for violating it could claim exemption from punishment on the ground of the unconstitutionality of the statute. But this could not be done if he was arrested for the violation of a private law enacted by a single judge in his private office or at his club on the application of some interested capitalist.

Such a private law is given another name. It is called an injunction. Therefore, forsooth, it is of "higher dignity and sacredness" than a law passed by the assembly and the senate and signed by the governor of the state.

The constitutionality of this law, called an injunction, enacted by one man, could not, until now, be called into question by any one charged with a violation of it.

Now that the highest court in the land has taken a tuck or two out of this one-man law called the injunction, and placed it upon the same footing with an ordinary penal statute of the regular legislative branch of the government, it will be interesting to see if the courts will accept this latest decision with all that it imports,

or whether they will shy away from those necessary results and try to differentiate.

In the latter event we shall be called upon to witness another long and wearisome struggle of old Sisyphus rolling his stone up the hill once more.

It would be well for the workers' lawyers to raise these questions at the first opportunity.

DANIEL DE LEON

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

With the death of Daniel De Leon, the most powerful individuality in the American Socialist movement passed away.

De Leon's name was synonymous with revolutionary Socialism—that Socialism which rejects compromise, recognizes the social value of reform but refuses to deal in reform, and considers revolutionary Industrial Unionism as the indispensable basis of Socialist political action and the revolutionary movement as a whole. De Leon saw clearly the impending menace of State Socialism, particularly within the Socialist movement; and his whole programme was an answer to that menace.

De Leon fought sturdily and uncompromisingly for ideas now popular when these ideas met only with scorn and ridicule; nearly every American expression of revolutionary theory and action bears the impress of his personality and activity; and revolutionary unionism hails him as its philosopher and foremost American pioneer.

The National Committee of the Socialist Party in a resolution pays tribute to De Leon's "honesty and singleness of purpose." But De Leon's activity was marked by more than "honesty and singleness of purpose," although these qualities in themselves are a heroic thing in the American movement, which often seems the negation of "honesty and singleness of purpose."

I

Opinions of De Leon jostle each other contradictorily—a shoddy intellectual and a genius; a martyr and a scoundrel; a cheap politician and a thinker who built for the future; a man of no principle and a man who adhered too strictly to principle. The New York *Volkszeitung* says that De Leon died a couple of decades too late, and viciously stigmatizes him as a "destructionist," and that alone.

The *Call* correctly terms him "truly great," but shows only a vague conception of his rôle in the Socialist movement. The *Weekly People*, organ of the S. L. P., praises him extravagantly as "one of the world's greatest" and the "American Marx," but like the *Call*, shows only a vague, though ecstatic, appreciation of his personality and activity. And through all these opinions runs the strain of love and hate aroused by De Leon's peculiar personality, which colors all judgments of his career.

None deny De Leon's great influence in the Socialist movement. Many may restrict that influence to 1890-1900; others extend it to the rise and decline of the I. W. W. The claim that this influence was wholly or largely pernicious ignores the movement in which it functioned, and smacks too much of the theological to deserve serious consideration. The Devil was painted wholly black in ages past. Milton realized that Satan was infinitely superior to the celestial hierarchy that fawned upon its Master.

The small movement that circumscribed De Leon's activity developed the Cæsarian spirit of preferring to be first in a small Alpine village to second in Rome. It narrowed his mind and ideas, producing the anomaly of a relatively small achievement in comparison with his tremendous capacity; and prejudiced his ideas in the minds of many who ignore ideas which are not expressive of a large movement. And yet De Leon's contribution to the American movement bulks large—large in itself, and larger still in comparison with the contribution, chiefly negative, of others.

De Leon was the first American Socialist to insist that the American movement adapt itself to the conditions of American life—*Americanize itself*, not in any jingo or opportunistic sense; but in the spirit dictated by Marxism, that is, economic and political necessity.

American Socialism has been unfortunate in its theoretical and tactical aping of the German Social Democracy. The early American Socialists missed the significance of the spirit of the German movement, that *you must not alone vision your ultimate ideal, but must adapt yourself to immediate conditions and grapple with those conditions*. This is the first principle of Socialist politics, which the German movement has put into practice. But the early American Socialists saw a large movement developing in Germany, and concluded that German *methods* were just as potent in America. The German movement was invariably hurled at De Leon's head whenever he argued on the basis of American conditions.

Early in its career the German Social Democracy adapted the general principles of Socialist political action to the special German conditions. It was wise strategy. Germany was not ripe for

proletarian revolution; its bourgeois revolution had been left uncompleted; and the Social Democracy in its practical activity concerned itself with establishing bourgeois democracy and bourgeois reforms. De Leon accordingly concluded that its tactics could only remotely affect the American movement, which had no bourgeois revolution to complete. The United States is unique, politically, in having no remnants of feudalism; unique, economically, in being capitalistically the most developed; Americans have different traditions and a different psychology from Europeans. And De Leon sought to adapt theory and tactics to these conditions. I remember an editorial review of Gustavus Myers' *History of the Great American Fortunes*, in which De Leon praised Myers highly, not alone for the merit of his work, but because it dealt with American conditions. De Leon had nothing but scorn for those Socialist "writers" who are perpetually rehashing the fundamental theory of Socialism as laid down with sufficient clarity by men abler than themselves.*

De Leon's first application of his theory was to lay particular emphasis upon the class struggle and revolutionary unionism.

The Socialist movement in 1890 was a weak thing. It oscillated between Anarchism and Populism, seemed to have no conception of the class struggle, and was living and fighting the problems of the European movement. It needed a dominant personality and emphasis upon the class basis of the movement. De Leon supplied both. The propaganda of class consciousness and class action was not so difficult in Europe as in America, and required less moral courage. In Europe class divisions were generally recognized and accepted; while in America fluid class conditions, free land and a pervasive bourgeois ideology obscured the class struggle, making its theory and practice all the more necessary. And De Leon hammered upon the idea of class struggle until it became part and parcel of the movement, resulting in uncompromising political action. This service can never be underestimated. In our peculiar American conditions it constitutes a greater achievement than similar services in any European country.

As a corollary to this, De Leon insisted upon revolutionary unionism, an insistence which crystallized into the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. And here the fight started. The reactionaries pointed to Germany and said, "We must co-operate with the trade-unions." De Leon answered, "But in Germany the unions came

* Morris Hillquit, in his "History of American Socialism" asserts that the split in the movement in 1899 was due to the efforts of his own group to throw off the German domination of the party. As a matter of fact, the Hillquit group of seceders was overwhelmingly German; while De Leon had the English organization, the majority, staunchly behind him. Hillquit and Berger have consistently introduced into our movement all the vices and none of the virtues of the German Social Democracy.

after the political movement, and were largely built up by the Social Democracy. While here the unions are notoriously reactionary and corrupt." Different conditions dictate different tactics. De Leon and the S. L. P. acted accordingly,—fought the unions and organized opposition unions. Was the S. T. & L. A. premature? Undoubtedly; but so was the old International premature; you must start somewhere: and pioneer work is indispensable.† Yet the S. T. & L. A. prepared the way for the American Labor Union and the I. W. W.—both premature and both necessary. These experiments have yielded valuable experience and a philosophy of revolutionary unionism.

At the S. T. & L. A. period, De Leon's conception of revolutionary unionism was pro-political. He still had the old Socialist theory that the political movement must dominate the unions, as in Germany. (Later De Leon reversed himself, and correctly conceived the political movement as pro-industrial; that is to say, revolutionary unionism must dominate the political movement.) At this period De Leon projected revolutionary unionism as an auxiliary of the political party, ascribing to it no decisive revolutionary mission. The S. T. & L. A. was largely a weapon to fight conservative A. F. of L. politics. The friends of the A. F. of L. roared in protest; and, as the *Volkszeitung* said ten years later, split the Socialist movement to save the A. F. of L.

This is significant: and the councils and policy of the Socialist Party have since its inception been dominantly molded by the A. F. of L. and the Aristocracy of Labor. This was just the eventuality De Leon feared and fought against. And at this period De Leon's revolutionary unionism was largely a means to prevent the Socialist political movement being controlled by the Aristocracy of Labor and the Middle Class—two social groups which, De Leon showed time and again, have certain interests in common and against the revolutionary proletariat.‡

† De Leon was essentially a pioneer in a pioneer movement; but he scarcely realized this pioneer character of his ideas and activity. Had De Leon realized this limitation, his acts would not have been so hasty, impatient, often intolerant. Tact and patience, pliability and not rigidity, should be the distinguishing characteristics of the pioneer. De Leon saw things loom large in a state of crisis, and acted much as if he were in the midst of the Revolution with a powerful movement at his back.

‡ De Leon was the first Socialist in America whose Socialism was Marxist in spirit. He was a brilliant Marxist, and his principle of "Americanizing" derived less from study of American conditions than from his grasp of the Marxian method. In this Americanizing process, De Leon neglected a few important factors subsidiary to the fundamental factors which he grappled with. He ignored the problem of the backward South and the subjection of the Negro. He failed to tackle the problem of the American judiciary, the usurped powers of which menace democracy. He seems never to have realized the importance of a national system of labor legislation in America, which would not only improve the workers' living conditions, but the struggle

And there surely is no better way of holding a Socialist party true to its revolutionary mission than by insistence upon revolutionary unionism—an insistence which is bound to alienate the Middle Class and Aristocracy of Labor. A Socialist political party must favor revolutionary unionism and actively propagate its tenets. There is not—in the very nature of things there cannot be—any such thing as “neutrality toward the unions.” The Socialist Party’s “neutrality” has ended in its swallowing the principles of the A. F. of L., and getting in return the support of the A. F. of L. machine—for the Wilson-Bryan party. The political movement is not a political party alone: it is the political phase of the revolutionary movement as a whole: and if revolutionary unionism is a necessary, an indispensable, factor in the revolutionary movement, the political party must incorporate revolutionary unionism in its propaganda.

There is another vital reason for revolutionary unionism: it is the only adequate answer to the menace of State Socialism. De Leon early saw the impending dangers of State Socialism, and grappled with the dangers. His opposition to the Socialist Party was fundamentally caused by its State Socialist aspirations—its propaganda of reformism and government ownership making for State Socialism or State Capitalism, in the interest alone of the Middle Class and the Aristocracy of Labor. De Leon originally fought this danger by insisting upon rigid class action and “no reform” politics, though still holding to the theory that control of the State was the way to revolution. But this in itself was insufficient. As long as control of the State is considered the only way to revolution, State Socialism is inevitable; you must have another agency *outside* the State to perform the revolutionary act. And De Leon, seeing this clearly in course of development, solved the contradiction by reversing his old position, and emphasizing the mission of Industrial Unionism as the means for the revolutionary act—the overthrow of Capitalist Society and its State.

De Leon’s espousal of Industrial Unionism and the I. W. W., and his development of an industrialist philosophy of action, constitute his crowning contribution to American Socialism. While he had no part in the conference which called the 1905 convention,

for which would impart new unity and impetus to the labor movement. These last two things have been taken up by the Roosevelt Progressives in a conservative manner and for a conservative purpose subsequent to the agitation of Herman Simpson, who, while editor of the *New York Call*, grappled with these problems in a Marxian, that is, revolutionary manner, seeking to make the Socialist Party drive forward the bourgeois progressives, instead of trailing in their rear. A. M. Simons’ efforts to “farmerize” the Socialist Party are non-revolutionary and non-proletarian “Americanizing”—making concessions to farmers and Middle Class.

De Leon was the dominating power in the convention itself, and for two years in the I. W. W. Impartial observers of the convention, like Paul F. Brissenden, have attested De Leon’s supremacy—a supremacy of ideas and personality, as De Leon and his co-delegates of the S. T. & L. A. were in a very small minority.

Many factors united to disrupt the I. W. W. There was the financial panic of 1907, the dishonesty of officials, which appears at the early stage of all revolutionary movements, and the conflicts over political action. The chief factor was the fight over a revolutionary conception of Industrial Unionism and a conservative conception—a fight between the unskilled and the skilled. The I. W. W. at the start tried to bridge the gap between the two, and failed; and now the Haywood-St. John I. W. W. is trying to build exclusively upon the basis of the unskilled. Revolutionary Unionism at this stage must depend upon the unorganized and the unskilled.*

De Leon’s fight for political action in the I. W. W. was the cause of his being thrown out of the organization in 1908. It is a fight which will have to be fought again. Socialist Party timidity is creating a strong anti-political sentiment with which the movement will have to reckon. And De Leon’s insistence upon political action shows his broad conception of the revolutionary movement.

De Leon’s activity in the I. W. W. was inspired by the following clear-cut conception of revolutionary action:

1. Industrial Unionism, organized in harmony with the mechanism of concentrated capitalist production, is the condition *sine qua non* of the revolutionary movement. Mere industrial unionism, however, is insufficient: it must be revolutionary industrial unionism.
2. By means of the industrial organization, the workers can secure all the immediate betterments they require—immediate reforms which, gained by means of the power of the workers through mass strikes, constitute steps toward the final goal, develop the integrity and self-reliance of the proletariat, and prepare it for its historic mission.
3. The movement should not deal in political reform. Reforms of this character benefit the Middle Class and the Aristocracy of

* Another factor was the desertion of Socialist Party men, such as Ernest Untermann, A. M. Simons and Eugene Debs; Simons and Untermann being disgruntled at De Leon’s supremacy, and Debs being unwilling to face the issue of the bitter internal fight. As an instance of the methods used in attacking De Leon, I may mention Simons’ charge in committee that De Leon was a police-spy and should be denied admission to the convention. De Leon was sometimes abusive and intolerant in attack, but he never went as far as his opponents, and often retracted, as in the case of Wayland and Ben Hanford. De Leon was not the intolerant bigot decried by his enemies; one instance in proof being his praise of the *NEW REVIEW*, although representing a different tendency from his own.

labor almost exclusively, and will be yielded by the ruling class to itself—a theory now being proven by capitalist Progressivism.

Political reform is a menace to the integrity of the revolutionary movement.

4. The Socialist political movement is purely agitational; its mission is not "constructive politics," but to lash onward the bourgeois parties by an aggressive policy, warm into life the revolutionary spirit of the workers, and courageously develop the necessary sentiment for revolutionary Industrial Unionism. Only upon this basis is political action justifiable.

5. The goal of the revolutionary movement is the overthrow of political government, which means the overthrow of *all* class rule—the substitution of industrial representation for territorial representation, industrial administration for political government. Industrial Unionism not only organizes for the immediate, every-day struggles of the proletariat, but prepares the structure of the future society, organizes the Socialist State within the Capitalist State, ready to assume control of society. In other words, the revolutionary act will be performed by the industrially organized proletariat; and Industrial Unionism will not only be the most powerful force in overthrowing Capitalist society but will constitute the basis of the Socialist society of the future.

It is obvious that this theory of the Revolution can be potent only when State Socialism is dominant. The Capitalist State is not yet bankrupt; it still has a mission to perform—the concentration of government control over industry and society, the development of a monstrous bureaucracy which will make the overthrow of political government imperative, exhausting the benefits of purely *political* reform, and clarifying class lines. De Leon faced the *menace* of State Socialism; when the movement faces the *reality* it will be compelled by necessity to organize itself industrially for the overthrow of political government.

There is another corollary which De Leon only vaguely adumbrated, the necessity of placing revolutionary emphasis upon the unskilled. De Leon's merciless attacks upon the Aristocracy of Labor, his scorn of mere reforms, his belief in the increasing misery of the workers (true only of the unskilled), and his whole philosophy show that he saw the necessity of building upon the organization of the unskilled, but he never clearly formulated this theory, and did not sufficiently emphasize the role of the unskilled.

It was De Leon's great achievement that, in spite of the limitations of his period, he saw clearly ahead and projected a program which not only has immediate value but which becomes indispensable in the very near future.

II.

De Leon's fight for Revolutionary Socialism met with the temporary defeat of similar fights elsewhere. Revolutionary Socialism has in all lands been pushed to the wall; reformism is now in the ascendant in the international movement.

It was a fight against the temporarily inevitable. Was the fight, then, useless? Not at all. It did an indispensable pioneer work; it laid the basis for a successful fight later on; and it has given the American movement an inspiring revolutionary tradition.

Asking no quarter and giving none, De Leon fought as uncompromisingly for these ideas with a small group of followers as with a strong organization at his back. *Men mattered little to him: ideas were the chief thing.*

This emphasis on ideas and neglect of men was a serious flaw in De Leon's make-up. Herein he was typical of the old school of Socialists, who acted on the belief that the movement had to deal mainly with *social* forces, *individual* influences being of only slight importance. They neglected individual psychology, assuming that for all practical purposes it was sufficient to know that the *social milieu* conditions psychology. But that is not sufficient. While socially conditioned, *individual psychology nevertheless becomes an independent factor in the social process as a whole*, obedient to laws and motives of its own: laws and motives which men engaged in organizing human forces must comprehend if they desire success. De Leon was not a psychologist; he misunderstood men and motives; and his wrong judgments of men often led him to harsh measures, rousing unnecessary antagonism.

Perhaps even more important was another serious flaw. While thoroughly honest in his ultimate purposes, never seeking a personal advantage unless he thought it in the interest of the movement, De Leon was sometimes dishonest in his methods of attack. He was temperamentally a Jesuit, consistently acting on the principle that the end justifies the means. And he attacked opponents with all the impersonal implacability of the Jesuit. These methods crushed opponents and drove men of ability out of the S. L. P.; while a suggestion of Cagliostro in his personality developed the fanatical loyalty of a sect.

It is an error to conclude, however, that De Leon's personality and methods were responsible for the decline of the S. L. P. Other Socialists have had the identical faults and succeeded in their ends. There were other and more fundamental factors involved.

De Leon's uncompromising conception of the revolutionary movement was an obstacle to a large party being organized. The many non-proletarian economic groups in revolt slowly gravitating

toward Socialism, and the immaturity of the proletariat, have made impossible as yet a revolutionary party as conceived by De Leon. Accordingly, revolutionary ideas at this stage are potent only *within* a large and broad movement, as an educational force; *not as the basis of an independent movement.*

The S. L. P. ignored the psychology of struggling workers; its propaganda was couched in abstract formulas; just as its sectarian spirit developed a sort of sub-conscious idea that revolutionary activity consisted in enunciating formulas. This sectarian spirit produced dogmas, intemperate assertions, and a general tendency toward caricature-ideas and caricature-action; and discouraged men of ability from joining the S. L. P.

De Leon was not a "destructionist"; his ideas were premature; the limitations of his period hampered him; and you cannot call a man in the clutch of these circumstances a "destructionist."

And having considered these defects of De Leon's character, just a few words about his truly noble traits.

His personality was vivid, compelling, constituted to arouse active love and active hate. His thorough honesty and great sacrifices for the movement are an inspiring thing, and the power and nobility of his inner character were suggested in his outward appearance.

His bearing was powerful, dominant; his appearance magnificent. His short neck was sunk in between drooping shoulders, above which towered a massive white head, worthy of posing for a Rodin "Thinker." His imaginative forehead rose in a curve and described a semi-circle with the back of a perfectly-shaped skull. In contrast with the backward curve of the rising brow was the forward projection of cheek bones and chin, characteristic of his aggressive personality. The wiry mustache and beard, protecting a firm, amorous mouth, emphasized the power of a strong face, serene in its intensity and intense in its serenity. In the corners of his deep-set piercing eyes lurked a laughing, mischievous twinkle, full of a humanity which often broke through his reserve, lighting his face with a human glow which made you expand in its delicate warmth. The only defect of that truly unique face was a big, vicious nose.

De Leon dressed shabbily—from necessity. Yet he had the artist's love of good clothes. A comrade one evening entered his office, dressed for a social function. De Leon complimented her on her pretty dress. "Oh, a trifling vanity of the flesh," she answered, lightly. "Ah, no," replied De Leon. "You say that out of regard for me: my own clothes are so shabby." . . . "That

man," said a friend of mine, "though clad in rags, would still be the aristocrat."

And this aristocrat—with pink skin, delicate hands and cultured ancestry—broke completely with his class to devote himself to Socialism. *All* his former connections were severed: his old world ceased to exist for him. The man was too big, too earnest, possessed of too much depth of feeling, to take an academic interest in Socialism: as a member of the Socialist Labor Party, De Leon became wholly identified with the movement. This fiery sincerity and intolerance of half measures were typical of De Leon's whole activity.

Socialists of to-day can hardly realize the courage and character expressed in this action. The Socialist movement twenty-five years ago was an insignificant thing: it was not important enough to attract intellectuals. De Leon was a lecturer on international law at Columbia University: openly to avow himself a Socialist was to lose caste with his associates, inviting ridicule and contempt; actively to identify himself with the movement was to be thrown bodily out of the university. All his brilliant prospects of a truly great academic career he thrust aside; left it all for a movement in the making. Nor did this mean sacrificing a career alone. It meant a complete change in life, in habits, in methods of thought—a temperamental revolution. It meant giving up the common comforts of life—frugality instead of good living; Avenue "A" instead of the Upper West Side; poverty of the worst sort for a man accustomed to comfort, and with a family to support.

A year before his death De Leon was offered a good position with a prominent firm of lawyers dealing in international law, and contemplated resigning as editor of the *People*. He was old, sixty-one years old; poverty was acute; and his children needed an education: "I have sacrificed myself; I have sacrificed my wife; but have I the right to sacrifice my children?" His friends dissuaded him. De Leon, as editor, received a salary starting at \$12 a week and ending at \$30 a week; yet at his death the S. L. P. press owed him \$3,500 back salary! And he never received a cent for his lectures, agitation tours, and scores of translations.

De Leon never complained. He suffered; suffered silently. Never a bitter word; never a regret; smiling activity was his answer to adversity. *The Revolution was worth it all!* Truly, the man was a heroic figure.

WHY A SOCIALIST PARTY?

BY WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

This is the real question that is bothering Walter Lippmann, and accounts for his otherwise unaccountable attack on my "Progressivism And After" in last month's *NEW REVIEW*. If Lippmann were the only Socialist who is asking himself this question the answer would be so easy and obvious that no reply would be necessary. The Progressive-Socialist who does not see the need of a Socialist Party can serve the world far better, and can even do more for Socialism, by becoming a Socialistic Progressive. Let him join the Progressive Party.

But the reformist Socialist also, while not asking himself why there must be a Socialist Party, claims that my book leaves no room for Socialist reformism—and therefore leaves no function for the Party. So I shall briefly answer both objections.

Jessie Wallace Hughan, in the *Christian Socialist*, thus sums up the sad state of mind to which my book leads the Socialist reformists:

Mr. Walling foretells three distinct phases of the social revolution. The first, upon which we are now entering, is state capitalism, the rule of the Progressives or small capitalists; the second will be state Socialism, the triumph of the laborists or skilled workers; the third and last is to be Socialism proper, the control of society by the unskilled masses. To a Socialist, the conclusion seems inevitable and disheartening—since our immediate demands are destined to be carried by the self-interest of the middle class, and since only after two revolutionary stages can Socialism hope for a government expressing the entire working class, then why strive at present for an independent political organization?

This is the conclusion, not of the Socialist, but of the reformer.

Why a Socialist Party? For the same reason that we have needed a Socialist Party in the past. To educate the laboring masses politically, to organize them politically, and to prepare gradually for the time when a Socialist political majority will, for the first time, be able to inaugurate Socialist policies in industry and government. We should keep all the measures of our immediate programme, but not as "demands" on capitalist governments. So far as they aid progressive capitalism they will be granted without any "demand" or intimidation—provided Socialists continue to give these measures their support (as they certainly will). In so far as such reforms are not good for progressive capitalism

we shall not get them by demand or intimidation. As soon as we can intimidate capitalism we can overthrow capitalism. That day will come. But it is not yet here.

Lippmann states accurately enough the basic distinction of my political economy. There are two forms of progress. The first aims, on its positive side, at the increase of the nation's wealth, but attempts to bring this about without any radical change in its distribution. This is Progressivism. It will make everybody better off—including the workers—but it allows the gulf between the classes to continue to widen, and so economic exploitation and class government will continue to grow worse. Socialists—even the most moderate—aim at another kind of progress, one that makes the division of the annual income more and more equal.

So far Lippmann has understood. But at this point he makes the most colossal and extraordinary blunder I have ever met in economic criticism. For he assumes that Socialistic progress can take place only at the expense of the positive achievements of capitalistic progressivism, that we must choose between the following alternatives: Either we must increase the national wealth and everybody's income, or we must have a more and more equitable division of income. On the contrary, every Socialist since Marx places his hope for the better distribution of wealth largely, if not exclusively, upon the progress of production, the increase of social wealth. To accuse me of doing anything else is monstrous. For my whole book—every page of it—is devoted to showing that not only the capitalistic development of production, but also its political expression—progressivism—leads to Socialism, whether its advocates know that this will be the result and desire it or not. This is my one contribution to current Socialist discussion. Lippmann is the only critic, and, as far as I know, the only reader, who has failed to find out what my book is about.

But if Lippmann misrepresents me, he makes himself very clear. And his views are representative—of the Progressives. He believes Socialists as well as Progressives should concentrate their attention on increasing the total product—provided this results in a considerable advance for all classes, including the wage-earners. This, of course, involves no class struggle. The progress that consists in a steadily more equitable division of the product, Lippmann and the Progressives are willing to postpone indefinitely. They are so little disturbed at class rule or class exploitation that they do not desire that any large social group—not excepting the Socialists—should devote itself primarily to putting an end to these evils. Though all immediate advances of the wage-earners are accompanied by a still more rapid increase of the sums of

which they are robbed, they say, let us give our undivided attention to this form of progress. That is their view. Socialists, on the contrary, always vote for and support all forms of progress, including the above capitalistic variety, since the wage-earners do get a small part of the benefit, which means a great deal to them, in view of their sufferings. But Socialists give their chief attention to agitation, education, organization and preparation for the day when they can overthrow all forms of capitalism—even the most progressive. When they control governments they will not reverse or retard any of the positively beneficial tendencies of capitalistic progressivism. On the contrary, they will develop production more rapidly than ever—but they will also inaugurate a new form of progress leading rapidly to a more equitable distribution of income, *i. e.*, to equal economic opportunity.

Lippmann, in the criticism above mentioned, forsakes completely the pragmatic standpoint. He claims that the increase of society's wealth is more important than its more equitable distribution. The truth is that both are of the greatest importance, and each is dependent upon the other. But assume that he is right, and that the two can be separated. The overwhelming majority of the ruling class are bent on increasing the national product and at the same time bitterly opposes those who demand its more equal distribution. *Pragmatism demands that we should turn, not to the thing the race needs most, but to the most important thing that is left undone.* The forces already making for a greater product and the forces that express this tendency politically, are innumerable. Those demanding a fairer division of the product are few.

Nor is this all. Even if the material advance of labor were made more rapid by concentrating all our efforts on aiding progressive capitalism, this advance might result in the strengthening of class exploitation and class rule. As a matter of fact, progressive capitalism is best aided by adhering to our revolutionary Socialism—as I have pointed out. And much as we desire and need the greatest possible development of capitalistic progressivism, it will redound to our benefit only if we give our chief attention, as hitherto, to organization, agitation, education, and preparation. (It is needless to point out that all these require activities, and that none of them consists in mere formulas or words.)

Are there any circumstances in which we ought to lay aside our preparatory activities altogether and confine ourselves—for a time—to co-operation with progressive capitalists, in order to secure immediate material results for the wage-earners? I believe there are no cases of this kind, except in backward countries like Germany, where remnants of eighteenth century absolutism—mon-

archy, nobility, bureaucracy, clericalism, militarism, etc.—still largely govern society. Bernstein's opportunism may be useful there, just as Fabianism may be all that the Empire-ridden people of England will stand for. But in countries more advanced economically and politically capitalism itself will provide for all the more elementary needs of labor—not out of fear that Socialism would otherwise take away its profits, but in order to increase them; well-fed, healthy, instructed and efficient labor being by far the most profitable in a country of highly developed industry.

Under modern conditions there is only one course more suicidal than opposing capitalistic progress, and that is—compromising with it. We cannot oppose progressive measures, but we must oppose progressive men and progressive parties. We cannot object to a benefit that costs nothing, merely because it is not a greater benefit. We must object to a man or a party that favors small benefits and opposes greater ones. For to favor a merely progressive candidate or party does cost something. It subordinates the Socialist party and candidate—except under a second ballot or preferential voting, where it is the progressive who is subordinated.

Lippmann says I look forward to an orderly progress of events without any unexpected crisis, such as a war with Japan. But I deal only with general tendencies and not with events at all. If I speak of the probability of society *beginning* to pass into the Socialist stage in another quarter century, this is only a round figure, and an illustration of what I mean when I say that we are near enough to Socialism to deal with it as a practical question. And if I do not endeavor to estimate at all the rate at which Socialism will develop after that point, this is precisely because I do reckon with racial and nationalistic conflicts as the last defence of the ruling classes of that time, namely, the governmental bureaucracy, the aristocracy of labor and the other similarly privileged groups of a State Socialist society, against the laboring masses clamoring for equal opportunities in employment and an equal voice in government, that is, for Socialism.

THE DRAMA OF DYNAMITE

BY FLOYD DELL

About real dynamite I know little. I am under the impression that it is a dark brown substance made by soaking sawdust in nitroglycerine: I may be wrong. But I understand that as a destructive agent it is inferior to lyddite, cordite and many other compounds. It will cause death, just like an accidental bichloride of mercury tablet, or the cholera. But it is less to be feared than a cigarette stub in a factory building. Dynamite is, moreover, a useful agency in mining and other industrial operations. But there is, on the whole, nothing very interesting about it.

Real dynamite, that is to say, is unimportant. But imaginary dynamite—that is different. The *idea* of dynamite is one of the most interesting things in the world. It is a socially destructive agent of the highest power. It spreads death and the fear of death over vast populations. It is frightful, insane, maudlin—and comic.

The story of dynamite—not the comparatively harmless thing, but the terrible idea—has yet to be told fully. But here is the scenario.

It begins with a poet. And by poet I mean simply a man endowed with an imaginative perception of facts—the ability to see and state those facts in such a way as to kindle the imagination of others. In this case, it required a man so poetically gifted as to see in dynamite something besides a dark brown substance useful in mining operations and dangerous to be around when it goes off. It required a man who could make of that dark brown substance something as symbolic, as imaginatively appealing, as universally memorable as the Crown, the Crescent, or the Cross.

And dynamite found its poet—its first American poet—in Albert R. Parsons. He saw in dynamite a destructive force that made a workingman the equal of an army; a force that by its very advent into the world destroyed the power of the rich to tyrannize over the poor; a force that meant the annihilation of class society. And so, glowing with that idea, he went up and down the land talking dynamite. He never saw a bomb. He never intended to use one. He talked about the bomb as Omar did about the wine cup, and was no more a murderer than Omar was a drunkard. In his innocent poetic enthusiasm, he preached the gospel of dynamite all over the Middle West. And just as Omar has given us the wine cup as

a symbol of pleasure and love, so Parsons gave us the bomb as an everlasting symbol of destruction.

He was hanged for it in 1887, after some unknown person had actually thrown a real bomb. Parsons was guiltless of responsibility for the act, and probably disapproved of it, for he was a gentle and friendly soul. But up to the last he was the poet of dynamite. In his eight-hour speech in court* after he had received sentence of death he said:

I am called a dynamiter. Why? Did I ever use dynamite? No. Did I ever have any? No. Why, then, am I called a dynamiter? Listen and I will tell you. Gunpowder in the fifteenth century marked an era in the world's history. It was the downfall of the mail-armor of the knight, the freebooter and the robber of that period. It enabled the victims of the highway robbers to stand off at a distance in a safe place and defend themselves. . . . Gunpowder came as a democratic institution. . . . There was less power in the hands of the nobility after that; less power in the hands of the king; less power in the hands of those who would plunder and degrade and destroy the people after that.

So to-day dynamite comes as the emancipator of man from the domination and enslavement of his fellow man. . . . Dynamite is the diffusion of power. It is democratic; it makes everybody equal. . . . Nothing can meet it. The Pinkertons, the police, the militia, are absolutely worthless in the presence of dynamite. They can do nothing with the people at all. It is the annihilator. It is the disseminator of authority; it is the dawn of peace; it is the end of war, because . . . dynamite makes that unsafe, undesirable and absolutely impossible. It is a peace-maker; it is man's best and last friend; it emancipates the world from the domineering of the few over the many, because all government, in the last resort, is violence; all law, in the last resort, is force. Force is the law of the universe; force is the law of nature, and this newly discovered force makes all men equal, and therefore free.

Judged as fact, it was simply not true. But as a poetic idea, it was charming. And he died for it—a thing few poets have done for their creations.

After the poet of dynamite, the next important figure is what may be called its novelist. I mean simply a prose writer with imagination enough to conceive in realistic detail the process of destroying the old order by the use of the bomb. And that gifted fictionist was Johann Most.

Most was a German revolutionist, a sincere sort of trouble-maker, and an orator of great eloquence. But his interest to us lies in his imaginative masterpiece, the "Revolutionary Handbook." This book describes the manufacture of dynamite bombs with a fidelity worthy of the author of "L'Assomoir," and the method of

* Autobiography of Albert R. Parsons.

plotting assassination in secret with a verisimilitude excelled only by the author of "Robinson Crusoe." It created an imaginary and sinister world, the like of which has never existed—and it stirred a few young men like Louis Lingg to feeble and ineffectual imitations, as powerful works of art usually do. It was advertised in the Socialist press of the time side by side with that paler piece of fiction, Bellamy's "Looking Backward." It was a revolutionary best-seller.

It is well known that people read fiction to escape from life. They seldom take literature seriously. And accordingly we find in all this period of bomb-talking no authentic record of any bombs except the famous Haymarket bomb, and that other with which Louis Lingg killed himself in prison. Nevertheless, there was one man in those days who did take literature seriously—a man who believed that everything he read about bombs was true. He lived in the unreal world created by Johann Most—a world populated by anarchists, meeting in cellars to plot the destruction of society, and going forth on errands with their pockets full of bombs. Like the naïve cowboy of the old joke, who rose in his seat at the play to shoot the villain full of holes, he was determined to protect society against the dangers with which it was menaced. A hero in his own mind, he was ready to move all the powers of heaven and earth to quell these imaginary enemies. He stood before society in the attitude of a protector, crying hysterically, "I will save you!"

This amusing figure was Michael J. Schaack, a police captain. Charles Edward Russell, as a newspaper man in Chicago, knew him well, and describes him in his Haymarket chapter in his new volume of reminiscences.* "He was," says Mr. Russell, "a man of restless and unregulated energy and, let us say, of small discretion. I have often wondered whether his delusions resulted from a kind of self-hypnosis or from mere mania; but certainly he saw more anarchists than vast hell could hold. Bombs, dynamite, daggers, guns, and pistols danced ever across his excited vision; in the end there was among the foreign-born population no society nor association, however innocent or even laudable, that was not to his mind engaged in devilry. The labor unions, he knew, were composed solely of anarchists; the Turner societies met to plan treason, stratagems and spoils; the literary guilds contrived murder; the Sunday schools taught destruction. Every man that spoke broken English and went out o' nights was a fearsome creature whose secret purpose was to blow up the Board of Trade or loot Marshall Field's store."

* "These Shifting Scenes," by Charles Edward Russell (George H. Doran, New York).

To save Chicago from these demoniac spectres of his fancy, Michael J. Schaack, like the witch-burners of old, tortured in his cells something like a thousand men in the period after the Haymarket bomb, and wrung from them "confessions" which were used to convict and hang the innocent eight-hour agitators, Anarchists and Socialists, who had been picked as the ringleaders of the "anarchist conspiracy." To give color to his anxieties, he discovered bombs everywhere—in alleys, under bridges, in workingmen's homes. "The trophies," says Mr. Russell, "began to look marvelously familiar. One in particular, a gas-pipe bomb that had been used as a copy-weight in a newspaper composing room, was brought three times to police headquarters and placed among the prize relics of the raiding. It was easily recognized because the harmless printer that had used it to hold copy on his case had at some time scratched his initials upon it."

Finally Schaack had to be suppressed by his superior, for fear he would drive the public as mad as he was. The chief of police later described the situation* in a newspaper interview:

It was my policy to quiet matters down as soon as possible after the fourth of May. The general unsettled state of things was an injury to Chicago.

On the other hand, Captain Schaack wanted to keep things stirring. He wanted bombs to be found here, there, all around, everywhere. I thought people would lie down and sleep better if they were not afraid that their homes would be blown to pieces any minute. But this man Schaack, this little boy who must have glory or his heart would be broken, wanted none of that policy. *Now, here is something the public does not know. After we got the Anarchist societies broken up, Schaack wanted to send out men to organize new societies right away.* You see what this would do. He wanted to keep the thing boiling—keep himself prominent before the public. Well, I sat down on that; I didn't believe in such work, and of course Schaack didn't like it.

After I heard all that, I began to think there was, perhaps, not so much to all this Anarchist business as they had claimed, and I believe I was right.

The last figure in this sanguinary drama ought to be called William Randolph Hearst. But chronology does not permit, and so we shall have to say—the Newspapers. Their part in the drama of dynamite was simply to make money out of the public's fears. They had not the poetry of Parsons nor the madness of Michael J. Schaack to excuse them. They exploited these impossible horrors and fictitious fears for profit. They scared Chicago almost to death, and charged a penny a shudder.

This part of the story no one can tell better than Mr. Russell.

* Quoted in Governor Altgeld's "Reasons for Pardon."

"The nervous strain upon the public had become," he says, "almost intolerable. The stories circulated, printed and believed in those days seem now to belong to the literature of lunacy. There were twenty thousand armed and desperate anarchists in Chicago, an assault upon the jail had been planned, all the principal buildings were to be blown up, innumerable anarchists had sworn that the men should never be hanged. The newspaper offices, the banks, and the Board of Trade were guarded night and day. Nearly all citizens carried weapons. I remember finding at ten o'clock at night a gun store still open in Madison street and crowded with men that were buying revolvers, and knowing the state of the public mind the spectacle did not strike me then as in the least strange but wholly natural. The dread of some catastrophe impending was not alone in men's talk but in their very faces and in the air."

The execution of the men—four innocent men—was worse than a lynching; more degrading a spectacle even than that. It was the spectacle of a whole city driven insane with fear by the newspapers. Chicago trembled before the four men whose necks were already in the noose—trembled and wept with fright, sickened and fainted with the nausea of utter fear. It was just an ordinary hanging, save that in this case, as it happened, the victims were innocent of any crime. But—

One block from the jail in each direction, [says Mr. Russell], ropes were stretched across the streets and traffic was suspended. Behind the ropes were lines of policemen with riot rifles. Thence to the jail the sidewalks were patrolled by other policemen similarly armed. The jail itself was guarded like a precarious outpost in a critical battle. Around it lines of policemen were drawn; from every window policemen looked forth, rifles in hand; the roof was black with policemen. The display of force was overpowering; the place was like a fort.

At six o'clock in the morning the reporters were admitted; after that all entrance was denied. From six until nine upon eleven we stood there. Two hundred of us, cooped in the jailer's office, waiting with nerves played upon by more disquieting rumors than I have ever heard in a like period. So great was the nervous tension that two of the reporters, tried and experienced men, turned sick and faint and had to be assisted to the exterior, whence they could not return. In all my experience this was the only occasion on which any reporter flinched from duty, however trying; but it is hard now to understand the tremendous power of the infectious panic that had seized upon the city, and had its storm center at that jail. Perhaps some idea of it can be gained from the fact that while we waited there a Chicago newspaper issued an extra, seriously announcing that the jail had been mined by anarchists, great stores of dynamite placed beneath, and at the moment of the hanging the whole structure and all in it were to be destroyed.

With its last gasp of hysterical strength, Chicago did the deed—the easy official murder. Nothing happened. The earth did not open and swallow them up in one vast blast of dynamite. They killed four innocent men, and the thing was over. Chicago breathed again. "It sounds now," says Mr. Russell, "a horrible and a cruel thing to say, yet visibly, most visibly, all other men's hearts were lightened because those four men's hearts were stilled."

It was done; but not yet did the newspapers let the public alone. They prowled ghoul-like in the graveyard, and sold their festering fancies to the public.

When a year had passed they were at it stronger than ever. The anniversary of the hanging, they said, was to be the occasion of a mighty anarchist revenge. The day came and passed, and nothing happened, save a quiet memorial service in honor of the dead. But the newspapers discovered a plot even in that. The date of the revenge, they announced, had been put off two weeks.

Those two weeks, [says Mr. Russell], were filled with stories so lurid and circumstantial of the terrible deeds at hand, that even citizens that so far had retained their poise began to be alarmed. Anarchists were gathering from all parts of the world; strange, sinister looking men were alighting from all the incoming trains; arms and ammunition were being collected; the Lehr und Wehr Verein, screaming for vengeance, was marching to and fro with magazine guns; united anarchism was to make one mighty outbreak, and punish Chicago by dynamiting the public buildings and slaughtering the principal citizens. Minute, circumstantial accounts of all these matters were printed daily. Such of the newspapers as were endowing the public with this line of news even knew the meeting place where the anarchist clans were to gather that Sunday afternoon to begin the work of destruction. They knew it and they printed it. Greif's Hall was the place, No. 54 West Lake Street. At two o'clock the vast hordes were to assemble, and march thence to blow things up, beginning with the City Hall.

Sunday came, two o'clock arrived. The police were ready under arms, in all the near-by streets and massed in the police stations. But nothing happened. Nothing at all.

"And the meeting in Greif's Hall? Oh, that was held truly enough," says Mr. Russell, "and right under the noses of the police. It was a meeting of the German Housewives' Society, and it gathered to knit yarn socks, and discuss the infamous price of sausage; which placidly and contentedly it did all the afternoon."

When Chicago learned the comic truth, says Mr. Russell, the ghost of dynamite fled. "It will never return," he says optimistically. But he is wrong. The drama of dynamite will play many a return engagement in this country, though never on so grand a scale.

The poets of dynamite are, perhaps, all dead. The "Revolutionary Handbook" is among the novels of yesteryear, unread and

forgotten. But the brass-buttoned maniacal savior of society exists on every police force, and the newspapers are still ready to feed the public on horror-stew and hell-broth. One fact alone preserves us from a recrudescence of this whole insanity. And that fact is the caricaturist. The newspaper cartoonist has done us a wholesome service. He has made the anarchist with his bomb a comic figure. If we were to meet such a figure on the streets to-day, our first impulse would be not to shudder, but to laugh. The bomb remains a symbol, but no longer a dreadful symbol. It is on its way, via the comic supplement, into the nursery.

ANOTHER STUDY IN BLACK

By W. E. B. DU BOIS

Professor John M. Mecklin of the University of Pittsburgh has written a book of 273 pages on "Democracy and Race Friction."

So far as the race problem is concerned, the book is symptomatic of the average of our national thought and is of scientific value only as it shows how far science dares go to-day in its anti-Negro campaign. As compared with Hoffman's book of a decade ago it indicates advance. As a social study it belongs to the "sociological" school with elaborate insistence on "psychology" and "groups" and a vast overworking of the word "social."

The book is divided into nine chapters. The first chapter says that the people must be alike if they are to live together in peace, and it hastens to add that if two unlike groups live together there is going to be "group" antagonism!

The social conscience cannot tolerate two standards of values different in quality and yet equal in authority. The race discriminations which one meets at every turn in the South thus become in their last analysis a form of self-preservation adopted by the group mind of the white. They often appear to the outsider cruelly unjust, and in individual cases perhaps they are; but the group mind, which thinks in comprehensive and convenient terms, has identified with the white skin the exceedingly fundamental problem of the preservation of the unquestioned supremacy of social ideals which are instinctively felt to be necessary to the integrity and persistence of the civilization of the white (p. 15).

The second and third chapters proceed to prove that the ten million American Negroes are a "race" and as such inferior to the white race. The proof is brain measurements, quotations from African travellers and a good deal of insistence on the lack of

variability and the form of the head of the Negro. Haiti and the supposed prevalence of venereal disease come in for the usual emphasis.

Summing up the results of the analysis of the race traits of the Negro, we assert that facts tend to show not so much racial inferiority as fundamental racial differences. . . . After every allowance has been made for the effect of the social heritage and for the generally acknowledged similarity of all mankind, so far as general mental characteristics are concerned, there is still left in the case of the Negro, as in the case of other races, a residue of racial traits that must be looked upon as peculiar to him (p.73-74).

This sounds encouraging; and then follows :

These differences are found *only at the lower level of instinct, impulse* (p. 74. Italics ours).

Handicapped by such absolute race differences the fourth chapter says that the social heritage of the Negro has been quite shocking. This wretched social heritage comes from their African life and their life since slavery, it seems. During slavery the blacks were, according to a long quotation on page 155, chiefly entertained with the beautiful colored plates of Audubon birds!

Chapter five goes on quite naturally to say that a people with such natural traits and heritage are the subject of race prejudice. This, however, is not bad, although the reaction of the Negro toward it may be dangerous!

The militant race philosophy preached by a certain group of Negro writers and thinkers is not one that the sincere friend of the Negro would like to see him adopt (p. 156).

However, all is not dark. Mr. Washington's philosophy of submission is at hand and there lies the way of salvation.

So far the book has followed the logical and old-fashioned development of the anti-Negro arguments. The author has been at pains to avoid extreme views and has modified his own with a certain semblance of fairness. He desires, however, to come out at a different point than the older race philosophers.

Chapter six, therefore, on "The Philosophy of the Color Line," represents a certain squirming away from the inevitable logic of the earlier chapters. This leads him to the following point:

The philosophy of the color line should enable us to understand why the full and complete social integration of the Negro is impossible. Such social integration as does exist must be based upon mutual concessions and compromises. The conditions of the greatest harmony will be, as already suggested, where the weaker group accepts unconditionally the will of the stronger group. Conditions of friction will inevitably occur where the weaker group refuses to accept these conditions. The most fruitful conditions of race

friction may be expected where there is a constant insistence upon a theoretical equality of the weaker group which the stronger denies. Starting with racial antipathy as a fixed and irreducible element in the problem, it is undoubtedly true that the farther we get from slavery and the nearer an approximation of the theoretical claims of democracy, the more difficult social integration appears (pp. 180-1).

Having reached this *impasse* he proceeds in the next chapter with "Creating a Conscience." This conscience, however, it seems, is to be created by the Negro race!

The facts cited in the chapter on the "color line" indicate that the social salvation of the Negro for an indefinite period in the future must be worked out within his own group (p. 182).

And, therefore, we have a chapter which revels in the various shortcomings of colored men; their lack of unity in a certain Lincoln Emancipation Celebration; their lack of pride, and particularly their sex immorality. This, the author returns to again and again with a peculiar smacking of lips. He has before recited the statistics of Washington hospitals, he repeats the assertions of southern white physicians, he laughs at Negro preachers and criticizes the "immaturity and uncertainty of group ideals" among the Negro intellectuals. In fact, it is quite evident after this orgy that nothing can save the Negro but the Negro himself.

When a modern white man of the privileged classes gets on the subject of sex morality and begins to compare his own sacrosanct record with "ancient Rome" and the "Orient" and "Central Africa," it is enough to make the gods shriek with laughter. Here are five million colored women whose great-grandmothers were stolen and whose mothers and grandmothers have been at the mercy of American white men for three centuries. Now comes a college professor to tell them that their "race traits" exclude them from his pure society and that they must "build a conscience." Who is going to build a conscience for the poor white prostitutes of the South who have increased 100 per cent. in the last twenty years?

The author now glances at the Supreme Court and is pleased:

The supreme court's interpretation of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments has demonstrated another fact also, namely, the bankruptcy of the old theory of natural rights. The sublime assurance with which Sumner, Garfield, Edmunds and others assumed the essential equality of all men by virtue of certain natural rights, a "God-given franchise," which they did not take the trouble to define further, has disappeared. The most vigorous repudiation of the doctrine often comes from the sons of those who championed it. Their vision of an ideal social and political order

based upon these "vague, irresponsible oracles of Nature" has now little more significance than an iridescent dream (p. 245).

This, then, brings him to his last chapter and his great solution, "Equality Before the Law." He names three possible solutions:

Summing up our conclusions we remark, first, that the semblance of democracy may be preserved, as has been suggested, by maintaining the Negro in enjoyment of an artificial state of equality until, through a slow process of social selection and a gradual approximation of the type of the dominant group, he is ready for complete assimilation. Such a solution is impossible. It presupposes for an indefinite length of time a mere *modus vivendi* injurious to both groups (p. 268).

On the other hand, it is conceivable that the principles of American democracy may perforce undergo modification to the extent of permitting a status based upon race traits and the resulting caste distinctions. In support of this view our attention is directed to the imperative need of a stable social order and the actual facts of race adjustment as they have taken place in the South since the civil war. Such a situation, however, apart from its violation of the spirit of democracy, serves only to perpetuate and to stereotype rather than to solve the problem. It would perpetuate it as slavery did or as peonage would do (pp. 268-9).

A third alternative is to accept the situation as it is, with all the complications arising from segregation and race antipathy, and to insist upon a stern, evenhanded justice based upon equality of consideration. This implies, of course, that each individual as well as each racial group be free to find a natural level in society (p. 269).

In other words, Mr. Mecklin, after having put the individual Negro out of the court and used nearly 300 pages to say that the whole problem is a problem of groups, comes in his last chapter to a perfectly rational conclusion, that this is not a problem of groups at all, but a matter of each individual finding his natural level. But having once come to this conclusion, how can we accept the situation as it is, because the essence of the situation as it is means that the Negro should be treated not according to his deserts, but according to that ever-indefinite thing, the present status of his race! Moreover, the "race" to which he belongs is assumed to be wholly of African blood and heritage, when, as a matter of fact, from twenty-five to forty per cent. of it is of Anglo-Saxon descent, and, finally, he is, as a matter of fact, judged not according to the real status of his race, but according to what public opinion for the time being assumes to be the status of his race.

One instance may illustrate the author's scientific method. He quotes a Negro writer on the discourteous treatment of Southern

Negroes in public in matters of salutation, etc. This he admits is true, but he explains it:

It is true if a Negro greets a white man, he is liable to be "flatly snubbed," but it depends altogether on how he greets him. If he greets the white man as an equal, he is likely to be flatly snubbed. If he greets him in an undefinable way, which all southern Negroes understand, *as a member of one group greeting the other*, he is a great deal less apt to be snubbed (pp. 124-5. Italics ours).

Just what a "group greeting" is, Mr. Mecklin fails to explain. It must, however, be something quite elaborate, and very convincing.

After all, this leads us to the inevitable conclusion that Mr. Mecklin's book is not valuable. It says nothing new, it is based on no first hand or intimate knowledge, and the only thing worth while about it is its illogical conclusion, which contradicts all that the book has attempted to say.

LABOR IN THE ROMAN WORLD

BY J. B. S.

In his latest work, "Labor in the Roman World" (*Le Travail dans le Monde Romain, par Paul Louis, Felix Alcan, Paris*), Paul Louis, well known to readers of the NEW REVIEW, traces the evolution of Roman society from the Royal period, through the Republic and the Empire, down to the final collapse, hastened, indeed, by the invasions of the barbarians but caused by the weakness inherent in its economic organization.

In a remarkably simple, clear, and fascinating exposition, the author sets forth the gradual development of slave, free and serf labor, in agriculture as well as in the industries, including the history of exchange and distribution, of commerce, money and transportation. Step by step he reveals how the political, military, and social history of Rome was determined throughout by economic conditions, and how the great political and social facts in their turn affected the various historic phases of economic life. In the skill with which M. Louis now separates the multitudinous constituent elements of Roman society, now combines them into a moving, living organism; in the masterly handling of keen analysis and large synthesis, constantly and closely interwoven, lies the great charm of his historic method.

Originally Rome was but a small town whose dwellers, barbarian peasants and shepherds, were poor, simple and warlike, and had largely conserved the ancient tribal organization of society.

However, already under the early kings, this organization, with its economic, political and social equality, was destroyed. By a series of usurpations of both the public and private lands, a small number of more prominent families developed into a privileged landed aristocracy, the patriciate, and henceforth Rome was torn by class struggles, due to the economic expropriation and political subjection of the plebs.

The town of Rome was confined within very narrow limits. Her soil was unproductive. The Romans, like all barbarians, were ignorant of agricultural technique and had no manufacture or commerce to speak of. But all around her in Italy dwelt peoples that had reached a more advanced economic stage and enjoyed a large measure of wealth, which lay temptingly at the gates of Rome. Her inferior condition and her increasing needs, the ever-growing appetite for luxuries in her aristocracy and the constant demands of her poor and turbulent plebs, drove Rome into a long series of wars of conquest with the surrounding peoples, who possessed a higher economic organization and were more peaceful. These wars developed her already warlike citizens into a highly efficient military engine. Conquest for the sake of plunder became early the established policy of Rome. War was her great national business, the art she excelled in, the chief source of her enormous wealth.

With the never-ending conquests during the Republic grew apace the greed of the Roman plutocracy, which utilized for its own class interests the external policy of Rome—greed for land and slaves, for money and treasure, for tribute and taxes, greed for new regions in which to establish colonies for the expropriated and rebellious plebs. The Roman imperialistic policy was a product of economic conditions. But its object was not the conquest for her manufacturers of markets or raw materials or unexploited natural sources of wealth, but mainly for the confiscation of ready-made wealth and for the extortion of taxes and tribute. The endless wars of defense during the Empire were likewise due to economic causes. It was absolutely necessary to hold in check or beat back the ever more threatening inroads of barbarians, if the colossal system of economic exploitation of the world for the benefit of Rome's plutocracy was to be maintained.

On the other hand, this policy of conquest had a determining influence upon the evolution of the economic conditions in Rome and in Italy. As the world produced for Rome, the development of the productive forces in Italy was neglected, the Romans being essentially exploiters, not producers. The policy of conquest led fatally to production in Italy by foreign slave-labor, and slave-labor was the profound and irremediable cause of the downfall of

Rome's economic and political power. Ruthless exploitation, accumulating untold wealth in Italy, drained the conquered world of its economic vitality, but in the long run it brought about the economic and political ruin of Italy herself.

Slave-labor became the dominant social form of labor in Italy. Unable to exist as workers by the side of the cheap and despised slave-labor, millions of her citizens were reduced to idleness and misery, and crowded into the great cities, forming, especially in the city of Rome, a dangerous beggar-proletariat that lived upon the bounty of the government and eventually became an instrument in the hands of ambitious and unscrupulous politicians and generals. To the struggles between patricians and plebeians were now added the great rebellions of the slaves and the civil wars between ambitious generals who vied with one another for the favor of the beggar-proletariat.

Owing to his absence from home during the long and frequent wars, the peasant soldier neglected his farm, fell into debt, and finally was expropriated and supplanted by the slave, the vast estates, *latifundia*, thus increasing in size and number. Besides, the peasant was changing into a professional soldier; he was gradually losing all taste and fitness for labor, agricultural or other; the soldier's trade was regarded as superior to the despised manual labor. The cultivation of breadstuffs was crowded out by the *latifundia*, which found it more profitable to grow grapes and olives and raise rare birds for the table. The countryside became depopulated, marshes taking the place of the deserted fields, and more and more Italy came to depend for her breadstuffs upon Sicily, Asia and Egypt.

It was not because of the harm to the peasantry and the country at large, nor because of humanitarian or religious considerations that slave-labor began to diminish during the latter part of the Empire, but because it ceased to be a paying investment. Work or no work, the slave has to be maintained by his master; he lacks initiative, energy and technical skill. Moreover, the slave system does not lend itself readily to division of labor. Add to all this the ever increasing dearth of slaves, owing to the cessation of successful wars of conquest, and the corresponding rise in the price of that merchandise. Thus economic considerations led to the enfranchisement of ever larger numbers of slaves. Out of these liberated slaves and out of the impoverished freemen was gradually evolved a new agricultural class, the *colons*, a kind of serfs riveted to the soil. In the industries a similar transformation took place: slaves ascending and freemen descending the social scale, became, by imperial decrees, riveted to their crafts, they and their offspring

forever; infractions of these despotic fiats were not infrequently punished with death. The tottering economic system could be maintained only by fettering the workers to their trades, in agriculture and in industry, and by an all-pervading economic paternalism. The emperors founded throughout the realm industrial establishments under government management or monopoly. Free labor, at no time of great importance in Rome, practically disappeared and compulsory labor became the prevailing social form of labor in the Empire. Under the colossal oppression of an unspeakable Oriental despotism and bureaucracy, whose exactions knew no bounds, and of a plutocracy wallowing in an Oriental luxury that beggars all description and consumed the very substance of the enthralled masses, the economic life of the world, humanity itself, was well-nigh being crushed out of existence.

However, the most despotic paternalism and the most draconic measures proved unable to stave off the inevitable economic and political catastrophe brought about by the effects of the conquests. The military power itself was ruined by the conquest of the world, for, as a result of this conquest, the masses in Italy now consisted of wretched slaves and serfs and of a physically enfeebled and morally degenerate proletariat. More and more the ranks of the legions had to be recruited with barbarian mercenaries.

In the later stages of the Empire, during the third and fourth centuries A. D., the economic crisis and attending misery were immense and universal. The Roman monster had devoured itself. Hated by the nations, Caesar stood helpless and discredited. Caesar was poor. In his straitened circumstances, a vulgar impostor, he debased his coin, and his august, his divine effigy stamped thereon proved unable to induce the enslaved and exploited world to honor it. He fell. His purple mantle was torn to shreds. And in the universal and utter anarchy that succeeded the Great Roman Peace, the pagan barbarian warrior-lords, ably emulated by Christian prelates, were engaged for centuries in a savage struggle for the possession of the tattered shreds of the Empire—for the inheritance of the divine right of exploiting the world.

Such, in brief, is the gist of M. Louis' leading idea, around which are grouped all the important facts of Rome's history. Economic, social and political facts are presented in their inmost causal interaction. The book is a thoroughly scientific study and a most vivid, lifelike picture, withal, of Roman society. The reader carries away from it a more clear and satisfying conception of the essential nature of Roman history than from any of the numerous and voluminous works dealing with this vast and ever interesting subject.

A SOCIALIST DIGEST

THE UPSHOT IN COLORADO

In our last issue we pointed out that the middle-classes of Colorado, bitter against Rockefeller and boasting their friendliness to the unions, were yet demanding compulsory arbitration. Judge Lindsey has recently been preaching something approaching this throughout the country, and nobody can question his radicalism or integrity. And now our good radical friend George Creel naïvely writes in *Everybody's* in favor of the same sovereign "remedy":

Nothing is plainer to them than that the solidarity of capital is fast bringing about the solidarity of labor, and that a continuance of present conditions will result in a class war of frightful proportions. To meet this menace they are preparing to advance the *rights of society*—the welfare of the great body of non-combatants whose peace and prosperity are destroyed by this constant warfare between two groups that have been made stubborn, lawless, and implacable by ancient hates.

Never again will an absentee landlord be permitted to bury Colorado in debt and shame out of his regard for "a great principle." Never again will strikers be permitted to attempt redress of wrongs by force of arms. The Rockefellers and the Haywoods are to be denied alike, and their menacing organizations met and defeated by a social solidarity based upon equal justice.

Compulsory arbitration has already been decided upon as a first step.

Creel did not notice that even the *New York Times* spoke out against Rockefeller and favored the recognition of the *good* union, the *good* union leader, and a *reasonable* agreement, like the heaven-sent Protocol of the clothing trades. To quote a contemporary:

On this question the Roosevelt commission (of 1903) had this to say:

"Experience shows that the more full the recognition given to a trades union, the more businesslike and responsible it becomes. Through dealings with business men in business matters, its more intelligent, conservative, and responsible members come to the front and gain general control and direction of its affairs. If the energy of the employer is directed to discouragement and repression of the union, he need not be surprised if the more radically inclined members are the ones most frequently heard."

This, the *New York Times* thinks, is the lesson the coal operators in Colorado are learning. The employers, it says, are right in their stand for the "open shop"; but in an important sense they,

too, as well as the unions, have stood for the "closed shop"—closed against the unions. While they have employed union men they have discouraged the unions and "refused to hear the union's representatives." The *Times* points to the plan under which 7,556 grievances have been settled in New York City in the garment industries, since the "protocol of peace" was signed in March, 1911, by which the union was recognized, but by which the right of men to contract individually as well as collectively was also recognized. This, it insists—the "open union," not the "closed shop"—is the solution of such difficulties as those in Colorado.

No strikes—this is the program both of the middle classes and of far-sighted employers. If slight concessions are needed they will be made. Protocols and a more or less compulsory arbitration or "legal minimum wage" are only means of achieving peace and of keeping down radical unions and radical union policies.

So this is what we get from Colorado? This is, indeed, all for the present—in dollars and cents. We may confidently expect from President Wilson a repetition of Roosevelt's reactionary commission which settled the anthracite coal strike of 1903.

DO SOCIALISTS HOLD ROCKEFELLER RESPONSIBLE?

The press of the country complains that Rockefeller is an absolute industrial monarch in Colorado—and other places. One day it calls for the abdication of this monarch, the next it calls upon him to be "good." Even so radical an organ as the *New York Globe* says: "Heavy is the responsibility that has been assumed by Mr. Rockefeller. It is so heavy that it is still difficult to believe that the full facts have reached him." In other words, our industrial monarch cannot be wholly bad. So, too, we had the private ambassador of President Wilson as well as Judge Lindsey pleading with his majesty.

The Socialist press also has attacked Rockefeller, but only as the representative of the principle of industrial monarchy, or rather of industrial oligarchy—for 100,000 tyrants are as bad as one. It is attacking the present social system, including the ruling class which defends the system, and every individual member of it who stands by his class. Rockefeller is responsible and guilty, but all the other capitalists are equally responsible and guilty.

Some leading Socialists, however, have given another view—in the anti-Socialist press. In an authorized interview in the *New York Sunday World*, in an article entitled, "Here is a Radical

Party that Repudiates Rampage and Riot," Morris Hillquit says:

Any attempt to single out one individual, be he ever so powerful, and to fasten responsibility on him necessarily tends to divert public attention from the vicious system and to encourage the false and sterile belief that the problem would be solved if a better and fairer minded man were substituted for the one chosen for condemnation.

The right answer to this argument was heard a few weeks before, at the annual meeting of the National Committee of the Socialist Party, from the lips of—Morris Hillquit. We quote the official Party *Bulletin*:

Max S. Hayes, Secretary of the Resolutions Committee, spoke in defense of the resolutions as submitted, and against Doyle's amendment and the proposition to name John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Governor Ammons, and the State and County officials in stricken Colorado as the real instigators of the outrages against the workers.

"We are making war against the capitalist system, and not against individuals," said Hayes. "I would not dignify John D. Rockefeller, Jr., or Governor Ammons by mentioning them."

He was also opposed to criticising President Wilson for not sending the Federal troops into Colorado sooner, or otherwise interfering in the Colorado struggle, because he said it was not yet certain that the Federal troops would not resort to the same coercive measures exercised by the State militia.

Committeeman Morris Hillquit, New York, was in favor of mentioning Rockefeller in the resolutions, since he stood in the eyes of the world as the incarnation of the capitalist system and its infamies.

"President Wilson has not yet sent an ambassador to Huerta because his hands are stained with blood, but he does send an envoy to John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and he is turned down cold," said Hillquit. "This should be pointed out to the people of the nation."

WILSON'S POPULISTIC VIEWS ABOUT MEXICO

Collier's Weekly very rightly assails President Wilson's political and economic philosophy:

From the melodramatic interview which President Wilson gave to the *Saturday Evening Post* we take this:

"I challenge you [he said] to cite me an instance in all the history of the world where liberty was handed down from above! Liberty always is attained by the forces working below, underneath, by the great movement of the people. That, leavened by the sense of wrong and oppression and injustice, by the ferment of human rights to be attained, brings freedom."

It would be difficult to compress more false history and bad statesmanship into so few words as are contained in the paragraph

quoted from Wilson's interview. To take the most obvious example, consider human slavery. It was once practically universal; it is now practically unknown. We can't recall—and it would be entirely safe to challenge Wilson to recall—a single square foot of the earth's surface upon which slavery was abolished by rebellion on the part of the slaves. (The island of Haiti may be a possible exception.) The abolition of slavery has invariably been "handed down from above." If these words of Wilson's were true, slavery in the United States would have been abolished by rebellion on the part of the slaves.

But *Collier's* does not dare to take up Wilson's other points—which, though populistic, fit the agrarian conditions of Mexico admirably—are in fact the politics for a country in that stage, though not for the United States.

Collier's lets London attack the Mexicans on racial grounds. It does not dare assail Wilson's bold proposition that every people can be readily prepared for self-government (though Wilson does not dare to apply this theory to Mississippi or South Carolina). And, whether the French Revolution was a revolution from below or from the middle, Wilson's comparison of that great movement with the present Mexican situation is sound, and the new editor of *Collier's* does not care to deny it. For the ruling class *was* overthrown by force. *Collier's*, the *Outlook*, and other Progressive organs, on the contrary, demand the protection of this very ruling class, consisting largely of foreign and American capitalists and concessionaires, at whatever cost to the American and Mexican people.

Against these concessionaires Wilson speaks out in the *Saturday Evening Post* as clearly as Danton ever spoke out against the nobility of France:

President Wilson banged the desk again. His smile vanished and his face became stern and set.

"And eventually," he said slowly, "I shall fight every one of these men who are now seeking and who will then be seeking to exploit Mexico for their own selfish ends. I shall do what I can to keep Mexico from their plundering. There shall be no individual exploitation of Mexico if I can stop it."

The question is, Will Wilson have the force to keep up this resolution against the overwhelming pressure of our large capitalists? And even if he does do what he "can" will his Party and his Congress support him?

It is a big issue. For if Wilson succeeds it means that foreign affairs as well as the domestic government have fallen out of the hands of the large capitalists.

That Villa is leading a genuine radical peasant movement is shown by the war he has opened on the Catholic Church—which has been attacked by every popular movement in Mexico for the last half century. A Torreon despatch to the New York *Call* says:

Considering that the Catholic party in Mexico has shown an active interest in the support of President Huerta, General Villa to-day virtually declared war on the church in Mexico and began the expulsion of priests.

Nuns also were ordered out of the country, except those guarding young girls in convents.

Twelve badly frightened Jesuit priests of various nationalities from Saltillo were sent north to-day. They were assured by Villa they would not be executed, but he urged them never again to return to Mexico.

All Spanish priests and nearly all Spanish nuns in Saltillo fled the city when the federal garrison evacuated.

Villa to-day said that while he would not deport the nuns left in charge of convents, he would not allow the church schools to be reopened. Practically all priests in Torreon and Chihuahua have left the country.

The reply of the Church is amusing. We take the following from the *Live Issue*:

The Mexicans to-day are poor and uneducated. Why? Because a series of INFIDEL GOVERNMENTS for more than fifty years have been mismanaging the affairs of a naturally rich and fertile domain. Yet we read this ignorant blast in the *Enterprise*, a Georgia paper: "General Villa realizes that the Catholic priests and bishops have designedly kept the working classes in ignorance and poverty so that the few could own the many as helpless slaves. All the revolutionists are particularly bitter against the priests and bishops. Mexico is much like France in 1789 suffering from the same identical causes, the corruption and rottenness of the Church and State."

JACK LONDON IN MEXICO

Instead of using the Mexican situation to point out the lessons of revolutionary Socialism, the economic interpretation of history and class war, Jack London has evolved a racial interpretation of history and is preparing the ground for a race war. John Reed has told us of the Latin quality of Mexican civilization. And so far as there is a civilization, it is among the middle classes, and is undoubtedly Spanish in origin and Southern in temperament, that is Latin. This accounts, for example, for the rather extreme

language and theories of the Mexican "Liberals." But, of course, it does not account for the basic economic facts.

London goes further. It is only blood that counts, not even tradition is of any real moment—to say nothing of economic facts. The Mexican peons are "Indians" of a certain breed; that describes them. And the ruling middle classes are "half-breeds"; that sufficiently describes them. We read in a recent number of *Collier's*:

It should be understood at the outset that Mexico is not a Latin country. Mexico is an Indian country. The people of Mexico are not Latins. They are Indians. And they are Indians, only somewhat resembling the Indians of the United States. They are not merely a different tribe. They are a different race of Indians.

Sixty-five per cent. of the inhabitants are pure Indians; 15 per cent. are pure Spanish, Americans, English and other foreigners. The remaining 20 per cent. are mixed Indian and Spanish. It is this mixed 20 per cent. that, according to the stay-at-home American notion, constitutes the Mexican, and practically the totality of the Mexican population.

And it is just precisely that 20 per cent. half-breed class that foment all the trouble, plays childish with the tools of giants, and makes a shambles and a chaos of the land. These "breeds" represent neither the great working class, nor the property-owning class, nor the picked men of the United States and Europe who have given Mexico what measure of exotic civilization it possesses. These "breeds" are the predatory class. They produce nothing. They create nothing. They aim to possess a shirt, ride on a horse, and "shake down" the people who work and the people who develop.

These "breeds" do politics, issue pronouncements, raise revolutions or are revolutionized against by others of them, write bombastic unveracity that is accepted as journalism in this sad, rich land, steal pay rolls of companies, and eat out hacienda after hacienda as they picnic along on what they are pleased to call wars for liberty, justice and the square deal.

They claim the government of Mexico is theirs, these gentlemen with shirts, on the backs of stolen horses. And government, to them, means just precisely the license to batten upon the labor and industry of the country. The trouble is, so lacking are they in the ability for government, that they cannot maintain for any length of time the battening government of their dreams. They continually quarrel over the division of the spoils, and fight among themselves for a monopoly of the governmental battening privilege.

It does not seem to have occurred to London to compare Mexico with other countries in the same stage of social evolution. He does not seem to know, for example, that many of these conditions are identically the same in Russia, where upper, lower, and middle class are all of the same blood. He seems to have remembered nothing of his Socialism and never dreams of explaining Mexico

as a feudalistic agrarian State suddenly invaded by a fully equipped and modern industrial capitalism. No, he prefers the outworn and discarded theory of the inferiority of mixed breeds.

Nor does he stop at this. He goes on to insinuate the inferiority both of the Indians and of the Spaniards of whom this particular mixed breed is composed. Neither of them have any "ability for government." The Spaniards have notoriously failed:

Spain, despite her world empire, which she picked up at a lucky stroke, much as a Hottentot might pick up a Koh-i-noor, never possessed any genius for government. The descendants of the Spaniards in Mexico, interbred with the native Indians, have likewise displayed no genius for government. Facts are facts.

And the Indians also have failed, not because they are undeveloped, scattered over vast spaces, uninformed and unarmed; no, because they are not Americans!

But how about the peon? There are twelve million peons. They have had four centuries to get interested in the subject. Considering the paucity of the numbers of their masters, they have evidently not considered the matter to any purpose. I doubt, by a count of noses, if one-fourth of one per cent. of the peons of Mexico are bearing arms for the purpose of gaining free land or of gaining anything else their leaders desire.

Villa confiscated the great estates of Chihuahua. To each adult male in the State of Chihuahua he gave sixty acres of land. But there was a string on the gift. For ten years the land was to be inalienable. His explanation of this string is that the peon has lost his ancient land hunger, and that, if given the land outright, he would immediately sell or gamble away his holding.

Of course, the peon should have the land. Some day he will have it. But when no more than one-fourth of one per cent. of the peons have risen to take the land, the feebleness of the peon land hunger is fully told. So another magic phrase means one thing to the American mind and quite a different thing to the Mexican mind. It is impossible to conceive of twelve million Americans, gnawed by the land hunger, arming and sending into the field one-fourth of one per cent. of their number to fight for the land.

Villa is belittled and the popular movement reduced to 100,000 men in arms. (How could there be more when there are no more arms, to say nothing of feeding larger forces!) And since there is no strong man and no strong breed, nothing is left but intervention:

There is no other Porfirio Diaz in sight. There is no strong "breed" capable of whipping the rest of the disorderly "breeds" and the country into shape. There is no popular movement on which such a strong man might depend for support. Nor is there a national cause. The educated Mexicans, the wealthy Mexicans, the business and shopkeeping Mexicans, hail American intervention with delight.

"Mexico must be saved from herself." Neither the masses of the Mexican people nor the American working class are to be consulted—unless the latter can be misled by London's tawdry jingoism.

AN A. F. OF L. VICTORY

The bitter protest of the 350,000 business men of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the unanimous attacks of the reactionary press, show that in the final round Gompers won in Washington. The arguments on the floor of Congress were clear—either we must support the present conservative A. F. of L. or we shall have some such revolutionary labor union movement as the I. W. W. And, after all, the action taken was not radical. It merely places the United States on the plane of other civilized nations—reached by England in the repeal of the labor conspiracy law in 1875.

Until the enactment of the Sherman Law in 1890 the United States was in much the same condition in her labor union law as other countries. After a quarter century of reaction we have now advanced to the position of 1890. But it was a hard fought victory and may presage really constructive and genuinely radical legislation later on.

What turned into a victory was at first a defeat. Labor was *not* exempted from the Sherman Law. Unions were merely given the right to exist! According to the Washington Letter of the Socialist News Bureau, Representative MacDonald of Michigan said:

That amendment will not exempt those organizations from the operation of the anti-trust laws. IN THIS AMENDMENT YOU HAVE for certain purposes and as to certain acts BROUGHT THESE ORGANIZATIONS WHERE THE COURTS MAY HOLD THEM EXPRESSLY WITHIN THE OPERATION OF THE SHERMAN LAW.

This view was shared by Murdock, leader of the Progressives, and almost a hundred progressive Democrats and Republicans, who favored direct and explicit exemption.

But what had been lost was more than regained a few days later. Not only was a strong anti-injunction law passed, but it clearly legalizes both picketing and the boycott. The vigorous fight being made on it in the Senate, the threat to keep the whole Congress in session for months, unless a compromise is made or the legislation is postponed until after the Congressional elections, shows that employers do not trust the courts either to interpret

this law against labor or to declare it unconstitutional. Says the *New York World*:

"To establish this most odious form of privilege the House at Washington has hit upon the idea that picketing and boycotting when pursued by 'peaceable means' are not unlawful. In an effort to set apart a favored class forever, it has passed a bill amending the Anti-Trust Law so as to exempt labor unions from its operation."

DEBS, REVOLUTIONARY UNIONIST

Though still wedded to the hope that the aristocracy of labor will finally be compelled by conditions to leave their alliance with the employers and join the revolutionary laboring masses, ultimately making possible a general strike, Debs' immediate plans for the unions are thoroughly and, at the present moment, even increasingly revolutionary. While he hopes to gain the labor aristocrats later, he repudiates them as long as they are in alliance with the employing class and the political parties that represent it.

The following from an appeal to the United Mine Workers and the Western Federation of Miners appeared not only in the journals of these organizations, but also in the *International Socialist Review*:

Now I have said that the miners hold the key to the industrial situation. What I mean is this: If the miners will consolidate into one union, withdraw from the (Civic) Federation of Labor and then issue a call to the organized workers of America to send representatives, according to their membership, to a convention to be held to launch the American Industrial Union, or by whatever other name it may be called, it will be the greatest industrial convention and result in the greatest industrial organization ever known in this country.

This outcome, if not immediately probable, is decidedly possible. But when Debs goes on to speak of the possibility of getting the railroad workers into such a combination, and so preparing for the general strike, he is on far more doubtful ground. Debs says in this connection:

The railroad workers as well as the mine workers are having their eyes opened to the class war and to the imperative necessity for industrial organization. The heavy assessments and light benefits of the craft unions are driving their members toward industrial unionism and they are ripening rapidly for the change.

The industrial mine workers and the industrial railroad workers in harmonious co-operation should in the near future become a realized fact.

What a gigantic power there is in the very suggestion of such an industrial combination!

The railroad and mine workers combined can of themselves halt every wheel and close down every industry. Why then, in the face of the threatening conditions that confront them upon every hand, do they not unify their forces and fight together under the banner of industrial unionism?

Certainly the railroad and mine workers may come together—though probably not in the immediate future. But if they do, the railroad workers may predominate and the combination may be conservative rather than revolutionary.

It is, doubtless, Debs' belief in the general strike that makes him repudiate methods primarily, if not exclusively, adapted to the unskilled or semi-skilled laboring masses, which, deserted by the skilled, can hope neither to become a political majority nor to call a successful general strike. Accordingly he writes:

It is vain to talk about the I. W. W. The Chicago faction, it now seems plain, stand for anarchy. So be it. Let all who oppose political action and favor sabotage and the program of anarchism join that faction.

The two miners' organizations repudiated Debs' invitation to leave the A. F. of L., as was to be expected. Debs is not a leader of conservative labor union opinion. But this new declaration does probably represent the views of the central and controlling element among the rank and file of the Socialist Party. And by means of such statements Debs maintains his position as the chief spokesman of American Socialists. His views—whatever we may think of them—are undoubtedly those of the majority of Socialists.

AMERICAN SOCIALISTS AND THE LAND QUESTION

The present platform of the American Socialist Party, as well as the resolution on the land question passed by the Convention of 1912, has been widely criticised on the ground of ambiguity. It was held that the demand that the land be held only by actual users and without exploitation meant one thing to Party members and another thing to many dissatisfied small farmers, whose votes were sought by some Party leaders. Fanatical believers in private property, such farmers might suppose that this language was directed merely against large landholders and landlords and not against all farmer employers.

The new state platform now being voted upon by the Socialist Party of Texas corrects this ambiguity by employing the expression italicized in the following paragraph—a phrase which, it would seem, might easily have been used also by the National Party Convention of 1912:

To tax all land in excess of that required for personal or individual use without the exploitation of the labor of other persons, in an amount equal to its rentals, exempting entirely from taxation all homesteads actually occupied and used *without exploitation of the labor of others*, thus compelling the owners of unused land to throw such land on the market at its real value.

This represents progress. But the proposed Texas platform proceeds to repeat its old demand for private ownership, and actually reinforces it by demanding *the prohibition of all collective ownership*, to say nothing of collective operation:

It is a principle of Socialism that "all property privately used should be privately owned." In accord with this principle we pledge that the land publicly owned or acquired by the state shall be sold without profit or rented in parcels not larger than may be used without exploitation of the labor of others, to persons seeking homes, *and when the rent shall equal the cost of acquirements, rents shall cease and title be vested in the renter, making occupancy and use the sole title: no land to be otherwise disposed of if needed to supply such applicants.*

Fortunately, however, the current issue of the *National Bulletin* of the Socialist Party prints with approval (in its Information Department) a document which demands national ownership and states the real grounds therefor. It is entirely non-Socialist, being taken from the memorandum of Baron De Forest, M. P., embodied in the report of a Parliamentary Committee. It places chief weight upon the need to reduce the cost of living, and as the same arguments could be used for collective *operation* it is also sound from a Socialist standpoint. Its chief points, which compose an excellent and brief statement of the whole question, are as follows:

Agriculture is stagnant to-day because of the want of capital, because of the want of wise control and of proper exploitation in the common interest.

The whole population has a deep concern in the abundance and the quality of the products of the soil. Surely then it is the duty of the state to protect the needs of the vast industrial population, and to control and direct the exploitation of this essential service.

A national administration, working not on the traditional lines of private landlordism, but with a single eye to "developing, both in amount, in quality and in kind, the whole total of our agricultural production," would insist on good husbandry, on the use of the best improvements and methods of modern science. It would supply to its tenants on reasonable, but businesslike terms, a sufficiency of capital. It would organize co-operation. It would utilize land now unused because of the improvidence or the impecuniosity, the incompetence or the caprice, of a private owner.

Satisfactory conditions of life and labor would be provided for the workers on the land. The rural housing problem would be solved by the state's carrying out on ordinary business lines its duties as owner of the land.

Above all, it would be possible to secure for the first time the full exploitation of the agricultural resources of the country, and so to secure the enormous increase in production necessary to meet the needs of the people generally. It is most of all in the interests of the whole body of consumers that the change to state control is necessary.

As in the country, so in the towns. The undevelopment and underdevelopment of land can be stopped at once. All existing areas of undeveloped or underdeveloped land can be made immediately available for development. The housing problem would be solved. For it would be possible to extend all the cities to any circumference, and to establish all those sanitary, pleasant and æsthetic conditions which are planned to-day, only for it to prove impossible to carry them into effect. The towns would spread on land belonging to the people; and instead of rising land values being a barrier to progress, the inhabitants would enjoy the increment created by their own genius, activities and resources.

For under a system of communal ownership the increased land values come automatically back into the common fund. All municipal and national improvements would thus pay for themselves, and would yield a surplus which would ultimately become available for further improvements. And a vast and continually increasing fund would be at the disposal of the state.

The fund thus available would ultimately suffice as well for all local as for all national purposes, a sufficient portion of its rent being returned to each locality for the use of its local services. The rating problem would thus have disappeared.

The American Party has been remiss in pushing this reform, more important perhaps than any other, and it is encouraging to see the *Party Bulletin* take it up. But it is now swinging rather too far in the Single-Tax direction. For besides the paragraphs above quoted, De Forest's memorandum advocates land reform as a panacea, as we can see from the following statements:

The transfer of the land to the state would thus provide the means, and, in fact, the only means, for the real solution of these various problems. And at the same time it would strike directly and effectively at the root of the evils discussed above. Under a system of national ownership the absorption of wealth by private individuals would cease at once. And all the future increased wealth, all the advantages of scientific improvements in methods of production and of transport, of developments in industrial organization, of all the great advances whose advent we can foresee so clearly, will be felt and enjoyed and possessed by the whole people.

Not only is land nationalization no panacea, but an employers' government would use it almost exclusively for employers' purposes. Only a labor government would expend the new governmental income communistically for the benefit of labor.

It is strange, indeed, that the *Bulletin* should give these latter statements to its readers without criticism or explanation and with apparent approval

SHALL CHILD-BEARING BE MADE COMPULSORY?

"Governmental compulsion of child-bearing"—this is a German phrase for the proposed legislation to forbid the sale of all means to prevent conception. Such legislation, it should be observed, is something novel in Germany.

Under the above title, "Governmental Compulsion of Child-Bearing," the Berlin *Vorwaerts* discusses the proposal in no friendly tone. It first reminds its readers that the Social Democratic Party had refused to have anything to do with the "Birth-Strike"—an idea brought forward last year by certain Socialists as a means of limiting the number of future soldiers and wage-slaves. But the Party is equally unwilling, declares the *Vorwaerts*, to go in the direction of this law: "Such an interference in the most intimate personal affairs of the individual would be a mockery of civilization, and of all the laws of social health."

Of course such laws would only be effective against the poor and ignorant. The *Vorwaerts* recommends those who want to increase the population, to turn their attention to the upper classes, and quotes figures to show that the families of officials are smaller the larger their income.

The *Vorwaerts* calls attention to the fact that the ruling classes, until recently, preached the morality of small families. On the one hand, they said it was a disgrace for poor men to have larger families than they could properly provide for. And on the other they said that this led Germany to become overcrowded and forced some of its best citizens abroad. And now these teachings are being completely reversed.

But the *Vorwaerts* and modern German Socialists are by no means pessimistic about these new tendencies of capitalism. A surplus population under the conditions of a generation ago meant a surplus of labor, with the result that labor is cheaply rewarded by employers and cheaply regarded by the government. A deficient population and an under-supply of labor, of which capitalism now complains, means better wages and the conservation, protection and development of labor by the government. So the demand for more babies is a good omen:

This change in the social valuation of the getting of children is to be welcomed. It is beginning gradually to be perceived that all the piling up of material civilization comes to nothing if the supply of human beings fails. The importance of the generating values and the productive forces of the body of the people has now been

demonstrated even to those whose economic idol is the capitalistic principle of national wealth. The gift which the child-bearing woman brings to society is recognized as the most valuable increment of the national wealth.

In proportion as this truth is understood, even the ruling classes are being forced along the road of a policy of which the first word is—*economy of men*, that is the conservation of human material after it has come into being. The rate of the increase of population by no means depends upon the number of births alone, the number of deaths is a second determining factor. Only by the subtraction of one figure from the other can the increase of population be found. Every individual who prematurely passes away decreases this rate.

The *Vorwaerts* proceeds to point out acceptable means by which the death rate can be lowered as well as means by which the birth rate may be raised. This is its remedy for increasing the birth rate:

Instead of trying to force children on those who do not want them let the ability to provide for children be given to those who do want them.

"Why," *Vorwaerts* asks, "do the best situated families limit the number of their children more than others?" And this is the answer it gives:

The growing love of pleasure is responsible for this according to certain well-nourished moral preachers. And naturally there is no lack of people who regard the bringing of children into the world and raising them as a troublesome interference with their pleasure-seeking in the Spring, Summer, Fall and Winter seasons. In what circles these high-livers, both men and women, are to be found, scarcely needs to be said. For the most part they are specimens of the psychically and physically degenerated of our "best" society. Let them eliminate their germ cells from the chain of the generations. That will not lower the level of the race as a whole.

The world's leading organ of Socialism then proceeds to show that very many people would be glad to have larger families if economic conditions were more favorable. High rentals, it points out, are a serious obstacle to large families even among the middle classes, while the cost of keeping children in school during the long periods which are necessary for technical education are an even more serious obstacle. What parents can do for two children, they cannot do for four. The desire to give children a technical education now limits families in Germany, just as the desire to give them enough land to live on has limited the size of families among the French peasantry. Many young people are paid insufficiently so that they are not in an economic situation to marry without submitting their children to terrible hardships. Not marrying, these young people, especially the men of course, con-

tract sexual diseases, and Professor Blaschko has shown that for every hundred marriages there are sixty miscarriages due to these diseases. The young women employed in minor official positions are especially badly paid by the Government itself, those in commercial employments would gladly have children in most instances if they could afford it. The *Vorwaerts* suggests that pensions for mothers and state aid for those about to become mothers, and also for the confined, would lead to a considerable increase in the birth rate. Moreover, let the State assume not only the cost of intermediate and higher education, but also the maintenance of children during this period.

But the increase of the population is to be secured rather by lowering the death rate than by raising the birth rate. As reforms making in the direction of *economy of men*, the *Vorwaerts* mentions: State provision for school-children, protective legislation for youth, labor legislation, industrial sanitation, housing reform, and other measures that tend to raise the income or improve the conditions of the people. But it gives special attention to the possibilities of lessening the death rate of nursing babies. This amounts to 27 per cent. in Russia, 17 per cent. in Germany, 14 per cent. in France, 11½ per cent. in Great Britain, 8 per cent. in Norway, and 7 per cent. in Sweden—which demonstrates conclusively that at least 60 per cent. of such deaths in Germany are unnecessary and can be avoided.

Moreover, one of the chief causes of death among children is—too large families. An investigation by Herr Hamburger shows that whereas in families of one and two children only 21 to 25 per cent. die in childhood, among families of eight children the percentage is 32 per cent., and among families of nine children, 36 per cent. If we add still-born children to those who die in childhood, over fifty per cent. of the children die in families of eight and nine.

In Saxony, the number of births *decreased* by 4,000 during a period of three years, whereas the number of surviving children *increased* by almost the same number. "In view of such facts," concludes the *Vorwaerts*, "it is simply madness to endeavor to increase the population by coercing the poorer part of the population and making the means of prevention of conception more difficult. And it is a mockery in view of the further fact, testified to by Hamburger, that thousands of working women perish from this 'blessing of children.' Not a blind increase of births, but the most careful provisions for infants after they are born—this is the solution."

SOCIALISM OUTLAWED IN THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY

Last month it seemed that the unity of the two Socialist Parties of Great Britain was about to be accomplished—since the British Socialist Party had agreed to become a part of the Labor Party, at the suggestion of the International Socialist Bureau. But the Socialist Party, apparently with the consent of the Bureau, made one condition, that their candidates should be allowed to run as Socialist as well as Labor candidates. And then the other Socialist Party (the Independent Labor Party) refused to endorse this demand, which means that in elections Socialism must be absolutely subordinated to Laborism.

But the I. L. P. itself can claim no very great success for its Laborite tactics. One after another leading labor unions have been refusing to continue their financial support of the Labor Party of which the I. L. P. is a part. Altogether 473,000 votes have been cast against such financial support to 323,000 in favor of it.

At the recent Congress of the I. L. P., too, there was strong criticism, for example, that of the leader of the Miners' Union, Robert Smillie. The *Daily Citizen* reports him as follows:

He had greater difficulty to-day in persuading his audiences to become members of the Independent Labor Party than he had many years ago, because, rightly or wrongly, there was a feeling abroad that the Labor Party, if not the Independent Labor Party, were drifting into closer alliance with the Liberal Party.

He ventured to say that Mr. Asquith and his Government were more afraid of the Labor Party a few years ago than they were to-day. They were afraid of the Irish Party. Why? Because they knew the Irish Party would take each and every opportunity of voting and fighting against them, unless they got their own terms. It was only on such terms that a healthy Labor Party could be built up in this country. (Hear, hear.)

He found that 20 years ago he seconded a motion that the party should be called the Socialist Labor Party. He would prefer a party with seven independent Socialist Labor members in the House of Commons, outside an alliance with anybody, to 40 members allied to either of the other parties.

The fact that the I. L. P. Congress was held on the twenty-first anniversary of the foundation of that organization led to a general review of its work and its present position both in the Congress and in the press generally. Says the *New Statesman*:

The I. L. P. is still left chafing at the awkward entanglement with the Liberals in the House of Commons in which the party has manifestly been for the last two or three sessions. What is the way out? Are the causes of the entanglement likely to disappear? When Home Rule and Welsh Disestablishment and the rest, to

which Liberals and Labor men alike are pledged, have been disposed of, will not other great issues emerge to throw the "progressive forces" together once more? If this is to continue, then why not an open coalition? Such a development would be logical, and, as some hold, more honest and even more effective than the present state of things.

But the I. L. P. would not listen for an instant to a proposal of that sort, and it is futile to speculate on its possibility.

The Sidney Webb-Bernard Shaw organ then proceeds to analyze the proposed solution of this problem that was adopted at the Congress:

From this awkward situation the I. L. P. appears to consider that it has found a way out. For several years past it has been presented with a proposal emanating from Mr. Jowett and his friends, known in Socialist circles as the "Bradford Resolution." The plan in its original form was that the Labor Party should vote "on the merits" of each question as it arose in the House of Commons, regardless of the convenience of the Government. This heroic damning of the consequences has always made a strong appeal to a certain section of the Socialist movement, but it has always been rejected by the majority as an absurd scheme which would make a farce of Parliamentary government and a speedy end of the Labor Party. This year, however, it appeared in an altered form, urging "that Cabinet rule . . . which implies the resignation of the Ministry and the dissolution of Parliament when proposals of the Cabinet are negatived, besides making almost impossible the free consideration of proposals which have not received the Cabinet hall-mark, is inimical to the good government of the country; and that, with a view to the ultimate break up of this system, the Parliamentary Labor Party be asked to take no account of any such considerations and to vote on all issues only in accordance with the principles for which the Party stands."

That resolution seemed to the Conference to imply a substantial difference of principle from the old proposal to consider only the "merits of each question," though we rather suspect it is a difference of words only. It was carried, largely under the influence of an able speech of Mr. Jowett, by an overwhelming majority. As to the desirability of abolishing the Cabinet system or the likelihood of doing it by this method we say nothing; we refrain even from the interesting speculation on the probable consequences which the attempt to apply it would have among the hard-headed British electorate, for, frankly, it is hard to be confident that such an adventurous policy will commend itself either to the cautious Socialists at the head of the Labor Party or to the half-hearted Liberals who compose its tail. But the sure fact remains that the I. L. P. is not alone in thinking that the present situation cannot continue indefinitely. We are not of those who say that the Labor Party is played out or a hopeless failure; on the contrary, we believe that it has been, and is, a great force, and that the future belongs to it—if it will bestir itself. But, be the reason what it may (and we appreciate the enormous difficulties of the Party), it has lost a good deal of

popular sympathy and interest during the last few years and, if it is to live, it must contrive somehow to strike anew the imagination of the country. We do not suggest that it should begin forthwith on the task of breaking up the Cabinet system, but we can foresee that presently, if it does not find a better plan of its own, it may be compelled, as a last desperate resource, to set out on the path of Mr. Jowett's Great Adventure!

The *Nation* agrees that the Labor Party will have to find some way of becoming independent. As a Radical organ it would welcome the effect of such a course on the Liberal Party:

It is surprising that in the existing conditions of our State life the Independent Labor Party is not a more powerful body than it is. It has come of age, it has ideas and a vocation, and leaders full of zeal and experience. Yet in its twenty-first year it faces a coming General Election with an empty war-chest and a reluctant or a divided constituency among the workers. Why? Is it that the Parliamentary idea is receding, and that "Guild Socialism" holds the field in the younger Socialist groups and among the more aggressive trade unionists? Is it that the intellectual attraction of Socialism weakens, and young men with a conscience and brains, wishing to see something done in their time, prefer to call themselves Radicals? Some answer to these questions must be sought in the weakness of the electoral basis on which the "I. L. P." rests. The main force of labor politics still resides with the trade unions, and the "I. L. P.," though it has a strong permeating influence, still counts only a handful of members of Parliament. Even these seven members are not the choice of purely Socialist electors. In nearly all of them, we fancy, is a Liberal admixture; while in certain double-member constituencies they represent a tacit exchange of votes between Liberal and Labor candidates. This seems to us a perfectly wise arrangement; but it does not provide an entirely "independent" basis. Nor does this party of a mixed origin think it wise as yet to press a descriptive Socialist label on its standard-bearers, or to put forth a definitely Socialistic programme in competition with Liberalism. The "I. L. P.," in a word, is a Radical-Socialist Party, with the important qualification that it has a sectional aim and title, and has hardly thought out its general relationship to national and Imperial politics. . . . We are no believers in the kind of independence which is independent of common sense, that is to say, of the consequences of men's actions. But we confess that, in our view, the "I. L. P." would have made a greater impression on Parliament and the country if it had been able to carve out for itself a clear course of action, and rigidly hold to it.

But, as Fred Henderson points out in the *Clarion*, an independent party can exist only for independent purposes. When we ask what such purposes are, we are referred by Keir Hardie, in the *Labor Leader*, to "Adult Suffrage, the Nationalisation of the Land, a General Eight-Hour Working-Day, a Thirty Shilling Minimum

Wage, and the Right to Work." But certainly many non-Socialist Radicals would endorse this programme, so it could hardly serve to maintain independence.

Moreover, Keir Hardie in the same article shows that he still maintains faith in the old form of independence, which makes the party "the balancing power between the older parties." This obviously does not require a radical programme, but that the Socialists or Laborites should, on some questions at least, take a position between that of the Progressives and the Reactionaries!

IS LABOR PERMANENTLY SPLIT IN NEW ZEALAND ?

Labor is often divided in strikes, the skilled "scabbing" against the unskilled and *vice-versa*. But it is more serious when there is a nation-wide general strike, a political and social revolt, and the skilled then join the employers and strike-breakers. This was the case in the recent New Zealand strike.

We quoted last month from a report of the strike by Tregear. Tregear mentions the desertion of the skilled, but does not say much about it. In an article in the *American Economic Review* Professor Le Rossignol, whose facts agree with Tregear's at nearly every point, tells us more about this feature of the strike.

The strike was supported by the majority of the United Federation of Labor (70 per cent. at the last convention) and by its political arm, the newly formed Social Democratic Party. The 30 per cent. minority stood by the old United Labor Party. The Federation adopted practically the I. W. W. preamble and prepared for a general strike—relying chiefly upon seamen, dock-laborers, and miners, the railway workers being on the other side.

The United Labor Party issued a manifesto against the strike, and Le Rossignol credits its opposition as being one of the chief causes of the defeat.

Nevertheless, the "syndicalistic" Social Democratic Party hopes to elect about a third of the representatives to the coming Parliament—in spite of the desertion of skilled labor. In fact, it was defeated in a recent election at Lyttleton only by a narrow majority of 226 out of 4,500 votes.

THE MARCH TOWARDS POLITICAL DEMOCRACY

The first step towards pure democracy in our more progressive states has been taken with the adoption of the initiative and referendum. We have now become accustomed to seeing several states

pass over to this system every year. Though reactionary plotting sometimes makes this reform worthless through trick amendments—or rather delays it—a few more years will probably suffice to make it general throughout the country.

Already direct legislation is showing what it can accomplish towards still further democratizing our state governments. In Oregon, for example, it is now being used in an effort to abolish the state senate and introduce proportional representation in the lower house—which would give the Socialists about 17 members.

Even more important is the recall of judges, already in force in Oregon, California, Arizona, Colorado, and Nevada, and passed in Arkansas, though declared invalid by the courts. As the Oregon law was enacted only in 1908, and the others since 1911, this revolutionary reform is making rapid progress. The *Bulletin* of the National Popular Government League (Munsey Bldg., Washington, D. C.) shows large majorities and a heavy vote cast—except in Arkansas, where the majority was small, and Colorado, where the vote was light. The significance of this reform lies in the fact that no individual or corporation that has incurred the popular wrath can hope to escape the consequences. Neither courts, lawyers, nor laws can shield a recognized enemy of the people in these states. Also judicial persecutions of unions are impossible—unless backed by the farmers who compose the majority of the voters in that section.

Equally promising is the use of the referendum to secure new constitutions or easier methods of amendment. The latter reform answers all purposes and so is favored by the radicals as against the method of constitutional conventions, which, at present, might still fall into the hands of reactionaries and saddle us with retrogressive systems as bad as those we have now. This is why La Follette and a dozen other progressive Senators prefer the Gateway Amendment to a National Constitutional Convention, and this is also why the reactionaries are working so hard for constitutional conventions in New York, Pennsylvania and other states.

In New York both sides are reactionary, those opposed to the convention wishing merely to preserve the present unequal representation which grossly favors the country against the towns. In Oregon and Arkansas the convention method was also tried against the radicals, and Massachusetts and other states are now facing the same problem. Once an easy system of amendment by initiative and referendum is proposed, a constitutional convention is evidently only a reactionary device, as *Equity*, the organ of this movement, points out. (This quarterly, at 50 cents a year, is published at 1520 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.)

THE ETHICS OF SABOTAGE

Dr. James P. Warbasse has published a very thoughtful and readable pamphlet under the above title. Sabotage he defines as "the retardation of the profit-making business of employers," with the object of securing concessions in the interest of the workers "as a class," and at the same time of "the bringing about ultimately of a better society":

Sabotage is a war measure. In so far as war is unethical, sabotage is unethical. It presupposes the existence of a conflict between the capitalist class and the working class. It presupposes that the former is a parasitic class and the latter an exploited class. Its premises declare that the capitalist class owns most of the means of production and distribution; that the great majority of the working class can earn a livelihood only by selling its labor to the property owning class, and that the owning class buys the labor of the working class only when the latter produces wealth greater than the compensation which it receives for its labor.

The progressive industrialist feels that he is attacked, that he is being plundered daily of the wealth that he is producing. Why should he produce \$8 of wealth when he is receiving only \$2 for it? Why, after he has produced \$2 worth of wealth, which is all his class is to get, should he go on and produce \$6 worth of wealth which is for the parasites whom he regards as not necessary to the work? If he diminishes his output, what is he doing but refusing to dig gold faster for the robber who stands at his elbow to relieve him of it as fast as he takes it from the earth? The club which the robber holds over his head is represented in special privileges and laws and customs prejudicial to the interests of the working class and favorable to the property-owning class. This is the feeling of the industrial worker when he slackens his pace.

This may be the ethics of sabotage, and Dr. Warbasse does us a great service in pointing it out. But it is not the economics of sabotage. "Poor work for poor pay" means "good work for good pay." The craftsmen and skilled workers restricted output *all the time*, partly out of the spirit Dr. Warbasse has described, partly to create more work, to absorb the surplus supply of labor, and to tighten their monopoly of the trade. They did *not* use it as a club against the recalcitrant employer. Sabotage may mean, in some cases, this age-old practice. When it does it no longer serves as a weapon in the class-war.

Dr. Warbasse defends both violent sabotage and legal sabotage. He points to the almost universally justified use of violence by oppressed minorities, and continues:

Sabotage at the hands of the wage-workers expresses itself also in conformity with the laws of the State. In France, for example, the shop clerks have practiced it by telling the truth about the

wares they sell, desisting from the deceits which the employers insisted upon. In Austria the striking mail clerks punctiliously obeyed the laws to the letter, weighing and examining each package as the law prescribed, with the result that in a few days the post-offices were so congested that business was at a standstill and the strikers' demands were granted. Sabotage may be practiced upon the employer by filling the bottles with material specified on the label and omitting to put in the dilutant or adulterant, thus decreasing profits. The striking waiters in France practiced sabotage by publishing the truth about the conditions in restaurant kitchens.

It can be imagined that the workers may omit to introduce powder in cartridges intended for the destruction of human lives. They have learned this from the capitalistic contractors, who manufactured cartridges for the Russian army in the Russo-Japanese war, and omitted powder as a simple means of increasing their profits. Were this practiced by all the workers, making all the ammunition for two warring forces, sabotage would assume an ethical grandeur yet undreamed of.

CORRESPONDENCE

WHY "REVOLUTIONARY"?

To the NEW REVIEW:

Whaddayamean "revolutionary"? In an article on the "Revival of the Revolutionary Spirit," in the Socialist Digest of the June issue, you say that the State Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of New York "adopted a resolution (concerning Colorado) which might satisfy the most revolutionary." Then you quote the resolution as declaring: "John D. Rockefeller, Jr., caused the Colorado butchery and hecatomb and is guilty as an accessory before the fact just as much as if he with his own hand plunged a knife into the breast of the victims and held their quivering bodies over the fire."

Again I say unto you: Whaddayamean "revolutionary"? Is the doctrine of accessory before the fact revolutionary? Or is the lurid indictment of an individual for a horror of the class struggle revolutionary? Wherein is this statement, gratifying as it may be in its boldness and show of temper, more *revolutionary* than any other pronouncement of the New York State Socialist Party?

When the Typographical Union subscribes for arms and the Cigarmakers start equipping a regiment for actual service in Colorado, it seems proper to speak of the revival of revolutionary spirit. When members of the militia mutiny, we see it again. But when a Socialist organization contents itself with indicting Rockefeller, it seems to me hardly more revolutionary than the amiable young lady who used to damn him at the Franklin Statue. I sympathize heartily with the attitude of the Executive Committee and with that of the anarchist girl. I know that their words

spring from honest emotions. But in both cases there seems to have been much passion and little revolutionary thought.

Is it an indication of revolution when people show extreme feeling? If so, I venture to say that the Progressives are generally more revolutionary than the Socialists, the opportunists more revolutionary than the radicals, and the reformers generally more revolutionary than the revolutionists.

I am not writing this in condemnation of the action of the Executive Committee. Officialdom within the party has been so timid that a show of heat, even if it goes beyond reason, is a welcome sight to many of us. I should rather see the Executive Committee err in judgment than to see it forever standing still. I fancy the writer of that article felt the same. But the word revolutionary means more to most of us than four R's and an explosion; and calling everything hysterical revolutionary is not the way to bring about revolutionary action within our party.

Yours hypercritically,

New York, N. Y.

CHARLES W. WOOD.

THE ABOLITION OF POVERTY

To the NEW REVIEW:

I have just read Lippmann's review of Walling's "Progressivism and After" in the NEW REVIEW. It is done with his exceptional gift for lucid statement and shrewd reasoning, and some of the points he makes against the book are well taken. But I cannot help feeling that he has chosen as the fundamental weakness in Walling's argument what I have always felt to be the most unassailable feature of his theory both in this latest book and in "Socialism As It Is." Lippmann thinks Walling gives away his case when he concedes that the non-Socialists will abolish "poverty" and that for Socialism will be reserved the struggle for the establishment of Equality. This he considers Eighteenth Century and terribly unscientific and old-fashioned (and I don't know but that against a Supermodernist like Walling the charge of being Eighteenth Century is rather a good debating point). Once abolish poverty, he says, and the work is done; the rest is simply a matter of detail. What he does not see is that the "poverty" of the present day may be abolished and yet, by leaving a widening gulf between classes, leave class antagonism as strong as ever. Possibly Walling was imprudent in speaking of the "abolition" of poverty; as a positive condition it may be done away with; as a relative condition—and there Poverty and Inequality are the same thing—it will continue. Poverty must always be a state in relation to what might be. Four times six dollars a week may leave the shop girl as "poor" as she is to-day, when she is really quite rich in comparison with the Russian factory girl. As a fundamental human trait I agree with Walling that the demand for equality can never be destroyed by the attainment of Lippmann's "comforts." I have my own case against his book, but Lippmann doesn't seem to touch him at all on essentials.

New York, N. Y.

S. S.

THE NEW REVIEW

BOARD OF EDITORS

Frank Bohn
William E. Bohn
Floyd Dell
W. E. B. Du Bois
Max Eastman
Louis C. Fraina
Arturo Giovannitti
Felix Grendon
Isaac A. Hourwich
Paul Kennaday
Robert Rives La Monte
Arthur Livingston
Robert H. Lowie
Helen Marot
Herman Simpson
Albert Sonnichsen
Wm. English Walling

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Arthur Bullard
George Allan England
Charlotte Perkins Gilman
Reginald Wright Kaufmann
Harry W. Laidler
Austin Lewis
John Macy
Gustavus Myers
Mary White Ovington
William J. Robinson
Charles P. Steinmetz
J. G. Phelps Stokes
Horace Traubel
John Kenneth Turner

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Alexander Fraser
Jessie Ashley
Louise W. Kneeland
Caro Lloyd
Gertrude U. Light
Arthur Livingston
Paul Wilson
Max Heidelberg
Louis C. Fraina

CONTENTS FOR AUGUST, 1914

	PAGE
A FEMINIST SYMPOSIUM:	
Feminism	441
<i>Marie Jenney Howe.</i>	
Feminism and Socialism.....	442
<i>Louise W. Kneeland.</i>	
Socialism and Feminism: A Reply to Belfort Bax.....	445
<i>Maud Thompson.</i>	
Some Anti-Feminist Vagaries.....	448
<i>Frances G. Richards.</i>	
Direct Primaries	451
<i>Isaac A. Hourwich.</i>	
Movements of Migratory Unskilled Labor in California	458
<i>Austin Lewis.</i>	
The Great American Scapegoat.....	465
<i>Max Eastman.</i>	
A "Socialist" Advocate of Plutocracy....	471
<i>William English Walling.</i>	
A SOCIALIST DIGEST.....	478
Socialism vs. the State.	
The New Tory Party.	
"The Constitution of Peace."	
Wilson, Roosevelt, and the Trusts.	
Roosevelt, Reactionary.	
Congress of German Labor Unions.	
Revolutionary Berlin.	
Radicals and Socialists in France.	
An Irish Labor Party.	
The March of Collectivism.	

Published Monthly by the New Review Publishing Association
80 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY.

ALEXANDER FRASER
President

MAX HEIDELBERG
Treasurer

LOUIS C. FRAINA
Secretary

Subscription \$1.00 a year in United States and Mexico; six months, \$0.50. \$1.20 in Canada and \$1.50 in foreign countries. Single copies, 10 cents. In bundles of 5 or more, 6 cents a copy.

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

"A little more verification, a little less assertion, would be so much to the health of the Socialist hypothesis."

"When the NEW REVIEW arrives upon the heights to which it is destined," writes Max Eastman, "I trust we may establish in connection with it a bureau of economic research. It would be worth much to revolutionary science."

And that is not all we hope to do when we "arrive." We have already begun with the work of sincere and fundamental criticism which must precede any real unanimity in thought and action. In that work, which the Socialist movement in America at this period most needs, the NEW REVIEW will continue to take a courageous and responsible part.

The development of a sound and original theoretical literature, germane to our economic, social and political conditions and temperament, to back up and give discipline to the current activity of the Socialist movement, is another work to which the NEW REVIEW pledges itself to lend its strongest efforts. The American movement should lead the International in the power and originality of our Socialist literature.

The discovery of more and more new writers capable of expressing original thought in the social and economic field with precision and power, is one of the chief opportunities of such a magazine as the NEW REVIEW, and it is one which we shall not neglect.

We are co-operating to make these things come true. Will you co-operate with us?

Louis C. Fraina,
Business Manager.

The New Review

Vol. II.

AUGUST, 1914

No. 8

A FEMINIST SYMPOSIUM.

FEMINISM

BY MARIE JENNEY HOWE

No one doubts that women are changing. We need an appropriate word which will register this fact. The term feminism has been foisted upon us. It will do as well as any other word to express woman's effort toward development.

No one movement is feminism. No one organization is feminism. All woman movements and organizations taken together form a part of feminism. But feminism means more than these. It means woman's struggle for freedom. Its political phase is woman's will to vote. Its economic phase is woman's effort to pay her own way. Its social phase is woman's revaluation of outgrown customs and standards. Feminism includes the misdirected as much as the well directed efforts of women.

Anti-Suffrage is a phase of feminism. It is the struggle of conservative women to defend their temperament. For the sake of conviction they enter public life. They are impelled to study, speak, write, publish and organize. Anti-Suffrage is the effort of a group of women to express themselves. The effort is developing. It redeems them from inertia and makes them part of that process of growth which is feminism.

English militancy is equally a phase of feminism. It is the same struggle on the part of a different group to defend a different temperament.

Feminism is not limited to any one cause or reform. It strives for equal rights, equal laws, equal opportunity, equal wages, equal standards, and a whole new world of human equality.

But feminism means more than a changed world. It means a changed psychology, the creation of a new consciousness in women.