

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VIII

JULY, 1907

NO. 1

The Real Import Of The Austrian Victory.

THE CONTINUED brilliant successes of the Socialist Movement in all the great countries of Europe have been for us too much a mere matter of self-congratulation or academic interest. Between the Amsterdam and the Stuttgart Congresses, in three short years, the position of every socialist party of Europe has been revolutionized. Not only do the tactics differ in each country, but there are often now several disciplined but widely varying factions within the same party. We must stop boasting international successes, and using them merely as proof of the general justice of the socialist philosophy. We must analyze and study each party and faction to find what lesson it has for the United States.

In studying any party, however, it is convenient to classify it and compare it with other parties of the same tendency. Of course we must recognize that the parties will fall into entirely different groups, according to the principle of classification chosen. If, for instance, we classify the parties according to their interest in the economic struggle at the *present moment*, we find that the parties in England and Germany are most interested in the labor unions, while those of France, Belgium, Italy, Austria and Russia, though supporting with their full power the unions, especially, since they themselves have been the chief union organizers, are concentrating their attention either on parliamentary or revolutionary politics. If, on the other hand, we classify the National Movements according to their interest in the Agrarian question, we have a somewhat different grouping. All the movements, except that of England, are having considerable success with the landless proletariat or agricultural laborers. It is when we come to the problem of organizing the small proprietors that the diffi-

culty begins. All Socialist parties of all countries are now agreed that the small farmers should and must become socialists, but only a few have had any success in that direction.

A. M. Simons' "American Farmer" now so widely read all over Europe must have aided in changing the former dubious and rather hopeless attitude toward this social factor; that numerically outweighs the industrial proletariat in all the great nations except England and Germany, where it is nearly as important. When the growing protective tariff system now being adopted by the world shall have reached its climax, even England's exceptional position may change, for in the British Empire, which in some form or other will then arise, the Agrarian population of the Colonies will balance the industrial population of the mother land. At any rate, Mr. Simons has proved the hopefulness of the American farmer for socialism, in proving his hopeless economic plight. Certainly with our Federal and State system, the farmers will hold the balance of power between the city workingmen and city business class for many decades. The State dominates the city, elects presidential electors and constructs congressional districts.

Not for a generation can the city workingmen hope to gain a majority against united Farmers and Bourgeoisie in more than half a dozen states. But with another generation our capitalistic society will develop large new classes of the benevolent feudalism, servants, servile employes, and Hooligans of the London type. If the benevolent feudalism continued, these half dozen industrial states might never grow to be more numerous, but capitalism will continue until replaced by socialism. With the American movement, the farmer vote is, therefore, not a luxury,—it is a necessity. So the success of the European socialist parties in converting and organizing the small owners of agricultural land is of the most vital moment to the United States.

In this respect, the comparatively uninterested and unsuccessful group among the European parties include England, Germany, Austria and Italy; the successful ones are Russia, Hungary, Bohemia and Galicia. France and Belgium also have had distinctly successful, but not yet very satisfactory results. Russia has already converted her millions of peasants to a certain form of socialism. One of the socialist parties concentrates its attention on the peasants, and believes that this process of their conversion will be completed in a year or two more of revolution; the majority faction of the other party thinks the conversion of the peasants and the revolution will last a decade or so, but does not doubt a socialist outcome. The chief pride and accomplishment of the Hungarian movement also is a very strong and aggressive Agrarian organization, but it is in Bohemia and Galicia that the



32101 019606449

THE AUSTRIAN VICTORY

8

most brilliant results have been achieved in the election just elapsed, and since the Austrian party failed to convert the small proprietors in the same elections in which the Bohemians gained a general, and the Poles a partial victory, the discussion of this election should lead to far-reaching conclusions.

All the parties of Austria are united into one; all are socialist through and through, and all reached splendid successes in the last election, not excepting the smaller Italian, Slavonian, Ruthenian and Roumanian sections, which we shall leave out of this discussion. But a system of National Autonomy prevails in the United party of the Empire, and as a consequence there were wide differences in the tactics displayed by the Germans and by the Bohemians and Poles in the elections.

At first it would appear that the Germans had a greater success, since they secured 50, and the Bohemians only 30 seats in the parliament. But this is due to two facts,—(1) The Bohemians though numerically equal to the Germans were given many less seats by the Election law, so that 46 Germans have the same vote as 54 Bohemians. (2) The German Socialists were tacitly supported by several bourgeois parties, and got a third of their seats through bourgeois votes in the second ballot, while the Bohemians were opposed by a "block" of all bourgeois parties, and got only two out of 50 re-ballots.

Notwithstanding this obstacle, and the comparative newness of their party the Bohemian Socialists got a larger percentage of the total votes cast by their nationality, than the Germans did of those cast by theirs. The explanation is that the Bohemians actually succeeded in getting a large proportion of the vote of the small agricultural proprietors.

Let us first examine the results achieved by the Austrian party. There is no doubt that they are excellent,—as good, if not better in a movement scarcely twenty years old than those achieved by their fellow Germans of the land of Marx. They organized the vast majority of the working men, both politically and economically, against overwhelming odds, while Austria still remained a semi-feudal regime. Finally, it is they, and they alone, that forced the Government to make Austria a parliamentary State. The Emperor was forced like Bismarck, to consider universal suffrage as an offset to the sectional strife of the privileged classes of the different races that compose the Empire. But it was the Socialist demonstrations and threat of a general strike that forced the privileged to cease their opposition to the epoch-making edict.

The Emperor had already issued a threat of universal suffrage to quell the nobility of his other dominion, Hungary; the Czar had already promised the Duma,—the Socialists paraded

the example of these neighbor countries, and their agitation did the rest. But, of course, the Emperor granted universal suffrage with malice aforethought. His calculation was that another International party than the Socialists,—that is, the Catholics, would get the upper hand, and owing to the failure of the Austrian Socialists to get any hold among the small proprietors, Franz Joseph was not disappointed.

Austria furnished nearly half the seats in the new parliament. Of these, the Socialists got 50, but the Clericals got nearly twice that number, and the related International group, the Agrarians, obtained 29 seats. Among the Bohemians also, these groups outnumber the Socialists, but not in the same proportion. The Socialists secured 25 seats against the Agrarians 21, and the Clericals only 16. And in Bohemia the Clericals and Agrarians combined with the city bourgeoisie against the Socialists, while in Austria the large majority of the other bourgeois parties voted for the Socialists.

The Clericals and Agrarians will not quite control the new parliament. This result is due almost entirely to the Bohemian and Polish Socialists who forced their Clericals and Agrarians to share their seats in the second ballot with more democratic bourgeois parties in order to gain the latter's support in other doubtful districts. Therefore, in the new parliament also the Clericals and Agrarians will be forced to share their power with some more democratic party, probably the Polish people's party, which while composed of Catholic peasants is opposed both to conservatism and reaction.

If the German Socialists of Austria had gained the vote of the small proprietors, as did the Bohemians, they would have forced the Agrarian Clericals into a combination with the nationalistic city liberals, either at the second ballot, or in the parliament. The combined Socialist party in Austria might in that case have gained less seats in parliament, but it would have doubled the German Socialist vote, and made the Socialists not the third, but the second political group in the Empire,—the place now occupied by the German and Bohemian nationalist and liberal parties.

What is the cause of the lamentable failure of the Austrian Germans among the peasant proprietors? It is not far to seek. The Austrian Socialists have inherited from their Prussian, German comrades, a tradition of hostility to the peasantry. Through Kautsky the German theorists have long tried to make the Prussian misfortune the rule for other lands. The stupidity, loyalty and servility of the Prussian peasant are proverbial. But these qualities are nowhere else so highly developed, not in Russia, not in France, not even in Bavaria, which has already cast off

Kautsky's doctrine of waiting for the increase of large estates and of the landless agrarian proletariat before expecting success in the country districts. Meanwhile the small proprietors continue to increase in nearly all countries, either naturally, or by laws naturally enacted by the ever alert bourgeoisie for their own protection against the rising tide of socialism in the towns.

There can be little doubt that the German party in Austria is improving in this respect, but it is still hostile to the propertied peasantry. When in the recent campaign, the Christian Socialists (Catholic, agrarian, anti-semitic demagogues) read in public meetings, statements they said had been made by socialists against the farmers, the Socialists, or course denied the accusations. But the peasants, from what they knew of the German Socialists naturally believed what they heard, and the Socialists' own defense bore them out, for the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* replied to the attacks, not with an assertion of their friendliness to the small proprietors, but merely with a statement of their interest in the landless peasant proletariat, which, doubtless, no one had ever denied. In a later number it is said in reproach of the catholic priests that they in their country environment actually became peasants, "*verbauern*," as if it were the depth of degradation to become a "*bauer*," plough man, or peasant. Do American Socialists use the word "farmer" as a term of reproach?

The Christian Socialists stand out frankly as *first of all* the party of the small peasant proprietors, and they get his vote almost to a man. The Socialists consoled themselves with the idea that Austria is, or soon will be, an industrial country with comparatively few farmers. But this is hardly true, even of German Austria, since the vote obtained by the Christian Socialists, Clericals and Agrarians in the country alone largely outnumbers the total socialist vote, and the Socialists have three-fourths or nine-tenths the city proletariat. In the Greater Austria, as in the United States, the farmers will long continue to outnumber the workingmen.

The Clerical and agrarian parties are accused by the German Socialists of Austria, of doing things of which Socialism cannot approve; for instance, of legislating to increase the price of agricultural products, and so of bread and meat. But how can any party expect the support of any part of the agrarian population if it does not promise either the increase or the maintenance of good prices for agricultural products? The Socialists accuse the agrarians of keeping up a high tariff, but here the Socialists of Austria are simply standing for the principles of our Democratic party, and classifying themselves with J. R. McDonald's Socialist, no-class-struggle party of England, or the checkmated German party. Socialism favors the discontinuance of tariff wars, as

well as wars with guns, but it does not demand that the most socialistic nations should disarm themselves in either respect. This is the liberal democracy of industrial lands,—taken up by the German party, only because in Germany there was no democratic party in existence worthy of the name.

What are the arguments used by the Socialists against the party that in this question, at least, truly represents the interests of the small propertied peasants. Why this, that the high tariff brings "little or no profit" to the small proprietors, and much to the big? But a little profit is much for a poor farmer. Farther, the Socialists accuse the Agrarians of trying to "*hetzen*", arouse, the bourgeois against the Socialists. But have not the Socialists already done this as true class-conscious fighters must? It seems not,—for the Socialists everywhere, in the second ballot, supported their employers, the financiers, the officials and the shop-keepers against the Agrarian. This lets the cat out of the bag; the German Socialists prefer the vote of their so-called enemies in the city to those they call their friends in the country. Throughout the whole Austrian literature is found this setting of the city against the town, the elevation of industry, the degradation of agriculture. No wonder they don't get the farmer's vote.

Of course, some of the Socialist accusations against the present agrarian parties are true. These parties do not, on the whole, truly represent the small proprietors, and this is just the reason why the Socialists should step in as they have across the border of Bohemia, and fulfil this profitable function.

Like our Democratic and Republican parties, the Austrian and Bohemian agrarian parties have themselves an impossible task. In their fight for more power they want the powerful, as well as the numerically important classes in their party, and so they have bid for the support of the large landlord employers who, though they are certainly for the interests of agriculture, are utterly against those of the small proprietor. The small proprietors' first interest is a democratic state,—the landlords are for the feudal system. The small farmers' second interest is for the compulsory purchase by the government, and sub-division among themselves of the landlords' estates.

The Bohemian party occupies a totally different position. After capturing the city proletariat, it went out like the German party, after Agricultural laborers. But it did this in a more aggressive manner, centering a large part of its attention on the Agrarian strikes against the large landlords of South Bohemia, who were a very important factor in the old semi-feudal state. Having once taken up the fight of the landlords it continued it all along the line with such fervor that it attracted the favorable attention of the landlords' other enemies, the small proprietors,

and finally, secured a large part of their suffrages. On the other hand, it drove all those middle-class peasants who hire one or more laborers for the season into the Bohemian agrarian party.

Here is the class-struggle in the country as it is now sought for by all the socialist parties with a very few exceptions. On the one side, the landlords, and those farmers with whom the wage-bill is an important item; on the other, the agricultural laborers, and those farmers who work with their own children, when they have them, or with the aid of some young prospective farmer when they have no children. These are the people who make up the co-operative farmer socialists of Denmark, and who composed a majority of the voters at the last Russian election, so that when the suffrage is equal they will control a majority of the parliament of the greatest agricultural country in the world.

The Polish results reinforce the lesson given by those of Bohemia. The industries of Bohemia occupy nearly as many people as its farms. Galicia is the most agricultural country in the world except Roumania. Moreover, in the towns, the Ruthenians and Jews have parties of their own, in order to resist the dominant Poles, who though they are less than half the population are able by an unjust political system to control everything. Even the working people are drawn into this Nationalistic fight, and not only is the overwhelming majority of the population rural, but it is also Catholic. So in Polish Austria (Galicia) the Socialist party, against whatever odds, has been compelled to go out after the small proprietors from the outset. It was the peasant that sent the first Socialist to the Austria Parliament from Galicia, and it is to the peasants that they owe a majority of the hundred thousand votes they secured in the recent election and half of their seats in parliament.

The Polish Socialist Party of Austria has not only kept the division of the large landlords' estates in the foreground, but like the Polish party of Russia, it has proposed the co-operative plans by which this small proprietorship shall lead to Socialism. It is as much opposed to the tactics of the Prussian Socialist party as the Poles generally are opposed to all things Prussian.

But there is hope in the future, even for the German section of the party. Already in the elections the Bohemians and the Poles have obtained more votes than the Germans. This should sooner or later lead to their predominance in the party of the Empire,—the adoption of progressive Agrarian ideas by the Germans and the ending of the latter's tacit co-operation with the bourgeois parties at the second balloting against the peasant parties.

Moreover, when Hungary leaves Austria in 1917, and sets up a tariff against Austrian manufacturers, Austria will retaliate by

raising the tariff against Hungarian agriculture. This will give a new boom to agriculture and the agrarian problem in the whole empire. The German Socialists will be forced by economic conditions to seek the peasants' support.

This is not the only pressure. The semi-agricultural Bohemians, and the entirely agricultural Ruthenians (Russians) of Galicia, by a just election, ought to have fifty more seats in the parliament. Unless all the Socialist parties of Austria unite to get a share of this vote, Austria will not only cease to advance, but will go backwards. For the Catholics and landlords will not neglect their opportunity, and if they get all these votes they may have a majority in some future parliament, even without having to obtain the support of any genuinely democratic element like the Polish People's Party.

Austrian Socialism hangs in the balance. If the Socialists can obtain their share of the agricultural vote, the Socialist Party will become the chief party of opposition, and will force the other parties to unite, as in all the great countries of the continent. If not, it must play the secondary role which would be played by the Prussian party to-day if Prussia were predominantly an agricultural, and not predominantly an industrial State.

Let the Socialist parties of all nations assume, not the everlasting stupidity, but the ultimate intelligence of the rural population. Let not the curse of miserable feudal Prussia become the self-afflicted limitation of the Socialist parties of less unfortunate and backward nations. The influx of the rural socialist vote will prevent the threatened abandonment all over the world of political for economic action, protect the socialist parties from the domination either of the conservative labor unionism of England, or the anarchistic labor unionism of France, and insure, in our generation, the political and perhaps even bloodless victory of socialist principles in every civilized country of the world.

W. E. WALLING.

First Impressions of Socialism Abroad.

EARLY on Easter Sunday I went to the "House of the People" to attend the twenty-second congress of the Belgian Labor Party. In one of the busiest and most important sections of the beautiful capital of Belgium the socialists have built their temple. It was opened in 1899 and cost over 1,200,000 francs. It is a veritable palace. It has a theatre which is filled every night with large audiences. Besides the offices of the International Socialist Bureau and the Belgian Labor Party, all of the trade unions have their quarters in this building. There are also several large meeting and committee rooms, and of course the stores, tailors shops etc. of the Co-operatives. On the ground floor there is a large and handsome café which is filled every evening to overcrowding by working people and their families. In addition to this "*House of the People*" there are five branch establishments, all of them handsome buildings and one of them with large grounds in addition.

On this gorgeous morning the four-storied palace was splendid in the sunlight; red flags were flowing, a great banner with "Welcome to All" was flung over the broad entrance door. At the top of the building were imprinted on four tablets the names of Marx, Proudhon, Volders and César De Paepe. How significant are these names. The first two were the great intellectual geniuses that bequeathed to the Belgian movement, as to all other working men's movements in the world, intellectual lines of guidance. The third represents the genius of agitation and propaganda, the name of him who during his short period of activity literally destroyed himself by days and nights of feverish propaganda. Before he died this young man was I am told the master of Brussels. César De Paepe was a friend of Proudhon, of Bakunin and of Marx; he was a great scientist, an eminent scholar and an indefatigable propagandist. Above all he was a worshipper of the working class solidarity, and it was I think his spirit and council more than any ones else that made possible the superb unity, and impressive harmony which rules the Belgian movement. In other words his was the genius that taught solidarity.

At the top of this great House of the People is a superb hall

with seats for perhaps 2,000 people. The night before I had seen it crowded with the poorest of the working men, women and children of Brussels, who had come to see the immensely popular Cinematograph. This morning working men from every part of Belgium, from the mines, quarries, docks, glass works, mills, and all the great industrial enterprises were gathered together to deliberate upon their affairs. There were about 400 delegates representing Co-operatives, Mutual Societies, Trade Unions, Socialist circles and Party Federations. They were almost entirely working men, for the movement in Belgium is distinctly a Labor Party, and in the composition of its membership it resembles markedly the English Labor Party. The mass of the men there were of course unknown to me, as they are not writers of books; they are the builders and the organizers of working class movements. Many of them are masterly in debate and in propaganda, but few outside of Belgium know their names, or can appreciate the immense role they play in party affairs. There were however a few men whom we all know. There was Louis Bertrand, who in the early days of the movement carried on an immense propaganda and was also the president of the conference at which the Labor Party was formed. Vandervelde, perhaps the most able parliamentary leader, and a scholarly and conscientious writer on economic subjects, was unable to be there, because of illness. Professor Emil Vinck, who has specialized for many years upon municipal questions, was there to deliver an important report. Senator Lafontaine, an extraordinarily brilliant man. Jules Destrée and Louis De Broukere were also in attendance. Camille Huysmans, the secretary of the International Socialist Bureau, was as efficient in the Belgian congress as he is in all important congresses and committee meetings, whether international or national.

The youthful looking person in the chair is Edouard Anseele. I have always wanted to see this superb warrior, ever since I learned that Socialism was not a dream or a utopia, but a present day movement full of purpose and vitality. I had imagined that Anseele was now old and fatherly looking, with white hair, benevolent face and kind eyes. Instead of the sort of person I had had in my mind, I saw a short, powerful, well-muscled, youthful-looking man with a small head and a strong neck. His jaws are those of a fighter and in action they open and shut like a steel trap. He is a man with a soul full of conviction, and to express this soul he has a body of iron that knows no ache or pain. Obstacles are to him a joy. I think he must love to meet them, to battle with them, and to conquer them. He is strenuous when Teddy is still abed and he is still strenuous when Teddy nods off to sleep. He never rests; he can't walk, he runs. He does the work of half a dozen men; his activity and his accomplishments are prodigious.

He manages one of the largest Co-operative undertakings in Belgium which does an annual business of over 5,000,000 francs. He is a fighting deputy and no discussion passes, but finds him on the fighting line. He is the *bête noir* of the capitalists in the Chamber. He annoys them, he routs them out of their lethargy, prods them to activity and goads them into a fury. He is also an indefatigable propagandist flying to all parts of Belgium to carry the word of socialism. The son of a workman, he is the very incarnation of the working class revolt.

It is recorded of Anseele that once when about 18 years of age, he heard by chance some socialists speak. One of them described the misery and wretchedness of the weavers of Gent. Anseele wept. That meant something for that lad and since that hour he has been a revolutionist. In his youth he sold papers on the streets, he wrote socialist novels and in the evening hours he carried on a ceaseless propaganda. As he was extremely poor he often sold to his audiences shirts and other articles to pay his traveling expenses and to assist the propaganda. Later he became the editor of the local Socialist paper, and went to prison for some months because after the soldiers had shot down some workers on strike, he called the King, Leopold, Assassin I. and at the same time he wrote a passionate appeal to the mothers, sisters and sweethearts of the soldiers begging them to write to their dear ones in the army, demanding of them that they refuse to fire upon their brothers, the working men. It would be impossible to tell what this man has accomplished by his superhuman activity during the last 30 years. It would require the space of a book and the story would be as thrilling as a novel. Perhaps here I should say nothing more. Anseele was in the chair.

The congress reminded me very much of the English one. It was cool, even tempered, practical and efficient. There were no great orations delivered and the questions discussed had to do with practical and definite party work. For an outsider there was not a great deal of interest. After considering reports from the parliamentary group, the trade union group, the co-operative group and the federated municipal councillors, the congress gave consideration to certain detailed questions of administration and to other matters largely of local interest. Louis Bertrand introduced an important report upon the eight hour day and the old fight for universal suffrage came up under the form of a proposed affiliation with the Liberal Party. Vandervelde in his report on the subject traced the history of the struggle for universal suffrage and advocated affiliating with the Liberal Party for the purpose of excluding the Clerical Party from all municipal councils. The clericals have always been the most obstinate opponents to universal suffrage. It was the opinion of Vandervelde that

a general and concerted Electoral affiliation should be worked out with the Liberals which would enable the Socialist and Liberal parties to control practically all the municipal bodies of Belgium.

The readers of the REVIEW know that the struggle for universal suffrage in Belgium has been a long and bitter one. There have been two general strikes, countless riots, imprisoned leaders, martyred socialists and for half a century an almost continuous bitter and consistent fight to obtain universal suffrage. In all the congresses since the formation of the party, there has been a discussion of this question: The working class of Belgium has suffered much in this long struggle to obtain a more equitable electoral system. In 1895 after the general strike the old law was repealed; but the new law while marking an advance over the old one well deserves the name that Anseele gave it "The law of the four infamies." This legislation still irritates the workers and the suggestion of Vandervelde was considered as perhaps the only wise means now available to force the Government to grant a further extension of the suffrage. It must be said that there have always been in Belgium affiliations among the opposition parties. The wisdom of such affiliation is doubted by some members of the party; but each section or federation has been left to do as it pleased in such cases although the party statutes provide that the principles of the party program shall not be sacrificed. The proposal of Vandervelde was therefore not so extreme as it at first appears. It was proposed that instead of isolated instances of affiliation, the socialists should work out a consistent plan for affiliation with the liberals in all parts of Belgium. The discussion on the question was exceedingly interesting. It was however decided not to agree to a general plan of affiliation, and to leave to the local federations freedom to do as they desired.

This is perhaps the only matter of interest to American readers that came before the congress. It is easy therefore to understand that it was not the congress, but what was back of the congress that impressed me the most. The Belgian party is not a party of politicians; its power is not the power of orations nor of orators. It is the power of an economic movement expressing itself in many diverse forms, all closely associated in one definite political organization. Those present represent organizations which express every aspiration of the Belgian working class and their variety and extraordinary development help to make the movement there one of the strongest and best in Europe. I said in a previous article that the Belgian movement was an integral one and I gave in a general way the form of its

constitution. It will be interesting I am sure to consider the details of its organization with somewhat more care.

To begin with there are the Syndicates or Trade Unions. These organizations have existed in Belgium from early times and while almost every type of organization can be found there including a considerable movement called "The Knights of Labor," copied from the American movement, the trade union movement as a whole is weak. The reasons for this are various. In the first place the law has been most unfriendly to their development, and they have not seen the necessity for large dues and efficient well paid secretaries; they have practically no paid organizers. At the time of a strike, they often depend more upon assistance from the Co-operatives than from their own treasuries. Furthermore the trade unions usually have a political or religious bias. There are for instance four types of unions: first: those connected with the Liberal Party; second: those connected with the Clerical Party; third: those connected with the Socialist Party, and fourth: the independents who refuse to affiliate themselves definitely with any party. It is however significant that outside of the Socialist and Independent Unions there is really no movement. There are now about 148,483 Trade Unionists in Belgium: only 17,000 are Catholics, only 2,000 are Liberals and about 31,000 are Independents. In other words about 94,000 are affiliated to the Socialist Party.

It is sometimes said that Socialists do not desire a strong union movement. It is even sometimes argued that Socialists have worked to weaken the force and influence of the trade unions. In answer to such criticism it would be significant if I could take space here to show how much the development of the trade union movement of Belgium has been due to Socialist initiative. But that would take me too far a field; nevertheless it is important to observe that the party is now using all its power to build up a strong and more virile trade union movement. Its propagandists are agitating in all parts of Belgium for paid trade union officials who can give all their time to the affairs of the union, and to the building up of the economic movement. While I have been in Belgium this has been the thing most discussed by the Socialists. If one were to attempt to give a complete answer to those who make these criticisms of the Socialist movement one would only need to mention the remarkable organization of the unions at Ghent. The unions there are closely affiliated with the party and they have realized an immense progress. It is entirely through the influence of the party that the unions have obtained first from the city of Ghent and later from other cities in Belgium an insurance scheme for assisting the unemployed members of the unions. Since 1901 the Municipal Council has given to unem-

ployed union men one dollar for every dollar they have put in the trade union treasury. This is an extraordinarily important development, for it means that instead of the unions having to bear the entire responsibility for the unemployed, the various cities in Belgium are now undertaking to co-operate with them to the extent at least of bearing about half of the total expense.

The next group of organisations connected with the party are "Les Mutualités". They are mutual Insurance Societies such as we have in America. They existed in Belgium long before the foundation of the Labour party. A number of these societies became affiliated with the party at the time of its foundation, although many did not affiliate for the reason that they included in their organization both employers and employees. In 1905 according to the report of the Bureau of Labour there were about 7,000 such societies in Belgium. These societies were organized to insure against sickness, old age, death and similar misfortunes. Although this seems a very large number for so small a country there are still many others who do not report their affairs to the Bureau of Labour. One of the most interesting of the latter is the "Bond Moyson" named in memory of one of the original Socialists of Flanders. In 1890 after a long discussion and a rather heated battle all of these Insurance Societies excepting one, affiliated themselves to the group of Socialist organisations centering about the Vooruit. After this affiliation there opened an era of immense prosperity and the members of these Insurance organisations increased from 4,600 in 1897 to 10,323, or including families to nearly 30,000 persons in 1904. Soon after the reorganisation several new Insurance measures were adopted. A new fund was begun to provide insurance against invalidity, and another for ordinary life insurance. The members now of the Bond Moyson obtain three classes of benefits: first: they are given pensions in case of illness, second: a physician and medical help is provided and third: bread supplies from the Co-operative stores with a pension to the family in case of the death of the insured one. Special assistance is also given at the time of child birth. As a part of this whole scheme the Vooruit Co-operative establishment now gives a pension to all those who buy regularly at the Co-operative stores for 20 years. And when they are 60 years old they are given a pension, including practically all their necessary supplies, from the Co-operative stores. The Mutual Insurance Societies have really taken an extraordinary development. Brussels has a system equally remarkable; and organisations similarly constituted and managed are being organized in all parts of Belgium.

The third group of organisations are perhaps the most important. They are the Co-operatives and they comprise almost

every type of associated effort. One sees now in almost all the industrial towns of Belgium handsome stores, beautiful meeting halls, large assembly rooms, cafés and restaurants, modern bakeries and other similar establishments owned and administered by the working people themselves. In addition to the stores, where the activity is largely commercial, there has also developed a series of productive enterprises and almost every industrial town of Belgium has now one or more handsome model bakeries. In all of these bakeries the workmen have an eight hour day with the maximum trade union wage. There are also two or three breweries and cigar making establishments, boot and shoe factories, printing shops, cotton mills and co-operative dairies.

It is again at Ghent that the organisation is the best developed. To begin with there is the beautiful house of the Vooruit which is called "Our House". This house, in addition to being a large department store where almost everything that is required by the working people can be bought, is a working men's club. There are rooms for meetings and for recreation which in many ways resemble those of the University Settlements in America. On the first floor of "Our House" is a large café where about 1000 people can sit comfortably at the tables. No alcoholic drinks are sold although one can always obtain light beers and wines, tea, coffee, milk and similar non-intoxicating drinks. In the evening the café is invariably filled with men, women and children, the weavers of Ghent. Above this room is a large and beautiful library which is used also at times for lectures and meetings. On the same floor there are also several committee rooms. On the top floor there is a large assembly room which is also occasionally used as a theatre. All the rooms are handsomely decorated with Mural paintings, illustrating in ideal forms the subject of Labour. Throughout the town there are many branch stores where all sorts of supplies for family use can be obtained. On the outskirts of the town there is a new model bakery with the most improved machinery. About 200,000 lbs. of bread are sold per week from this establishment. In addition there are several branch libraries, a large cotton mill and a handsome print shop where two daily papers and most of the books, pamphlets, tracts and other publications of the party are printed. For twenty cents a year every member of the co-operative receives all publications of this print shop, and there are actually about 155,000 persons who regularly receive printed matter on this subscription plan.

Perhaps the most significant move that has been made by the ever enterprising Anseele and the working men of Ghent was the buying of a fine old house with an immense garden in one of the most aristocratic quarters. It was formerly the aristocratic

club of the city ; but it was found too expensive to keep up ! Suddenly and quite secretly this house was bought by the weavers of Ghent and it is now their club. It has a large café, a library, a handsome theatre and meeting rooms, in addition to a large garden which is used on Sundays and other fête days for the games and assemblies of the socialists. In the midst of this old, aristocratic quarter Vooruit has placed its standard of revolt and the neighbors now hear at close hand the singing of the Internationale and other revolutionary songs and see the working people at their games and dances.

It is of course impossible to give in a short paper an adequate idea of the development of the co-operatives. The following figures may convey some idea of their extent. The annual sales in Belgium during 1906 amounted to about 32,000,000 Frcs. and out of the profits benefits were allotted to the members amounting to over 3,000,000 Frcs. This latter sum was distributed to about 120,000 persons who were affiliated with the co-operatives. In addition to the above mentioned co-operatives there are the various productive enterprises including breweries, bakeries, dairies and so forth. The total sales from these establishments during the same year amounted to about 1,500,000 Frcs. Their value however is not shown only by the amount of money which they distributed to their members. As I have said elsewhere, they furnish supplies in immense quantities to the strikers when there is any great battle on between employers and employees. In addition to these grants they supply funds in many other directions. The Maison Du Peuple of Brussels for instance during the six years from 1897—1903 gave to the socialist propaganda half a million Francs. And of course this is only one example of what they are also doing in other cities of Belgium. Perhaps a less important but very useful service rendered by the co-operatives is the aid they give to those agitators and propagandists of the Labor movement who have been blacklisted by their employers. These men can always find some work to do in the co-operative establishments and still have time free to carry on their organisation and propaganda.

The fourth development of the working class spirit is the Labor party itself. It is the bond which ties all of the various activities together. It is meant to express the views and aspirations of the working people politically. The party has now in Parliament twenty-eight deputies and seven senators. In the various municipal councils of Belgium it has about 500 representatives and its total socialist vote is about 500,000. While the unions fight the battles of the workers on the economic field and endeavor to force the employers to accord them better conditions and better wages, the co-operatives endeavor to displace the

middle man in commerce and to gain for the workers immense advantages in buying the necessaries of life. But the workers of Belgium realize that neither of these efforts can accomplish their complete emancipation. They do not under-value these two economic movements, on the contrary they promote and strengthen them in every possible way; but they fully realize that so long as the capitalists control the machinery of government, they must remain a subject class. They therefore make an immense effort to conquer the Government. In this work the party carries on a tremendous propaganda. It has six daily papers in Belgium reaching 106,000 persons daily, twenty-two weeklies and fourteen monthlies.

I went to see the printing establishment of the Brussels "Daily". I found the paper in possession of a handsome establishment with everything required to produce a first class daily paper. There were large and adequate editorial rooms, light and airy rooms for the compositors and ample quarters for the five large presses. The biggest press was at the time of my visit printing daily papers for the two other towns about two hours from Brussels. These papers as soon as they were printed, were forwarded to these cities where in the morning they would be delivered to the subscribers or sold on the streets. In addition they were printing on one of the presses an illustrated weekly. The Brussels paper sells for one cent while the smaller daily papers sell for two centimes or less than one half cent. The Co-operative establishment has decided recently to issue a new "Daily" for one centime or one fifth of a cent. This will give some idea of the enterprise and business methods of the Belgian Socialists.

Of course there are immense efforts made in other directions as well to promote the propaganda. Countless numbers of the party are speaking and agitating all the time. At the Socialist theatres throughout Belgium Socialist plays are given. There is an extremely clever method of spreading Socialist views amongst the very poorest workers through the medium of several cinematographs. Between every scene there are shown socialist emblems, socialist mottos and short phrases expressing socialist views. Criticisms of politics, words of enthusiasm and of revolt are thrown on the canvass, and in this way the poorest and most illy educated workers gain some idea of the aim of the Socialist party. In addition there is a university in Brussels which is practically in the control of the Socialist party.

After the brief description of the details of organization and of the immense activity of the Belgian working class, the Labor party will mean something to the reader of this article. The members are as a rule simple ordinary working men. Most of

them have left school before the age of ten and have gone into the mines, factories, and shops to begin their life of labor. They have worked at the lowest wages of any workers in the large industrial nations of Europe; they have fought their battle in the face of a brutal and reactionary government, which has always endeavored openly and underhandedly to destroy the co-operatives, the unions, and the political party. Furthermore the German movement was old, the trade unions of England and America were mature when this tiny little country of Belgium gave birth to its Socialist party. Almost all of these economic and political organisations, now wielding such power, have come into existence within the last twenty-five years.

The working people of Belgium have had to fight for everything; nothing has been given them, not a step has been taken without suffering. Indeed it was their misery that drove them together to make a common struggle. It is their suffering and their martyred brothers that have so united their life and spirit that not a single important division has occurred in the movement during the last twenty years. The party is a practical and efficient one, and its members would never think of neglecting any opportunity open to them to fight the battle of the disinherited. They scorn no method, they eagerly use and develop all. They believe in co-operation, in trade unions, in municipal ownership and in national ownership; they believe in economic action and they believe in political action; indeed when anyone of these methods is but weakly developed, the whole party with hearty good will and with all the energy in its power gives its mind and effort to strengthen it. While other countries are discussing theories, while the working men elsewhere differ in their opinion as to methods and while especially the working men of America quarrel among themselves, the working class movement in the little paradise of the capitalists has been born and has grown to full maturity.

It seems hard to explain why it is that the Belgian working class is so fortunate, and why in the face of so many difficulties and even without universal manhood suffrage they are able to do so well what we seem to be unable to do at all. As I have said before it seems to me largely due to the advice and example of the old warrior of the Internationale, César De Paepé. He counselled solidarity at the day the party was born and he never ceased to repeat it. It is therefore significant that just about the time he was carried away from Brussels to die in Southern France, he should have written these words to the then assembled congress of the party: "I beg of you one permission, one only. Permit an old socialist, who has been in the breach for more than 33 years and who has already seen so many ups and downs, so many

periods of progress and of reaction in the revolutionary Belgian parties, to give you counsel. That is; Be careful, *above all*, in all your deliberations and resolutions, *to maintain among the different factions of the party and among the more or less extreme or moderate tendencies the closest possible union and to prevent all that can constitute even a suspicion of division.* Naturally this implies that it is necessary to commence by forgetting the divisions which have existed in the past. To divide you in order the better to oppress you, such is the tactic of your enemies. Flee from divisions; avoid them; crush them in the egg; each ought to be *your* tactic, and to that end may your program remain the broadest possible and your title remain general enough to shelter all who in the Belgian proletariat, wish to work for the emancipation, intellectual and material, political and economic of the mass of disinherited.”

ROBERT HUNTER.

Rise of the Russian Proletariat.

PREFACE.

THE HISTORY of all society, thus far, is the history of class strife." These are the words of Karl Marx and their truth is accepted by most historical students today.

Since the Plebeians of Rome rose against their Patrician oppressors the working class has been engaged in revolutions. By the burning of manor houses, by the smashing of new machinery, by defending barricades and by the more peaceful but no less bitter warfare of strikes and boycotts the workers, the world over, have been in almost ceaseless revolt against the class which does not work. Sometimes these revolts have been inspired,—have been directed or—misdirected by members of another class, but always the Strength and Blood have come from the workers. And so it is that a knowledge of Revolutions; of their aims, their methods and their results,—is of momentous interest to the working class. In no Revolution,—not excepting the Paris Commune,—have the wrongs and the aspirations of the mass of workers been so clearly and so insistently proclaimed as in this Revolution in Russia. It is a workingman's Revolution.

During the last two years a great deal has been written about Russia. But most of this has appeared in costly volumes or expensive monthly or weekly publications which are out of the reach of the vast majority of wage-earners. The working men of America have had to rely on the daily papers for their information. This source of information has two great drawbacks. It is always scattered and unrelated, and it is generally prejudiced.

And these pages are written on the assumption that there is in America a large number of working people who want to know how and for what their brothers are fighting on the other side of the world; who want some connected and brief account of this—the greatest of the world's Revolutions.

These chapters do not pretend to the dignity of History. The events are of too recent occurrence and the writer has been too close to affairs to get either the perspective of time or the purely impersonal attitude which are supposed to be fundamental in History. But there will be some compensation for

these defects in the fact that the writer was on the spot and to a certain extent concerned in the events narrated.

In order to understand properly the recent events in Russia some knowledge of the history of the country is necessary; therefore indulgence is asked for the brief, historical sketches which are sprinkled through the accounts of more recent occurrence.

INTRODUCTION.

The surprises and seeming contradictions which Russia holds for a Westerner are unending.

I had read in the papers of the labor demonstrations under Father Gapon and of the wonderful, general strike of October and was prepared to find a large and highly developed proletariat. One of my first surprises was to find that scarcely ten per cent of the population were factory workers and that these were the most pitifully conditioned and poorly organized of modern proletariats.

Even a slight knowledge of history is, at first, a positive drawback to one studying the Russia of today. As modern industry is very slightly developed one naturally looks for mediæval institutions. But Russia is as far removed from Feudalism as it is from Capitalism.

The principal reason for this confusion is that Russians give words, which have a well defined meaning in the histories of Western Europe, utterly different meanings. You hear, for instance, of "A merchant of the First Guild," and you think of the trade guilds of England and search vainly for their counterpart in Russia. No similarity exists between the so-called "Burgher Class" there and the burghers of the old Flemish towns. "The ancient Republics of Kazan and Novgorod" are often referred to. In reality, they are more like the old German Empire than any Republic we know of. When the Dynasty died out, as it often did in those days of incessant warfare, poisonings and murders, a few over-lords assembled and elected a new Despot. Neither the clergy nor the nobility plays a role similar to that which these classes took in Western Europe.

And so in studying Russia it is necessary to lay aside preconceived ideas. Russia is neither an advanced Asiatic Despotism nor a retarded Western Empire. The Slavic Civilization is unique. It has been influenced by its Tartar hordes on the East and by the ideas of its Western neighbors; but is distinct from either. And the assumption that the historic development of Russia must run in the same rut as that of Western Europe, leads only to bewildering mistakes.

It must also be borne in mind that Russia is not one nation but a group of nations. Its one hundred odd millions of inhabitants speak eighty different languages. It covers a territory twice the size of the United States, and the means of communication are very undeveloped. Odessa on the Black Sea, and St. Petersburg on the Baltic are in closer touch than many villages twenty miles apart.

The degree of education in different localities is also very unequal. In the Baltic Provinces, for instance, there are more people in every hundred who can read and write than in any republic on earth. In other parts of the Empire there are wild tribes more ignorant than our Indians; and between these extremes is the great body of the Russian people. A small class called the *Inteligenzia* are more cultured than the educated people in other countries, while in the peasant villages it is often difficult to find any one who reads.

Poland and Finland are examples of the dozen odd conquered nations whose hatred is not concentrated on the Tsar in particular, but is against the Russian people in general.

Each of these dissimilarities makes it increasingly difficult to speak of the Russian people as a whole. The distances are so great; the means of transportation so unequal and the education so varying that any united action seems almost impossible.

CHAPTER I.

GAPON.

The New Year of 1905 was ushered in with the usual hilarity in "The Bear," the swagger restaurant in the center of St. Petersburg. There was the glare of many lights and the blare of the military music. Officers in gorgeous uniform, and coarse women,—the hangers-on of the Court,—in fine raiment, made the night loud with their merriment. But in the factory suburb all was gloom. What lights there were, were dim, oil lamps or feeble candles. The music came from the plaintive voices of mothers, singing their minor song of the villages as they tried to make their haggard babies forget the cold. And these women, if more honest, were less beautiful than those at "The Bear." There was no gayety,—for the New Year held no promise save of twelve months more of bondage. Twelve months of the desolation of interminably long hours and unspeakably small pay. Twelve months more of the deterioration, mental, moral and physical, of mechanical routine; under-eating and over-crowding.

The center of St. Petersburg is a pleasure-place of palaces, playhouses and parks, but the City is encompassed by a ring of

suburbs. And here is a realm of misery; of grim factories; gaunt, tall tenements and squalid streets. From all quarters of the Empire the army of idlers come to the inner City on the hunt for pleasure. But to the outer City flock a greater army in their hunt for work and this contrast is the cause of the Russian Revolution. Never has Society presented greater contrasts. The distance from Cherry Hill to Fifth Avenue is not so great. The distance from the Faubourgs of Paris to Versailles was not so great as the distance from the Vibourg Suburb to the Winter Palace. And it was across this gulf that Father Gapon led the workmen on the ninth of January, 1905.

But before we can understand that fateful march or the people who made it we must look back a little into their history.

In 1861 serfdom was abolished in Russia. Before that time there had been no factories. There were a few in certain places but in the great heart of Russia, modern capitalism, the manufacture of things for profit, was unknown. The serfs tilled the fields of their masters. Such simple things as cloth and shoes, harness and household utensils, they made in their cottages during the long winter months. Things too complicated for home-manufacture were made in "Artels." These "Artels" were voluntary groups of peasants for the making of some special product. If, for instance, the community needed cartwheels, some of the peasants banded together and made them. When the demand was supplied, they divided their earnings and disbanded. The demand for some things was so constant that some of the "Artels" became permanent. Sometimes they reached the needs of their own village and supplied a larger district. In the permanent "Artels" the workmen could develop a high degree of skill but generally "Artels" were short lived and the skill was low. Although this made them a very uneconomical form of production, they are of great interest to Socialists. Although they were very crude and imperfect they were a direct experiment in co-operative production and eliminated the worst features of modern capitalism,—wage-slavery and the creation of surplus value.

Emancipation caused a change but the change came slowly. All the serfs who had been farm-workers received an allotment of land. The allotment was very small and often, through the dishonesty of the landlord, smaller than the law directed. And in order to pay for it, the peasants were burdened with excessive taxation; but in spite of all these drawbacks, it kept them from becoming immediately wage-workers. The serfs, however, who had been household servants or engaged in other than agricultural work, received no land and were at once compelled to look for wages. Some stayed on as servants to their old mas-

ters; some found work on the master's land,—but others gravitated to the cities and as industry developed, became factory workers.

Things did not go well with the newly liberated peasants. Although the death-rate is high among them the birth-rate is higher, and the population increases faster in Russia than in any other country. And the peasant land, insufficient at first, becomes more and more inadequate as the number of peasants increases.

Add to this, the crop failures, the lack of education, the overwhelming taxation and it is not surprising to learn that the peasant wealth has constantly decreased since the emancipation. Whenever figures have been gathered the amount of food eaten by each peasant has decreased and the number of farm animals for each family has grown less. This deterioration has been constant since The Emancipation but it has been intensified in the last fifteen years by the financial policy of Count Witte. Witte is a banker; not an economist. It was his idea to establish the banking system on a gold basis. In order to collect the immense gold reserve which was needed for a gold standard it was necessary that the country should export more than it imported; the difference,—“The Balance of Trade,”—would be paid in gold—and this gold would be collected by the Government for its reserve. The only thing which Russia produced in large quantities was grain. The high taxes made it necessary for the peasant to sell his grain as soon as it was harvested, and this grain was exported. As the grain exports increased famine increased. Witte collected his gold reserve by starving his countrymen. He probably learned this trick by watching England exploiting India. No other countries have so large grain exports and such frequent famines.

Another of Witte's schemes was the high tariff wall. The customs had to be paid in gold, and as these receipts swelled the reserve in the treasury, they raised prices on the already starving peasants.

Under the cumulative economic pressure of all these factors the peasantry has lost its solidarity and has broken up into three sections. The most fortunate and the most unscrupulous have risen above the average lot. They have saved a little money which they have loaned out in the days of the tax-gatherer at most exorbitant rates. Later, they sell out their victims and so acquire land. They also deal in grain. Knowing their neighbors intimately, they can buy at the psychological moment of greatest need and they have enough capital to hold their stock until prices are high. While still peasants in the eye of the law,

they are in reality small land-holders and money-lenders. They form a very small faction of the peasant body and are cordially hated by the rest.

By far the largest mass of the peasants have remained almost as they were at the Emancipation. Their luck has been the average luck. They still keep their bit of land and are respected members of their communities. The change with them is more inward than outward. There is a little more corn husk in their bread every year. They do not laugh as often as their Fathers and the worry of ever-threatening starvation has puckered their foreheads and their hearts. Unrest grows among them. They burn the landlords' barns and kill the tax-gatherer more often every year—and the increasing bitterness in their lives points to a horrible reckoning some day.

The third sub-class among the peasants are the landless. Their luck has not been good. Some, perhaps, owe their misfortunes to drink, more to bad harvests and sickness—but most of all to the relentless taxation. They have fallen prey to the money-lenders and their land has been swallowed up by debt. Some work as agrarian proletarians on the large estates, but most are forced into the cities.

And this constantly growing section of the peasantry is the basis of Russia's Industrial Proletariat. They come to the cities—not as in other countries, to seek a fortune,—but to avoid actual starvation. They are loath to admit even to themselves that the change is permanent, and the hope which springs eternal in their hearts is that somehow, luck will look up and they may return to the land. Most Russian peasants look upon agriculture as the only uncursed existence. Their attachment to the soil and their almost universal belief in some form of nationalization are the most distinctive characteristics of the Russian peasants.

These things;—the low standard of living brought from the famine-stricken homes, and the lack of realization of the permanence of the change,—make the Russian workmen an easy prey to exploiting employers.

The English economists of the last century developed the so-called "Iron Law of Wages," i. e. that wages normally amount to enough for the sustenance of the worker and his children. This law is ignored in Russia. The rapid decay of agriculture and eighty million peasants to fall back on,—relieves the capitalist of any fear about the labor supply—despite the frightful debasement of factory life, the army of the unemployed is on the increase and the wages sink far below the economic minimum.

At least forty per cent and probably fifty per cent of the workmen in St. Petersburg were born in the villages and are still peasants at heart. In other and newer industrial centers, the percentage is higher.

However, the concentration of so many workmen in the same city inevitably resulted in organization. There were two distinct labor movements. For many years the Socialists have been at work. Their success, considering the ignorance of the workmen and the watchfulness of the police, has been considerable. Gradually, the ideas of organizing and of striking for better conditions was growing. Trade unionism was a crime but as the magnetic idea of organized action triumphed over the oppressive laws in England, so it was doing in Russia.

About three years ago a Chief of the Secret Police conceived the idea of starting a rival movement. His idea was "The Simon-Pure Unionism," such as we know in America. His unions were purely economic and avoided all the political ideas of the Socialists. As long as the union strove simply to better its economic condition, it was fostered by the police. The Socialist idea of the workmen gaining the political power and so moulding their own fortunes was persecuted as much as ever. These police unions thrived. They offered the workmen as much as our American unions do—a chance to add a few cents to their day's wages or to cut a few minutes off of the day's work. Whenever they struck they found the police friendly. When a Socialist union struck, their leaders were thrown into prison or sent to Siberia. Large numbers of the more ignorant workmen joined the police union.

And it was among these Police Unions that Father Gapon first came into prominence.

His character was wrapped in so much mystery that it is impossible to write of him with certainty. There are some few who still believe in his integrity and others who believe that he was always and consistently a police spy. It is my own opinion, based on personal acquaintance and much investigation that he oscillated between these two extremes. He was born in South Russia of a simple peasant family. He became a priest and it is said, quarreled with his Superior and was defrocked. Later he was reinstated and in the last month of 1904 we find him, in the pay of the police, working among the factory population of Petersburg. He was very popular. A priest who takes the side of the people, even apparently, is so unusual in Russia that he is sure to have an immediate following.

Just how the idea of making a petition to the Tsar started,

nobody knows, but when one is familiar with the customs of the peasants it is easily explained.

From time immemorial, the peasants have believed that the Tsar was their friend, and they have attributed all their misfortunes to their landlords and the officials. When famine fell on their villages it was their custom to select some of the old men of the community to go to the "Little Father" and tell him of their woes. These deputations never reached the Tsar, but every one knew that they were stopped by the officials. When they returned to the villages, their backs scarred by flogging, the peasants' hatred for the officials increased, but their faith in the goodness of the Tsar never weakened. I saw two old peasants in a village near the Volga, who had three times started in such a mission and had, each time, been flogged and sent back.

But here in Petersburg, the proverb that "God is far above and the Tsar is far away" did not hold good. He lived just across the river in the Winter Palace. Somehow the idea sprang up and it spread like a living thing through the grim streets of the suburbs; from one squalid room to another, whipped on by hunger and gaunt cold. "If we send a small deputation, it will do no good", they said. "The officials will flog them; but if we all go together they can't flog us. We will all call out in a loud voice and "The little Father" will hear and come out on the balcony and we will talk to him and he will help us."

Gapon opposed the idea at first but it was too strong for him. A few days before "Bloody Sunday" he threw in his lot with it. It is possible that he was touched with the misery in which he daily moved. It is possible that the enthusiasm of the idea caught him up as it did others to that high point where martyrdom loses its horror. It is more probable that he saw he could not suppress the movement; that if he opposed it longer he would lose influence, that if he led it—even to defeat—he would be as a god among the men.

Certain it is that on the Friday and Saturday before the fatal Sunday, he made fiery speeches in which he said that it is better to die than to live as they were living.

There was no secrecy about the movement. Every one knew. The Tsar fled to Tsarsky Celo, and his uncle, the Grand Duke Vladimir, was put in command of the city.

The sun rose that Sunday morning as though it was not the greatest day that Russia had known — the beginning of the Revolution—the new life. It touched the gilt domes of the churches and awoke the snow-covered avenues into a dazzling glare and penetrated even into the dim streets of the suburbs.

In the center of the City there was unusual quiet save for the almost noiseless movements of the troops, but in the suburbs was the hum of great events. Through all the human ant-hills there were movements and preparation. The Workmen were clothing themselves as for a festival of the Church. At the appointed hour they gathered in their districts and in three great streams from the three main suburbs marched to the Winter Palace.

No better ambush could be imagined. The Winter Palace forms the straight side of an immense semi-circle. The curve is formed by government buildings and army barracks; and to this great amphitheatre there are only three entrances.

No troops blocked the way of the advancing workmen. They were allowed to gather and march into the trap unmolested. Then the entrances were closed by the soldiers and without warning volley after volley was poured into the dense mass of unarmed men and women. At last, in their helpless terror the people broke through the ranks of the soldiers and scattered through the City, where the Cossacks hunted them till dusk.

Father Gapon escaped, probably because he was dressed as a priest and carried a holy picture, and few soldiers would shoot at a picture of the Christ. It would have been better for him if he had died. He would have become a saint.

The next day he made his last revolutionary act of importance. He published a proclamation in which he said, "Russian people, there is no longer a "Little Father". "Oceans of blood separate the Tsar from his people."

Gapon was smuggled abroad. He raised considerable money — how much of it, if any, reached the workingmen, nobody knows. He drifted about in Western Europe for some months and at last returned to Russia and sold himself again to the police. Of this, there can be no doubt. He was killed in May of 1906, by some of the workmen he had betrayed.

He owes his notoriety to circumstances over which he had no control and to a proclamation probably written by some one else, but the circumstances and the proclamation are memorable. They mark the death of the fable of the Good Tsar. The circumstances proved as the proclamation said, that there was no longer a Little Father; that oceans of blood separated the Tsar from his people.

CHAPTER II.

THE PROMISE OF THE CONSTITUTION.

The smoke of the Grand Duke Vladimir's guns blew away quickly but the noise of the firing echoed and re-echoed throughout all the Empire, and the observant listener can still hear its re-

verberation. As the news of "Bloody Sunday" spread through the country it stirred a furore of protest. There was hardly a factory town which did not feel the shock. Many thought that it was a final blow to autocracy instead of being, as it proved, only the first.

In February — in the hope of quieting the country — the Tsar issued a manifesto in which he promised to assemble representatives of the Nation to aid him in the work of government. Bouligine, the Minister of the Interior was charged with the duty of drawing up a law establishing the Duma and arranging for the election. This manifesto was greeted by complimentary editorials in foreign papers, announcing in large headlines that Russia had at last entered into a constitutional phase and that the Revolution was over, but thoughtful Russians were less enthusiastic. "The Tsar's promises" are about synonymous with the "Sacred word of Charles I". "We will wait and see the law", they said.

In the month of August the Minister completed his labor and the so-called Bouligine constitution became public. It was no constitution at all.

The deputies were to be elected by the most cumbersome and unequal system of voting ever invented. After they were assembled, they would have no real power. The Parliament of England and the Estates General of France wrung the heads off of their respective Monarchs by controlling the finances, Bouligine had avoided this possibility. The Duma was not to meddle with money matters. The Deputies were to be bound by an oath which they must violate or give up all dreams of real reform. The law satisfied nobody and fooled very few. It became, however, a subject of intense discussion.

At first every one, liberal and revolutionist alike, were so outraged by this insult to their intelligence that they said they would have none of it. They would boycott it.

To understand the whole question of the Duma it is necessary to go back a little and to glance over the political history of Russia and see what were the roots from which the liberal and Revolutionary movement sprang.

Since the autocracy was established, political life has been smothered. The mildest opposition to the Tsar was treated as high treason and punished by exile or death. When you add to this the ignorance of the common people, it is evident that there could be no political movement among the masses. Whatever political aspirations the common people had, were unexpressed. And of necessity The Opposition drew its forces from the upper classes.

Peter the Great tried to force civilization upon Russia. Among other things, he endeavored to establish Civil Service in place of the aristocracy. He wished that advancement in the Government should be based on service instead of on birth. Any one, irrespective of their birth, could enter the Civil Service, but must begin at the bottom and work up. This measure, was, of course, offensive to the nobles who were turned out in large numbers from their fat positions in the Government. The significance of this reform is that it split the aristocracy into two hostile sections. Some swallowed their pride and entered the Civil Service side by side with Commoners—they prospered, and became the basis of the Bureaucrats, who are now the dominant class in Russia.

Others retired from Court to nurse their wounded pride on their estates. They have never regained their influence at Court and have steadily declined in power. The Emancipation of the serfs and the recent industrial policy of Court Witte—hostile to agriculture—has further weakened and impoverished the landed gentry.

These, the land-poor gentry, are one of the sources of the Opposition. They are Liberals in the Western sense of the term. Very much dissatisfied with the present policy of the Government, which gives favors to another class, they have been expressing their protests as loudly as they dared for the last thirty years. Their platform has been the meetings of the provincial Zemstvos. The Zemstvos are the local governing boards established by Alexander II. They were intended to be something like our County Councils and Boards of Supervisors but they have been mutilated by successive ministers till they have lost all real power. The peasant representation has been reduced to a farce, and about all Zemstvos can do is to send petitions to the central government. In the past they were neglected by every one except the discontented gentry who came there to air their grievances.

Another Branch of the Opposition, who, although they call themselves Liberals, are more like Western Radicals, are the professional men. The decay of the gentry caused by the reform of Peter the Great, the Emancipation and the recent industrial policy has forced many of this class into the liberal professions. Also the increase of educational facilities has given many of the sons of merchants and of richer peasants a chance to study and enter a profession, and the professional class, almost without an exception, is discontented.

The professions are frightfully overcrowded,—not absolutely, but in relation to the effective demand. The poverty of

the people at large is so appalling that the professions are without their normal support.

One Doctor of my acquaintance, single-handed, attends 3,000 peasants. Of every 100 Russians who die, only one is attended by a physician, and yet Doctors find it hard to earn a living.

No country offers such fine opportunities for engineering enterprise, yet the technical schools turn out more engineers than can find employment. To be a journalist, one must have an independent fortune, and so it is in law or teaching. The opportunities for practice are few and returns are pitifully small. The percentage of suicides among Russian professional men is appalling.

These educated professional men have often studied or traveled abroad and being more familiar with the political freedom of western Europe are more outraged at and more open in their opposition to the existing regime than the landed gentry. They are also much more radical in their demands.

Further to the left are the Revolutionists, most of whom are Socialists. It must always be borne in mind that until very recently, the peculiar conditions in Russia made it impossible for the masses to participate in the political life. So the Socialists as well as the Liberals and Radicals were mostly drawn from the educated classes.

The so-called *Intelligencia* are more broadly cultured than the similar classes in other countries. Extensive travel and the command of two or three foreign languages has made them familiar with all the movements, artistic, literary and political, of Western Europe. They have not neglected Sociology nor Socialism. The three volumes of "Das Kapital" in German and excellent translations have a wider circulation in Russia than in any other country, not excepting Germany itself. All intelligent Russians are familiar with Socialist thought. Those who do not accept Socialism become Liberals—Reformers. Others join the Socialist Party and become Revolutionists. The distinction is purely personal,—the difference between egoism and altruism.

The Liberal Movement sprang up and grew as the pressure of Autocracy bore more and more heavily on the middle classes. The Revolutionary Movement is older and had its birth in an impersonal horror at the degradation of the vast mass of the people. Very few of the Revolutionists have entered the Movement for personal considerations.

I have tried to give a purely materialistic explanation of these three streams of The Opposition, but of course there are many exceptions. There are many members of the parties of the Center, whose personal interests lie to the right of their

party programs, but with whom devotion to the ideas of progress and political liberty is stronger than economic interest. This is almost universally true of the Parties of the left,—the Revolutionists. But this phenomenon is common to all periods of "Sturm und Drang." Economic materialism can no more explain all the incidents of the Russian Revolution than it can the Democracy of LaFayette or the Socialism of LaSalle.

But to return to the Question of the Duma. From the first, the Revolutionists decided to boycott it. "We are pledged," they said, "to a government based on universal suffrage. We can have nothing to do with this unequal, unfair system of voting."

At first the Liberals were also of this opinion. Shortly after the law was published there was a Congress of Representatives from the Zemstvos and the Town Councils. It was fairly representative of the Liberals and the Radicals. They pronounced against the election. But gradually the tide turned. People talked of the Estates General in France and how it had wrung concessions and finally complete liberty from Louis XVI. Perhaps the Duma would have a similar history. A later Congress of the Zemstvos decided to take part in the Campaign. With them went all the Liberals and Radicals.

A small section of the Socialists, also decided to take part in the election, but the great mass of the Revolutionists, with some differences in detail, decided to boycott it.

About the same time that this discussion was raging, a new organization was formed, which, for a while, exercised great weight. It was the Union of Unions. In America we would have called it a Federation of Professional Unions, as there were very few working-men's organizations affiliated with it. In almost all of the professions there already existed some kind of organization. The lawyers had their Bar Association, the Doctors had Medical Societies, and there were Technical Clubs, a Union of the Teachers, etc. As the professional classes became more and more interested in politics these organizations became more political than scientific. Their conferences and congresses—like the scientific congresses of Italy in Garibaldi's day—became veiled political meetings. Professor Paul Melikov,—one of the Russian Radicals who is best known in this Country—organized all these diverse societies into one big federation which included practically every professional man in Russia. Some few of the Labor Unions were affiliated, but on the whole it was an organization of the intellectual proletariat. Their proclamations at this period carried great weight with the educated classes.

(To be continued.)

The Intellectuals and Working-Class Socialism.

PART II.

III. It is easy to understand how it is that a section of the intellectuals has moved in the direction of socialism and the working class.

Some have considered that their material interests could only be defended by socialism: these are the poor intellectuals of whom we have spoken. In the front ranks of these are the technicians, engineers, chemists, agricultural experts, etc., who sell their intellectual power on the market at a low price and who in the same way as the laborers find themselves a part of the industrial throng. By way of analogy they have considered their own position as more or less bound up with that of the manual laborers.

After these and of a quite different species come the mass of unemployed diplomats and other former office holders for whom the party in power has no more use and who through bitterness or envy have recklessly thrown themselves into the new movement. As the political influence of parliamentary socialism increases, as it wields a power more effective over the administration of the state, as it conquers municipalities, develops its press, creates a numerous bureaucracy for its inner organization, it thus exercises ever stronger attraction over this portion of the intellectuals.

Since socialism represents the future, the rising strength of tomorrow, they hasten to seek in it what they have not been able to find elsewhere — seats in parliament, sinecures, jobs, they trail after them the mentality due to their bourgeois education, vast hopes of dominance, unrestrained appetites for conquest, a devouring thirst for power. The capitalist world has rejected them, socialism receives them: they are nothing but waste products.

But if discontent or the spirit of adventure may drive into the labor movement that portion of the intellectuals whose position tends to become more and more precarious, there are less definite motives which have their influence over other categories of educated people. Sentimentalism, pity for the exploited, the desire to suppress poverty, etc., awaken in many cultivated people vague tendencies toward socialism. They understand neither its immediate bearing or its ultimate meaning but they offer their recipes, tender their support, contribute their sympathies. Sport

and fashion are still bringing distinguished recruits into socialism. Through a strange snobism the most decadent strata of the capitalist classes give rise to subversive ideas which threaten their nearest interests. There is a whole category of repentant bourgeois who "go over to the people" for the double purpose of disseminating happiness and lightening the burden of their own privileges.

There still remain the system-makers, the professional sociologists, the law-makers for future societies who claim the noble function of conducting socialism along roads that they alone know. Then there are all the diseased brains, the unrecognized inventors, the social apothecaries, the mystics, all those who are troubled by the prodigious disorder of our society and who all wish to take part in the movement which is to renew the world. Engels has a penetrating passage on these people in which he recalls the resemblances which the history of socialism has on this point to that of primitive Christianity. "And there is this further resemblance," says Engels, "that to the labor party of all countries flock all the elements which have nothing more to hope from the official world or have quarreled with it, such as the opponents of vaccination, the vegetarians, the anti-vivisectionists, homeopathists, preachers of dissenting congregations whose flocks have taken to the woods, authors of new theories of the origin of the world, unhappy inventors who have missed fire, the victims of real or imaginary wrongs in the courts, honest imbeciles and dishonest impostors,—it was just so with the Christians. All the elements which the process of dissolution of the ancient world had liberated were drawn one after the other into the sphere of attraction of Christianity, the one element which resisted this dissolution."*)

Even the representatives of traditional socialism have many times pointed out the danger from the intellectuals. It is Engels again who in 1890 indicated the peril in a letter published after his death, "Within the last two or three years a crowd of students, literary men and other young, unclassed bourgeois have streamed into the party; have come just in time to occupy most of the editorial positions in the new journals which are springing up and habitually regard the bourgeois university as a sort of socialist Saint-Cyr which gives them the right to enter the ranks of the party with the title of officer if not general."**

It matters little whether in the particular case he was discussing Engels was right or wrong. The essential point is that his words exactly apply to the crowd of intellectuals who have

* Contribution to the History of Primitive Christianity; *Devenir Social*, 1895, p. 32.

** *Le Socialiste*, Nov. 24, 1900.

invaded the socialist parties. So true is this that Kautsky in his turn took up, in a study not at all polemical, the thesis of Engels: "He who comes to us" he says, "driven by his personal interests, he who does not come to take part in the class struggle of the proletariat but to find in the proletariat the career and the success which the capitalist class refuses him, such a man is a poor acquisition and he may in certain cases, and especially when he comes from the 'Intelligenz' become dangerous. We can never be too careful to rid our party of the unrecognized geniuses, the bohemians of literature, the scheme builders, the inventors (inventors of new systems of spelling, new stenographies, etc.) and other similar ambitious elements."*

Even Bebel himself has been somewhat rude toward the professionals of thought. It was in 1903 at the famous Dresden congress where the "Mehring Case" had raised the question of the relation of socialism to the intellectuals. I am well aware that Bebel was considering these young doctors fresh from the German universities whom the democratic revisionism of Bernstein attracted into the party. I pass over the question of deciding whether Bebel's attacks did not in this particular case go beyond the intellectuals whom he was combating to strike a death blow at all liberty of thought without the party. All I am stating is the general opinion which he expressed on the body of literary men considered as a whole, an opinion which is equally good for the intellectuals on his side and on the other side. "And my experience," Bebel explained, "permits me to say to you, test new comrades well but test the intellectuals two or three times. They should not be repulsed. We have need of their intelligence and their knowledge, but precisely because they are intellectuals their first duty is to get information from the proletarians how the masses think who know better than they do what the class struggle of the proletariat means."

IV. These are evidently truths let fall in the fire of battle, but they remain and we are putting them on record. Moreover the attempts made by the socialist parties to rehabilitate the intellectuals do not seem fortunate. In a recent article in the *Peuple* of Brussels Vandervelde claims that without them socialism would not exist.** According to him a division of labor would be

* Soc. cit. p. 265.

** *Le Peuple*, Feb. 20, 1907:—The Use of the Intellectuals. Here is the most characteristic passage of this article which The Socialist, the organ of the united socialist party reproduced in its No. 96:—"The Romans had Vestals to tend the sacred fire. We must also have constant care for tending the sacred fire of the revolution. That is the part of the young, and Anseele will tell us that there are youths fifty years old.

established between thought and action. The workers would furnish the "dough" of socialism and the intellectuals the "yeast". I will think for you; you shall act for me. In other words the proletariat is incapable of finding its own way and has need of bourgeois "leaders".

Let us pass over for the moment, we will return to it later, the question of in what measure socialist systems have been of use to the proletariat. Let us keep simply to the proof on which Vandervelde rests his argument. "What would have been the socialism of the nineteenth century without Marx, without Proudhon, without Robert Owen, without the intellectuals who came into the working class?"

Marx, Proudhon, Owen intellectuals! Great Gods, whither is the confusion of words leading us! Evidently it would be agreeable to the throng of diploma bearers who under the shadow of socialism edge their way into sinecures, capture seats in parliament, concoct schemes, parade and gesticulate, to call themselves the direct descendents of Marx, Proudhon and Owen, and they might well thank Vandervelde for thus coming to their assistance. There is only one trouble. It is that neither Marx nor Proudhon nor Owen were "intellectuals". Indeed they were thinkers with whom the intellectuals found no favor.

Marx harshly expressed his opinion of the intellectuals in his celebrated pamphlet against Bakounine and his friends: "The Alliance of the Social Democracy and the International Workingmen's Association."* He reproaches his adversaries with desiring to put the working masses back again under the tutelage of a new class of professional Intellectuals destined to serve as "interpreters between the revolutionary idea and popular instincts". He denounces what seems to him the dictatorship of a general staff

It is perhaps equally the part of the intellectuals. It has often been remarked, generally by way of reproach, that in the socialist congresses many intellectuals showed themselves more radical, more uncompromising, more revolutionary than the workingmen themselves. In this there is nothing strange. The workingmen who suffer directly from capitalists oppression are justly concerned with the immediate reforms which may however little ameliorate their condition. The intellectuals on the contrary who have come into socialism for reasons independent of their immediate interest are naturally inclined to decide questions upon fundamental principles and to get broad views above particular events.

"It goes without saying that I do not pretend to make a merit out of this idealism of theirs which follows from their privileged position. I am especially careful to avoid exaggerating the importance of the part they play. Without the working class they would be nothing, but in the working class they are the yeast which makes the dough rise."

* *L'Alliance de la Democratie Socialiste et l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs*, 1872; V. p. 48-49.

of literary bourgeois exercised over the revolutionary proletariat in the name of the Idea. Bakounine especially had congratulated himself on having found in Italy "a body of young men ardent, energetic, untrammled and disinterested who had thrown themselves headlong into revolutionary socialism."* It is against these unclassed recruits that Marx rebels: "The pretended sections of the Italian International" he said, "are run by lawyers without clients, doctors without patients and without science, students of billiards, commercial travelers and others employed in business and especially writers on small newspapers. It is by getting hold of official positions in the sections that the Alliance succeeded in forcing the Italian laborers to pass into the control of their unclassed allies who in the International might find a career and an object in life."

We need not inquire here as our friend Michels does further on,** whether Marx's grievances against the Italian allies were well-founded or not. It has nothing to do with the present matter. Not that I wish in any way to echo Marx's attacks against Bakounine or to defend his methods of controversy. In a general way I am in accord with the reservations expressed by Michel on this point, but the important thing to remember is Marx's judgment upon the invasion of the intellectuals into the ranks of the proletariat.

Moreover such an estimation of them is in accord with Marx's general thought. For the Marxian the social transformation can only be the task of a working class arrived at its full capacity; that is to say prepared by its organization and its education to take the place of capitalism. It assumes not only that the capitalist economy has arrived at its highest development but especially that the proletariat has created a complete outfit of institutions and ideas sufficient to establish new ways of living.

Everything reduces itself to the elaboration of these institutions and these original ideas. By their very definition they can only be the antithesis of official society since otherwise they would be merely a bad copy of it. The proletariat must borrow nothing from the bourgeoisie; must imitate none of its modes of existence and must draw everything from its own funds. The rupture between the labor world and the capitalist world is the first condition of the socialism of the class struggle.

What have the intellectuals to do in such an interpretation of the proletarian movement! They represent by the education which they have received and the aim which they pursue the old parasitic and hierarchic society. By penetrating into the labor organizations they will bring to the proletariat those very traditional values

* Letter of April 5, 1872.

** *Controverses Socialiste*, by Robert Michels pp. 284, 285.

from whose influence it is the mission of the proletariat to break away. By conquering the state, by increasing the role of parties they will reinforce the social hierarchy, that is to say, the political and administrative organs which are its expression and which it is the task of the working class to eliminate or to re-absorb into the social body.*

The introduction into the labor movement of elements foreign to the body of the laborers can therefore only be the mark of the immaturity of the proletarian organization. That proves that the working class is not yet strong enough to shield itself from bourgeois infiltrations. Surely if the producers need help from outside to carry on their work, if they must submit to the direction of men outside their circle, it is because they have not yet arrived at their full capacity and that socialism is a long way off. In short, Marxism is essentially anti-intellectualist and I do not see how it could be the precursor of our university socialism. Did not Marx realize that a system is dead when it is finished? The struggle waged by him against the Utopians and his anxiety not to make a "system" out of his own ideas are so well known that we need not insist on them, but it is well to remember, as we confront the prevailing socialist intellectualism that Marxism is nothing but a *method of thought* which fits the movement of ideas to the movement of things, a philosophy of practice which aims to arrive at truth by laying hold of the facts of life.

Perhaps Vandervelde will oppose to us this well known phrase of the Communist Manifesto. "Just as, therefore, at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat, and in particular, a portion of the bourgeois ideologists, who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole.**"

Very true. But here we are dealing with ideologists swayed by theoretical convictions and not with the group of professional thinkers. These ideologists are not intellectuals. They have neither the aspirations nor the pretensions of the literary caste and if Vandervelde had meant to say that Marx is one of the gifted prototypes of those independent spirits whom free inquiry has led into socialism, he would have been right. Now he has not done this. He has made out of him an ancestor of those university pedants of whom some characteristic representatives lately took it upon themselves to write the following:

* Marx's anti-state-ism which we constantly meet in his works seems to me happily expressed in this phrase from "The Civil War in France" (page 47 of the American edition): "The Communal Constitution would have restored to the social body all the forces hitherto absorbed by the State parasite feeding upon and clogging the free movement of society."

** Communist Manifesto, page 28.

"Did not Auguste Laugel propose to create certain *ideal election districts*, within which from one end to the other of a great territory free spirits united by the quest of the Ideal too refined or too bold to be popular, might unite their votes on the names of a few choice candidates? Thus the system of proportional representation favorable to the democratic organizations of parties might give satisfaction to that intellectual aristocracy which bears within itself, if it can keep itself from egoism, so many germs that are precious for the future of all society."

On this question of the intellectuals, as on so many others, Proudhon is at one with Marx. It is surprising that Vandervelde should have forgotten the scathing pages of the *Capacité des Classes Ouvrières* * "There are among the working masses plenty of educated men capable of writing as well as talking, informed on business matters, more capable, and worthier representatives, twenty times over, than the lawyers, journalists, writers, pedants, intriguers and charlatans on whom the working men lavish their votes, and yet these men are rejected! . . . the instinct of deference is still a powerful force in our democracy. Its idea of what is called *Capacity* is singularly false and exaggerated; those who were formerly its masters who have retained the privilege of the so-called liberal professions, a name which it is time to drop, these men always seem to it to stand a head higher than other men."

If ever a thinker fought the artifices and privileges of the intellectual caste, it is that rude man of the people, that robust peasant, Proudhon. The wrath with which he spoke of literature and literary men will be recalled by that thunderous article in the *Représentant du Peuple* of May 28, 1848.

It would be difficult indeed to link the category of "intellectuals socialistically inclined" to the Proudhonian tradition, for the whole work of Proudhon, even more than that of Marx, is directed against that State, "an artificial organism essentially parasitic, distinct from the people, outside of and above the people," which is nothing more or less than the prey of the professionals of ideology.

I do not wish to quote excessively, but I cannot resist the pleasure of putting under Vandervelde's eyes this instructive page of Proudhon against the State: "We want no State", he cries "because the State, the self-styled delegate, or servant of the people, existing through a general and unlimited power of attorney from the voters, no sooner exists than it creates for itself a separate interest, often contrary to the interests of the people; because then acting in that interest it makes public

* De la capacité des Classes Ouvrières, p. 37 et 38.
(1) *Mélanges*, Troisième volume p. 76.

functionaries its own creatures, whence result nepotism, corruption, and little by little the formation of an official tribe as hostile to liberty as to labor We want no State, because the State, to increase its power outside the people, tends to multiply indefinitely its employes, then in order to bind them always more to itself, tends to increase constantly their salaries We want no State, because when taxes no longer suffice for its wastes, for liquidating its favors and sinecures, the State resorts to loans and misappropriations, and after taking other people's money, it still finds methods for having its thefts applauded We want no State, because we would purge society of the whole mass of bankrupts, usurers, bloodhounds, stock-jobbers, highwaymen, sharpers, extortioners, forgers, counterfeiters, jugglers, parasites, hypocrites and statesmen, because in our eyes all statesmen are alike, and all are in various degree eaters of human flesh, as Cato called them".¹

Owen was a practical man, as far removed as possible from intellectualism. I mean by this, that his dreams were applied to facts of the great industry, and that he represents in one sense the first period of capitalism in England. The expert manager of prosperous spinning mills, the unfortunate experimenter of New Lanark and New Harmony is also the father of labor legislation — and through his disciples —, of the English Trade Union and Co-operative movements.

But, from the point of view with which we are concerned, it is his conception of education welded to the workshop that should be preserved. Marx pointed out its importance in his "Capital": "One need only consult the books of Robert Owen to be convinced that the factory system has within it the germ of the education of the future, an education for which for all children above a certain age shall unite productive labor with instruction and gymnastics, and that not only as a method of increasing social production, but as the one and only method of producing complete men."

To make *complete men*, that is to say, to suppress the artificial separation of manual labor from intellectual labor which creates the *fractional men* of capitalist society, that was Owen's concern. It will be that of all those who analyze the evolutionary process of the industrial movement, and Proudhon will be found to propose the same solutions as forcibly as Marx. We shall return to this problem of education united to productive labor, which by the very fact that it does not conceive of thought isolated from action throws so clear a light on the abnormal position of the intellectuals in society. It is enough to observe that Owen's conceptions are directed against that monstrous di-

(1) *Melanges*, Troisième volume, p. 76, 77 et 78.

vision of the two faculties of labor, which assures to a caste detached from life, and foreign to its practice, the easy dominance of prestige. The only future which Owen's ideas reserve for the intellectuals is their disappearance as a privileged class of thinkers, their subordination to the world of production; in a word their re-absorption into social reality.

Truly the great names of Marx, Proudhon and Owen do not constitute the ideal shelter to cover up their intellectual merchandise.

HUBERT LAGARDELLE.

(Translated by Charles H. Kerr.)

(To be Continued.)

The Evolution of Socialism in Russia.

THE FIRST real step in the social revolution is, according to Marx in the Communist Manifesto, the nationalization of land. Russia is rapidly nearing this step. Already the bourgeois are for expropriation and the peasants for the prohibition of large estates. The workingmen socialist deputies in the Duma are for partial nationalization and fully half the peasant deputies, also members of a socialist party recognized by the international movement are in favor of complete nationalization of the land.

The controversy that wages in Russia between these workingmen and peasant socialists is the most momentous in all the international movement. For the agrarian program of the workingmen socialists is not nor never will be so popular among the peasants as the more revolutionary measure proposed by the peasant socialist party.

There is little question that nine-tenths of the Russian peasants will soon be converted to the latter program. If the workingmen's party allows the peasant socialists to settle their land question, reserving to itself the labor question, the already strong tendency of the peasants and workingmen to unite will be completed. There will exist only one Socialist party in Russia. This party will include three-fourths of the common people (all except some of the non-Russian peasants, such as the Poles, Letts and Lithuanians) and the victory of Socialism in Russia will be assured before any other great country.

The controversy is not so complicated as it appears. After several years of fighting at the high tension of a revolutionary time all minor and subsidiary questions are either decided or climinated. Both parties are in favor of a large measure of local autonomy. This would do away with the opposition of the small peasant proprietors of Poland, Lithuania and the Baltic provinces. If there is a middle-class peasant majority in these countries, they will rule and the Socialists will represent the landless or small propertied minorities. Both parties are agreed that there shall be no nationalization under the present government merely to increase its power, but only after a thoroughly democratic revolution. Both parties are agreed in favor of expropriation without compensation.

The only great difference is this. The Social Democrats, the city workingmen's party are in favor of expropriating only the large landlords and not the middle class peasants who work with their own hands. The Socialist Revolutionists, the party of the

peasants, are in favor of the expropriation and nationalization of all land. The Social Democrats support their position on the opportunistic ground that the expropriation of the small peasant proprietors, though they form only a small minority of the whole peasant-class, would nevertheless, in the present critical state of the socialist and revolutionary movement, endanger its success. This is the sole argument used on this question in the most recent manifesto to the peasantry of the Social-Democratic faction of the Duma.

The Socialist Revolutionists do not feel that the opposition of a few million small proprietors could check the wishes of twenty million communal peasants. They are prepared for delay and a long and hard-fought revolution. But they will not abandon the socialist principle of absolute economic equality.

If the large landlord with his thousands of acres is to be expropriated why not also the small landowner with his hundred acres since this is three or four times the amount of land he could hold at the present moment if it were equally divided among the whole people.

To this socialist revolutionary principle of a permanently equal division of the land among all the people, not for ownership but merely temporarily, for cultivation, the bourgeois as well as the social democrats have answered in the Duma that there is not enough land in Russia to give all who would apply for it a living. To this the socialist revolutionists reply as follows. This lack of land is Russia's terrible, crushing misfortune and just for that reason it should be shared by all alike. Because there is not enough land, is that any reason why large or small landowners should have more than their share? Better agriculture and the opening up of new lands will in a decade or so double Russia's agricultural wealth, but then as now all should share alike in the prosperity or misery of the country.

The Social Democrats feel that Russia must follow Prussia and certain other countries in the development either of large or middle-sized land holdings and an agricultural proletariat. The Socialist Revolutionists feel that socialism by this road would take several generations whereas it can be reached in a short term of years by checking any such tendency and simply holding to the communal ownership that has already prevailed in Russian villages for a thousand years.

Whether or not this program succeeds depends largely on the action of the Social Democrats. The government and the bourgeois parties are already doing everything in their power to break up the village commune and increase the number of small proprietors. If this process is not stopped the number of small proprietors will be doubled within a few years, complete national-

ization will have become impossible, and Russia will have to wait decades or generations for the social revolution.

Already the majority faction of the Social-Democrats which, as it is strongest in the Russian provincial towns, is nearest the peasants, is demanding common action with the peasant socialist parties. In the meanwhile the minority faction led by the theorists and St. Petersburg managers of the party and joined by Lettish, Caucasian and Siberian groups or by the Jewish Bund of Poland and Lithuania, where private property prevails or industries predominate is in favor of a temporary co-operation with the bourgeois parties until a purely political revolution is accomplished. It was the majority faction, friendly to the peasants, that first adopted the idea even of partial nationalization.

This ill-concealed contempt for and hostility to the peasants on the part of a faction of the Social-Democrats is due of course to historical causes. First this faction has taken nearly all its ideas from Germany and one of its chiefs glorifies in the name of the Russian Kautsky. However the Russian peasants have never been brutalized by a Prussian military system as in Kautsky's country. More miserable than the Prussian peasants and without any defined legal status, they have nevertheless launched forth a thousand local rebellions since their Prussian relatives were finally beaten into abject subjection. And although their emancipation from serfdom came a generation later than that of the Prussians, the conditions were more favorable and the government did not dare as in Prussia to rob the peasants of all the land in their possession. Prussia has conquered surrounding nations and her peasants have been patriots for centuries. Russia has been beaten for two generations and her peasants have no love for the war-game. I do not speak of the controverted benefit of the absence among the Russian peasants of private property in the land.

A second influence that led the minority faction to despair of the peasants is that before the present revolutionary movement there had been no unified, common organized, national effort among them. Whereas, for more than a decade strikes have been spreading among the workingpeople and even before the war with Japan the Socialist movement had obtained a universal foothold among them. At that time it was hoped to make a purely political revolution by the aid of the bourgeoisie. But this revolution was really made in October 1905, when the bourgeois and the workingpeople through the general strike brought about the Manifesto and freedom and the first Russian parliament. Since that time the bourgeois have been going backward until their leaders now declare that the revolution is over.

Yet the minority faction still demands co-operation with "the more radical" bourgeois and its leader Martof declares that the

peasant parties are not only not socialist but reactionaries. This may be true of Kautsky's Prussia but I doubt if it is true of any other country in the world. Everywhere the socialist parties are seeking to obtain the support of the small farmers on the ground that their property and trading interest is secondary to their interest as manual workers. And it is precisely in Russia that this policy has had its most splendid success. The very name of the leading peasants party in the first Duma, the Labor Group, is an indication of its position. And when this party sent its leader Anikin to London to the Interparliamentary Socialist Congress he was accepted immediately as the representative of a socialist party. In the second Duma this party is breaking up and the majority of its members are going to the Socialist Revolutionary party recognized by the Amsterdam Congress and the International Bureau of Brussels as one of the two Socialist organizations of Russia.

Marxist, materialist, class struggle socialism is rapidly taking hold of the Russian peasantry who have already elected a majority of Socialists in their delegation to the Duma. When the socialist consciousness will have gained the whole of the communal peasants it will have a clear majority of the people of the whole Russian Empire. Perhaps this point has already been reached in the rapid evolution through which the country is now passing. If it has we may soon see a Socialist Revolutionary Parliament, since all the popular parties demand universal suffrage.

However the bourgeoisie are not sincere in this demand since it would instantly end their power in the Duma. Before there is universal suffrage there will have to be a violent revolution. And doubtless after the election of a socialist parliament some kind of civil war would be inevitable. But here is where the majority civil war—and it expects the driving power to be always the faction of the Social-Democrats disagrees with the minority. It expects this course of events—violent revolution, followed by a civil war—and it expects the driving power to be always the thoroughly "democratic and revolutionary," not the "reactionary" attitude of the peasants party. The majority faction, according to its leader Lenin does not hope however with the peasants that socialism will grow directly out of this civil war offered by the bourgeois. Lenin thinks that Germany would not allow Socialism in Russia and would try to interfere. He then thinks the Socialist Revolution will break out all over Europe and that then only will the peasants see what true Socialism is and demand that it be applied not only to the land but to the factories also.

The situation at the present moment is this. One faction of one party despairs of the peasants. The other faction of this party

and the whole socialist revolutionary party stakes its hopes on the peasants. The Socialism of Russia is certain then to have an agrarian character as in no other land. And for this very reason Russia may be the first Socialist Nation.

WM. ENGLISH WALLING.

EDITORIAL

The Work if Not the Pay of a Spy.

Comrade Ben Hanford pointed out several years ago, that Daniel DeLeon was doing the work, whether he was receiving the pay or not, of a capitalist spy.

The last few months have doubled this impression and lead one to wonder whether he is not also receiving the pay.

Two years ago, and yet today, the Western Federation of Miners was the most militant, class-conscious, most feared labor organization on this continent. It set about pushing the principles that had guided it to that proud position into the East. If this move proved successful it would mean the mental and political arming of the workers of America for battle. It would mean the heaviest blow that could well be dealt capitalism.

Manifestly the thing which capitalism desired above all else was to prevent this, to sow dissension within the new organization, to make it repugnant to the workers of the country, to make it ridiculously impotent, and a stench in the nostrils of intelligent workmen,

These things DeLeon has practically accomplished.

But this was not enough. What Pinkertons, and state governments, and militia and Mine Owners' Associations and all the powers secret and open that capitalism had previously brought to bear against the Western Federation of Miners had been unable to accomplish, DeLeon's devilment did,—sowed the seeds of dissension among the membership of the W. F. M.

Go back over another portion of his history and more corroborative evidence of this theory arises. At the moment when the Socialist Labor Party was beginning to grow he loaded it down with the S. T. & L. A. and then distorted the purposes of that organization until no intelligent Socialist could remain in the S. L. P.

Then when the Socialist Party was growing there was no vituperation, no falsification too raw for him to pour out upon it.

The last few months has seen a change of attitude. The S. L. P. has practically ceased to exist. In many large cities it is no longer of sufficient importance to be valuable to capitalism as an obstacle to Socialism.

The Socialist Party on the other hand has grown into a power that seriously threatens capitalism, and gives promise of much in the near future. Manifestly the most effective way to earn the plaudits of capitalism is to sow dissension in the Socialist Party ranks. So we now note a sudden friendliness for that party. No longer do the columns of the "People" reek with nauseous abuse of the Socialist Party. On the contrary certain young and fresh and easily gullible members of the Socialist Party are bathed in fulsome praise by the clever schemer and are urged to start trouble within their organization. For years DeLeon could find no words sufficiently strong to express his denunciation of any "boring from within" tactics. Now he is practicing those tactics with all his slippery cunning, upon the Socialist Party.

He flatters the more susceptible members by telling them how clear, and intelligent, and class-conscious, and superior to their fellow members they are. When one of them can be induced to "resign" from the Socialist Party he is assured of as many columns as he may desire to pour out his venom in the "People," and his leaving the Socialist Party is hailed as a "split," although the total number of such weak-headed dupes that he has caught during the last year is not equal to the average number of new members taken in by Local Chicago at each monthly meeting.

DeLeon has recently finished a trip across the continent and the burden of his boast on his return is the number of "S. L. P. men in the S. P." And to those who know this man, one of the most humorous things about the trip has been the way in which he has slyly played upon the exposures of his own rascality and has posed as the "best abused man" in the country, while maintaining everywhere the suave smoothness, for which he has long been noted among those who know him.

Taking all these things into consideration, the conclusion seems almost inevitable that DeLeon is playing the part of a capitalist spy in the Socialist ranks.

There is another feature that leads to the conclusion that he is not doing this unrewarded. He has been running a daily paper in New York for seven years. Although it is little more than a handbill, yet with the limited circulation which he has it must have a considerable deficit.

WHO PAYS THAT DEFICIT? In all these seven years he

has never made a financial report. It would at least be interesting to see such a report. It might show that he was getting the money as well as doing the work of capitalism.

No apology need be offered for the preponderance of foreign material this month, for there are stirring times in Europe just now and much can be learned from events there.

Seldom has the Review been able to secure such a splendid set of articles as appear in this issue. No matter how much money we might have spent it would have been hard to have improved upon this selection.

The series of articles on the Russian Revolt, which are begun this month will constitute the standard history of the great struggle for liberty. They are written by one of the foremost of the group of younger writers, who are basing their work upon the Socialist philosophy. He has made a thorough study on the spot of all phases of the Russian revolution, and his work taken in conjunction with that of William English Walling and Robert Hunter will give a treatment of European politics such as has never been presented to the English reading public.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

The so-called Union Labor party of San Francisco has received a blow from which it is doubtful whether it will ever recover. With its chief prophet in jail and its boss discredited and despised by all men, and with any number of alleged leaders resting under a cloud, the future is dark indeed for this once promising, but unclear and bourgeois movement. Back a half dozen years ago, when class lines were clearly drawn in the great water front strike, when the class struggle was transferred from the industrial to the political field, the mass of the workers were thoroughly imbued with the class spirit and desirous of striking a smashing blow at capitalism and at the same time fortify itself. But the wretched, self-seeking poltroon, who are ever ready to counsel "conservatism" and sacrifice anything and everything to be enabled to climb over the backs of the workers into wealth and power, soon obtained control of the aggressive, fighting U. L. P. The musician Schmitz, who happened to carry a union card while voting the Republican ticket regularly, and who had no more conception about the rights of labor than a hen has about algebra, was whooped into office to the great consternation of the privileged class. But, while the laboring people were still shouting about their victory and assuring themselves that henceforth their industrial and social burdens would be lightened, Mr. Schmitz quickly surrounds himself with a lot of spoils-smelling politician ward-healers, and announces in the newspapers throughout the length and breadth of the land that he was no revolutionist, that "vested" rights would not be disturbed, and that everything would go along in about the same manner as under preceding administrations. Schmitz spoke the truth. While in a number of instances Mayor Schmitz was instrumental in arbitrating troubles between employers and employes, just as did capitalistic officials before him in San Francisco, and for that matter in many other parts of the country, he also sent the police to protect scabs and harrass union strikers, as did other capitalistic mayors.

The ludicrous attempt of certain capitalistic dailies to label Schmitz a Socialist is one of the humorous incidents of the silly season. I distinctly recall the well timed visit of Mr. Schmitz to the New Orleans convention of the American Federation of Labor. He had just been elected and was the lion of the hour. Gompers beamed upon him and bowed and scraped around him in a manner as only Gompers can when he is in the presence of the truly great. Of course, Schmitz made a speech; he talked eloquently about the "practical" things to be accomplished, and, behold! here was the personification of

practicability that would forever smash theatrical socialism and all its advocates into a cocked hat. I had quite a lengthy conversation with Mr. Schmitz. He frankly admitted that he could not accept the doctrine of socialism, but was inclined to believe in municipal ownership of railways "ultimately." When the political debate precipitated by the Socialists was before the house the San Francisco pure and simplers, led by Andrew Furnseth, pointed with pride to their "practical" demonstration on the coast, and they poured vials of wrath upon the "red-button soapbox orators" who got out on street corners and held forth in "Crazy Alley" and denounced the U. L. P. as a fake labor party, whereas they should have been good little boys and clambered into the Schmitz band-wagon and rode to glorious victory.

Again at the San Francisco convention of the A. F. of L., Mayor Schmitz was the whole show, and some beamed and bowed and scrapped some more. And the "reds" in "Crazy Alley" went forth nightly and they rented halls and challenged the so-called "Labor" party to show what if had done for the betterment of the working class and wherein the local administration was not as bad or indifferent as the Republican and Democratic tribes of politicians that held other municipalities in their grip. As a matter of fact along about that time some of the pure and simplers in 'Frisco were becoming quite lukewarm toward the "Labor" administration. Schmitz was beginning to hanker for high society—they say he developed an uncontrollable mania to become a member of the exclusive "four hundred" that ruled the social world from Nob Hill. Be that as it may, it is true that the public service corporations had everything pretty much their own way. Schmitz was becoming eminently respectable. He was regarded as a thoroughly "safe" executive, and the only thing that was necessary for those who desired favors to do was to "see Abe Ruef." The latter person was a typical snob; he despised the workers who brought him out of obscurity and created him a boss. He referred to the "labor leaders" who placed him on a pedestal as "a lot of hungry grafters who would eat the paint off a house." And like a disgusting snob that he was and is, he was bound to turn traitor and betray his pals to save his own precious skin. The world despises a cringing coward and has a certain amount of respect for a crook who has played his cards, lost and takes his medicine like a man. The old saying that "there is honor among thieves" proved untrue in San Francisco. A thief is an extremely selfish individual; he has no high ideals; there is no fraternal feeling for his fellowman in his soul. Quite naturally he thrives under and is an ardent defender of a robber system. The cold-blooded Ruef saw on the one hand a great mass of workers, who were class-conscious to a degree, and who by an accidental stroke, he was able to use. On the other hand were privilege-seeking plutocrats who were willing to pay him well for the opportunity to exploit the mass of people. Ruef played upon the cupidity of the big ignoramus Schmitz and the unholy alliance reduced the workers and held high carnival until fate finally landed them behind prison bars.

This San Francisco fiasco is not lost upon the Socialists. It vindicates the position assumed by the latter from the beginning. It only proves once more that these mushroom political movements that spring up here and there, and are not based upon the solid revolutionary rock of socialism are not worth enough powder to blow them to sheol. Not only is it a waste of time to join such movements, but

frequently they are positively injurious to the labor class as a whole, because that class must bear the odium, as in the San Francisco case, of the miserable fraud. Let the Socialists stand pat for their great international movement, more determined—yes, more fanatical, if you please—than ever. The little local sideshows are bound to destroy themselves sooner or later.

The expulsion of the United Brewery Workers from the American Federation of Labor by the executive council of the latter body has not added much prestige and strength to organized labor in a collective sense. On the contrary it has demonstrated the fact that, despite their professions to the contrary, some people have little regard for the sacredness of the contract, and, again, that the claim that the A. F. of L. is a voluntary organization and in principle opposed to coercion is untenable. The charter rights of the brewery workers provide that they be given jurisdiction over all employes in breweries, and the Federation laws read that the various affiliated organizations be fully protected in maintaining their entity. Yet because about 40,000 brewers, engineers, firemen, teamsters, etc. who are banded together in an industrial organization for mutual betterment refuse to disintegrate and associate with half a dozen craft unions they are drummed out of camp by the great leaders. Indeed the Prohibition Secretary of the A. F. of L., Morrison, in a newspaper interview, goes so far as to announce that the beer manufactured by the brewery workers will be regarded as an unfair product, and probably the next edict will be that all workingmen with cards, to be "good trade unionists," must sign a temperance pledge and join the prohibition party. Probably the "leaders" will actually lead in this respect and set a good example for the rank and file—and probably not.

Gompers has been the implacable foe of the brewery workers for years because he has been unable to use them, and for the reason that they are socialistic in tendency and believe in concentration, while he is anarchistic—or to use a more respectable term, "individualistic"—without the courage to 'fess up. People can say what they will, but Sam Gompers is the brains and the domineering spirit of the executive council. He has his way about things. He fired out the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, of which George Barnes, member of the British Parliament and a well-known Socialist, is general secretary, and of which Isaac Cowen, equally well known as a Socialist speaker, was American organizer. He also got rid of the United Metal Workers' International Union, of which C. O. Sherman, of the I. W. W., was general secretary. Now the brewery workers are expelled, and there are one or two other bodies slated for dismemberment or expulsion. They may not wait to be disorganized, but pack up and go of their own accord.

One would naturally imagine that while the open shop employers' associations are collecting an enormous war fund and considering plans to unite their forces that the labor "leaders" would aim to concentrate their organizations and prepare to meet any and all attacks. But not so. The brewery workers' locals affiliated with state and city and central bodies, according to Gompers' man Morrison, are to be driven out of those bodies, too, and, as the brewers have a few friends among the rank and file who have no axes to grind in all likelihood, if the great men at Washington carry out their threats,

there will be internal war all along the lines. The brewery workers have issued a dignified statement in which they declare that, despite the persecution of the reactionists, they will continue to observe union principles as they understand them. On the other hand, the United States Brewers' Association, the employers' organization, is reported to have announced that they will make contracts with the various craft unions after this year and ignore the brewery workers so far as the engineers, firemen and teamsters are concerned. The bosses are also said to be accumulating a fund to enforce their decree and look to the A. F. of L. to lend support in any possible contingency. There are some interesting times ahead.

It will be recalled that mention was made in the Review some time ago of the peculiar autonomistic or anarchistic condition that prevailed in the printing industry, where the International Typographical Union was struggling to enforce the eight-hour workday, while the pressmen were bound by an open shop agreement and were virtually forced to scab against their fellow-workers, and that, despite the indignation of the membership of the I. T. U. and the pressmen, President Higgins deliberately signed a new agreement with the employers' association to continue the nine-hour day and the open shop until 1909. Certainly, under the Gompersian interpretation of liberty and license, Higgins had a perfect right to bring incalculable injury upon the Typographical Union, of which organization, by the way, Secretary Morrison, of the A. F. of L., is a misrepresentative. But in the face of all opposition the I. T. U. has practically won the eight-hour day—at a cost of over \$3,000,000 actual money assessed upon the members. The pressmen have just held their annual convention in New York, and although every effort was made by Higgins and his followers to pack the assemblage, the revolt of the rank and file was so widespread that the "leaders" met their Waterloo. Higgins and his cohorts were turned down and out and their policies were reversed. The indications now are that there will be a strong printing federation consummated, which will virtually amount to an industrial body. Higgins was one of Gompers' ablest lieutenants, and a number of times was given the distinguished honor of presiding at A. F. of L. conventions while officers were being elected. This year the erudite gentleman of Boston will be sadly missed.

If the members of some other organizations—the men who pay the freight—would imitate the example of the pressmen, arise in their might and kick their "leaders" into the middle of next week there would be more progress and less reaction in the American labor movement.

The irony in this disgusting situation is that the brewery workers have never hesitated to make sacrifices for the benefit of some of the very organizations whose representatives on the executive council voted to expel them, and who would not dare to submit their acts to a referendum vote of their own unions for vindication. Moreover, some of the members of the executive council are at the head of organizations that are doing precisely what the brewers were excommunicated for. Take the miners, for example, the largest body affiliated with the A. F. of L., an organization that, during some of its fights for life, received thousands of dollars from the brewers to enable the ill-paid members to stand out and fight the operators. The miners claimed jurisdiction over the coal hoisting engineers, and

President Mitchell stated emphatically that they would not surrender them to the craft organization that repeated fights in the Scranton, New Orleans and Boston conventions for their alleged autonomy rights. President Keefe, of the longshoremen, will battle strenuously against yielding jurisdiction over the engineers on the docks to the International Union of Steam Engineers, which body is one of the organizations that is attempting to pluck the brewers to pieces. The carpenters, whose President Huber is on the executive council, are attempting to swallow the Amalgamated Woodworkers and claim jurisdiction over all employed in woodworking, but to hear them tell it they are "straight trade autonomists." The machinists, whose President O'Connell is also on the council, absorbed the International Association of Allied Metal Mechanics, thus giving them a stronger grip upon machine shops, but O'Connell is for "trade autonomy" and fiercest the brewers. There are several others who, if they were consistent, would surrender important elements in their organizations all the way thorough. But the only time they are consistent is when they are inconsistent.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

FRANCE.

By far the most striking event of the month has been the vine-growers' strike in Southern France. Although this movement has been widely heralded in this country as being a socialist uprising yet it really had no connection with Socialism, save in so far that every revolutionary movement at the present time is influenced by the dominant revolutionary note of the age,—socialism. As a matter of fact the Midi, as the section of France is called where the vine growers were in rebellion, is the most conservative, if not reactionary portion of the nation. The Socialist strength is largely in the North.

Neither was this a proletarian movement. The vine-growers have for years been confronted with falling prices. This is partly due to overproduction (in the capitalist sense) but also largely to the manufacture of "chemical" wines in the manufacturing centers and in Paris. A combination of sugar manufacturers and liquor traders who were behind this "manufacture" of "wine" were able to control the government and to prevent any legislation against adulteration.

The vine-growers, who had petitioned for such legislation over and over again, grew desperate, and finally announced that unless the government proceeded to stop this adulteration and to enact certain other legislation they would all "strike" and that all the local officials would resign thus paralyzing local government.

Under the leadership of Marcelin Albert this threat was carried into effect and for some time the Midi was in a state closely bordering on anarchy. The Clemenceau government ordered the troops sent to the locality, but those troops that were recruited in the disaffected region refused to fire upon their relations and friends, and there were many signs of widespread disaffection and mutiny.

The matter came up in the Chamber of Deputies and the Socialists proposed the immediate nationalization of the vineyards of the larger employing proprietors, and of the wholesale and retail trade in wine and sugar, with associations of the wine growers to direct the management,—details of compensation and management to be settled later. This proposal received only the votes of the Socialists and one or two other Deputies.

In the midst of the excitement, Albert, who seems to have been about as simple as the average small capitalist reformer, came to

Paris to see Clemenceau. He was evidently dazzled by the splendor of official Paris and after having been arrested, was released on parole, on condition that he succeeded in stopping the strike. On leaving the ministerial headquarters, Clemenceau kindly (?) offered him his train fare to his home. He accepted this, and immediately there arose a cry that he had been bribed, although the sum received was only about twenty dollars.

His followers, accordingly, refused to follow his instructions, but nevertheless the strike is gradually dwindling away.

In the meantime the Socialists are fighting in the chamber of deputies for the complete amnesty for all those engaged in the uprising, including the mutinous troops. This Clemenceau is resisting and the affair may yet easily precipitate a cabinet crisis.

In the meantime the general unrest among the peasants, while not now by any means a Socialist movement, may easily at any time drift into co-operation with the socialist movement. At any rate it indicates an insurrectionary spirit among the French peasantry long so famous as the backbone of conservatism.

RUSSIA.

The event of the month in Russia was, of course, the dissolution of the Duma by the Czar. This coup d'etat was determined upon as soon as it became evident that in spite of the gerrymandering and police interference with the elections that the Duma was not inclined to be completely subservient to the Czar.

The pretext upon which it was dissolved was that the Social Democratic members were plotting to establish a republic. There is something almost humorous in this charge since the Socialists have never attempted to conceal the fact that they were seeking the overthrow of the autocracy and to speak of their "plotting" to that end is a new use of the word. A demand was made upon the Duma that the Socialist members be delivered up for punishment,—which meant for death. This the Duma refused to do and dissolution followed. The Socialist members nearly all seem to have escaped arrest and have taken up the secret propaganda once more.

The government has also determined upon a still further revision of the election laws so as to place power entirely in the hands of the reactionary elements'. Incidentally this is a violation of the pledge of the Czar that no changes would be made in the election law without the consent of the Duma.

The immediate result of the dissolution has been a revival of all the old tactics, including terrorism. Just what attitude will be taken by the Socialists toward the elections for the next Duma has not yet been decided.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS.

The International Socialist Congress will be held at Stuttgart August 18th to 24th. This will be the first International Congress where the proportional system of voting will be in force. Hitherto each nation has had two votes no matter what its size or strength of its socialist movement. At the coming Congress an effort has

been made to apportion voting strength to the various countries in the ratio of the importance of the Socialist movement, the size of the country the strength of the labor union movement, and the number of Socialist parliamentary representatives.

The principle questions before the Congress will deal with immigration and emigration and the relation of the Socialist Party to the labor unions.

BOOK REVIEWS

Three Acres and Liberty. By Bolton Hall. MacMillan. Cloth, 435 pp., \$1.50.

Here is a combination of the Single Tax, "Back to the Land" and suburbanite enthusiasm, tempered with the supervision of an agricultural expert and written in charming literary style. Such a combination should be pleasing to a great variety of readers, and it certainly is. The farmer, gardener, suburbanite, chicken-farmer, bee and fruit raiser, nature lover and poet will all find something to enjoy in its pages, while it has much of great value to the sociologist.

The burden of the book is that on three acres enough can be raised to give economic freedom. While the book does many things, as has been suggested, it seems to fall something short of proving its main thesis. There is no doubt but what enormous crops, far exceeding the average at present can be brought from the land. The examples which are quoted, and which are largely taken from Kropotkin, may on the whole be accepted, although some of them seem to lack discriminating accuracy in statement. But the present writer, like Kropotkin, neglects to tell us that the market gardeners of Paris, who have conquered climate and soil and cultivated the earth to an intensity unknown elsewhere on earth are sunk in a poverty as deep as that of the city sweat-shops. Their hours are the limit of human endurance,—their only sleep being often that which they can catch on their carts as they wait outside the walls of Paris, to be first in line at the market. Nor have all those who have tried market gardening been so successful as Mr. Hall would have us believe. There are plenty of failures in the neighborhood of every great city. The fruit belt of Michigan could tell a story longer than the volume before us could contain on this point.

Passing by this optimism, which is excusable in the enthusiast, even though it destroy the heart of the argument of the book, there is still enough that is valuable, interesting and helpful to make it one of the important books of the year. There are a host of practical suggestions from how to buy a farm to what to plant and how to care for it, although on the latter point the writer wisely refers to technical works on gardening rather than cumber his pages with details on points already covered. Here one notes some omissions that might well be supplied in a later addition. A discussion on the possibilities of intensive fruit raising should not have neglected the new dwarf fruit that enable such wonders to be so quickly wrought, nor, in work with so much of detail one should have expected to have seen some reference to the raising of such fruits as strawber-

ries in barrels and boxes. Again the author's pessimism leads him to overlook the failures that have been met with in vacant lot cultivation by philanthropic bodies and to mention only the more remarkable successes.

That there will be a tremendous "Back to the Land" movement as soon as economic conditions permit is certain. That even under capitalism there is much of a movement in that direction is evident. That such a movement can ever solve any problem of present time, or give "liberty" to any large number is doubtful. Yet if it does no more than arouse a desire in those who have the possibility of cultivating the soil it will have done good.

Sex and Society. By William I. Thomas. University of Chicago Press. Cloth, 325 pp., \$2.00.

After discussing the various theories that see in woman a partially developed man, a lower human being, etc. Prof. Thomas concludes his chapter on "Organic Differences in the Sexes" with the statement that:

"Man consumes energy more rapidly; woman is more conservative of it. The structural variability of man is mainly toward motion; woman's variational tendency is not toward motion, but toward reproduction. Man is fitted for feats of strength and bursts of energy; woman has more stability and endurance. While woman remains nearer to the infantile type, man approaches more nearly to the senile. The extreme variational tendency of man expresses itself in a larger percentage of genius, insanity and idiocy; woman remains more nearly normal."

The book is a close social and psychological study of sex relations and the part which they have played in race evolution. It is a welcome relief from the vast amount of undigested sentimental rot that it poured forth on this subject, and this whether the reader agree with the author or not. Indeed there are not many conclusions with which to agree or disagree as the work is largely descriptive of facts.

There are chapters on Sex and "Primitive Social Control," "Social Feeling," "Primitive Industry," "Primitive Morality," "The Psychology of Exogamy," "The Psychology of Modest and Clothing," "The Adventitious Character of Woman" and "The Mind of Woman and the Lower Races."

The Theoretical System of Karl Marx in the Light of Recent Criticism. By Louis B. Boudin. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, 286 pp., \$1.00.

The contents of this work are already familiar to our readers as it was first published in the columns of the International Socialist Review. It is an attempt to present the Marxian system of thought, with the emphasis on the **system**. The materialistic interpretation of history, the doctrine of the class struggle and the labor theory of value are shown to be integral parts of one symmetrical system.

Considerable space is given to a discussion of the various critics of Marxism. In this respect it is particularly timely since the Revisionist movement, which produced most of these critics seems to have practically dissappeared so that their criticisms may now be

looked upon as completed. Much use has been made of those portions of Marx' work which have not yet appeared in English. It is here that the author appears at his best. There are many who will disagree with some of his presentations of Marxism, which is patterned very closely after that of Kautsky, but there are few who will deny that he has made good in overthrowing the critics of Marx.

The book cannot be looked upon as an adequate presentation of the Marxian philosophy,—it is doubtful if any such presentation can be made in less space than that occupied by Marx in the original statement—but to the person who has already read the first volume of Marx and an average amount of Socialist literature this book will bring new ideas and give a much better grasp of the philosophy of Socialism.

It is almost the first of what promises to be an extensive literature in English corresponding to that already existing in other languages, expounding, explaining, elaborating Marxism.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

A NEW WAY TO BUY STOCK.

Most readers of the Review are already familiar with the co-operative plan on which the publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company is organized. Starting without capital, and getting our support not from capitalists but from laborers, we have gradually found new co-operative stockholders, until at the end of June we have a paid-up capital of \$23,380.00. But all this and several thousand dollars of borrowed capital beside is invested in copyrights, plates, books and accumulated advertising, so that more capital is needed if we are to enlarge our work.

We can not expect to receive large sums from investors, first because our work is not in the interest of the people who have large sums, and second because we offer no dividends. Moreover, we regard it as essential to the future of the publishing house that the control be kept in the membership of the socialist party, so we are making no effort to secure stock subscriptions for more than a single share. We already have 1761 stockholders; if we could double the number within a year we could more than double the output of socialist books.

Only a small portion of those who have subscribed for stock were able to pay the full ten dollars at one time. Most of the stock has been paid for in monthly installments of one dollar each. This plan has been a great advantage on both sides, but there have been some serious drawbacks which we believe the new plan will overcome. The stock subscribers have had to promise definitely to pay a dollar a month, while the office force of the publishing house has had to keep a record of each promise and send notices when payments were delayed. We have allowed those making payments to buy books at reduced prices while paying for stock, and this has worked out unequally in the case of those unable for various reasons to complete their payments. Some have put off buying books until their stock should be fully paid for, and on account of ill health or loss of jobs have been unable to get any benefit whatever from their stock, subscriptions. Others have paid a single dollar on stock, pur-

chased a large number of books at cost, and then have stopped their payments. And the office force has had to put a good deal of unproductive labor into the collection of the deferred payments of some who have finally paid. We believe our new plan will work better on both sides.

The New Plan. Our discount on books to stockholders is forty per cent when we prepay charges, fifty per cent when books are sent at purchaser's expense. To buy stock on the new plan, simply send the retail price for what books you want to the amount of a dollar or more at a time. We will send the books and with them a credit certificate for 40% or 50% of the amount of the remittance, according to whether we prepay the charges on the books or not. These certificates will be received the same as cash at any time within a year in payment for a share of stock; after a year has expired they will be of no value. Thus the purchase within a year of books to the amount of \$25.00 if we prepay charges, or \$20.00 if purchaser pays charges, will entitle the purchaser to a full-paid share of stock without any direct outlay.

These credit certificates will be transferable. If several numbers of a local or branch of the Socialist Party will buy books and turn over their certificates to the secretary, a share of stock can easily be secured without burdening any one.

In this way the purchasers of books have everything to gain and nothing to lose. They will for every remittance get their money's worth of books. If they buy the number specified within the year, they get their stock without any direct outlay. If not, they have no explanation or apology to offer, and they will receive no letters requesting them to keep up their payments.

The publishing house on the other hand will save an immense amount of unproductive labor, and will be enabled to make every dollar count toward the circulation of more socialist books.

"JUNE BREAKS ALL RECORDS."

Our readers will remember that April broke all previous records for the sale of books. We had expected that the April record would stand untouched until fall, but June, ordinarily a dull month, has surpassed April. Our book sales for June have been \$2878.68, Review receipts \$155.51, stock subscriptions \$216.93, total \$3251.12. The large total book sales are partly due to special orders from the Wilshire Book Company and the Appeal to Reason, and partly to the fact that many stockholders responded to the offer of a special discount during the month of June. The result is encouraging in that it has enabled us to meet our most pressing obligations without resorting to a bank loan at high interest, but it does not mean that further

effort is needless. The contrary is true. We have been printing and binding new books so fast that we must keep up the pace another month to pay the bills that are coming due. We have strained our credit to publish these books because we believe the socialists of America want them. The following list includes only the newest books. For a complete list, see our Socialist Book Bulletin for June, mailed free on request.

LATEST SOCIALIST BOOKS NOW READY:

Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. By Karl Marx. Volume II, The Process of Circulation of Capital. Edited by Frederick Engels and translated from the Second German Edition by Ernest Untermann. Cloth, 614 pages, with index, \$2.00.

The Rise of the American Proletarian. By Austin Lewis. International Library of Social Science, Vol. 14, \$1.00.

The Theoretical System of Karl Marx. By Louis B. Boudia. International Library of Social Science, Vol. 15, \$1.00.

Landmarks of Scientific Socialism (Anti-Duehring.) By Frederick Engels, translated by Austin Lewis. International Library of Social Science, Vol. 16, \$1.00.

Socialism, Positive and Negative. By Robert Rives La Monte. Standard Socialist Series, Vol. 19, 50c.

Capitalist and Laborer, a reply to Goldwin Smith, also **Modern Socialism**, a reply to W. H. Mallock, by John Spargo. Standard Socialist Series, Vol. 20, 50c.

The Right to be Lazy and Other Studies. By Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr. Standard Socialist Series, Vol. 21, 50c.

Science and Socialism. By Robert Rives LaMonte. Pocket Library of Socialism, No. 22, 5c.

Marx on Cheapness. Translated by Robert Rives LaMonte. Pocket Library of Socialism, No. 50, 5c.

All the above are NOW READY. They will be sent to any address for \$6.60, and a credit certificate receivable on stock subscription will be also sent,—for \$3.30 if purchaser pays expressage; for \$2.64 if we pay it.

IN PRESS:

Revolution and Counter-Revolution. By Karl Marx. Standard Socialist Series, Vol. 22, 50c. Ready about July 15.

The American Esperanto Book. By Arthur Baker. A complete text-book of the new International Language, including grammar, exercises and vocabulary. \$1.00. Ready about July 15.

What Socialists Think. By Charles H. Kerr. Pocket Library of Socialism, No. 57. Ready about July 15.

American Communities. By William Alfred Hinds. Third edition, revised and enlarged, with many new illustrations, \$1.50. Ready about August 25.

Marxian Economics. By Ernest Unterman. International Library of Social Science, Vol. 13, \$1.00. Up to the date of going to press the author has not given us concluding pages of the manuscript for this work, though our contract with him provided that it should be in our hands as long ago as last January, and we announced it accordingly. He is at present in Idaho, and writes us that he will complete the work shortly. Those who have ordered advance copies may substitute something else if they prefer not to wait. We will not attempt to fix the date of publication until we get the rest of the manuscript.

International Socialist Review, Vol. VII. This volume is now being bound, and will be ready about July 15. We can now supply volumes II, III, IV, V and VI, at \$2.00 a volume, and Volume I, the supply of which is nearly exhausted, at \$5.00. These prices are subject to the usual discount to stockholders. The price of Vol. VII will also be \$2.00, subject to the same discount. We have a few copies of Volume II with slightly damaged cover which we will mail at \$1.00 while they last (no discount from this special price). A set of the **Review** is indispensable to any one desiring a history of the International Socialist movement and of the development of socialist thought for the years beginning with July, 1900. Please note that we do NOT bind back numbers nor exchange bound for unbound volumes. We can still supply a few single copies of the different numbers of Volume VII, but shall close them all out by the end of August. To make sure of a full set of the **Review**, order now.

Marx's Capital.

Do not forget that we are now offering the first opportunity to get the second volume of this great work in the English language. No one who is ignorant of this book really understands socialism. If you have the first volume you will want the second, if not, you should send for the first. Two dollars a volume, postpaid. And do not forget that at \$1.50 we are publishing Morgan's "Ancient Society," which has always sold at \$4.00. With more co-operators we can do more. ' How about yourself?