

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VIII SEPTEMBER, 1907 NO. 3

The Stuttgart Congress.*

From every point of view the last International Socialist Congress was greater than any ever held. Not only in the number of delegates and their representative character, but in a host of different points, some of which will appear in the course of this report, the meeting at Stuttgart was one of which the International movement may well be proud.

There were about 900 delegates present. The exact number cannot be stated until the final report is accessible as there were several arrivals after the preliminary statement of the International Secretary Huysmans.

The preliminary arrangements for the Congress were marvelously perfect and were significant of that wonderful power of organization and attention to detail so characteristic of the German mind. Every convenience that could be devised to add to the comfort of the delegates and the effectiveness of the work had been foreseen and provided. All the little items in the way of stationery which had been prepared for the delegates were inclosed in a roomy portfolio that formed at once a great convenience during the proceedings and a valued souvenir when the Congress adjourned.

There was a machine-like character to some of the arrangements that amused the delegates who had been used to the free and easy (and confusing) way of conducting an American political convention. When the Germans make a rule they have the strange habit of enforcing it, and when they said that none but delegates would be permitted upon the floor of the convention they proceeded to effectively exclude all others. As a consequence most of the delegates soon became accustomed to going about with these "Legitimations" in their hands ready to display them to the ever vigilant ushers.

*) From report submitted to National Secretary, Socialist Party.

THE GREAT MASS MEETING.

The first Sunday is one which it is safe to say will never be forgotten by any one who experienced its events. The *Volksfestplatz* (Peoples Festival Place), ordinarily used for military manouvers, had been secured for a great mass-meeting. This place is located on the banks of the Neckar a little more than a mile from the center of the city, and for two hours before the time set for the meeting every street and road leading there was filled with a solidly marching mass of men, women and children. Standing on the beautiful Neckar bridge which overlooks the place a wonderful sight presented itself. An almost perfectly level place, some twenty or thirty acres in extent was one solid mass of closely packed humanity. The estimates of those present varied between fifty and one hundred thousand persons and the latter figure was in all probability not far from the truth. At six different points on the place gayly decorated speakers' stands were located.

From these places the greatest orators of the Socialist movement, and some of these stand unrivalled among the world's orators of whatever political belief, sent forth the message of international solidarity and brotherhood to the vast multitude, that in turn sent great waves of cheering rolling across the mighty human sea. The very names of the speakers will convey an idea of what an event it was better than volumes of description. There were Bebel and Singer and Vollmar from Germany, Jaures and Guesde and Vaillant of France, Adler of Austria, Hyndman of England, Ferri of Italy, Vandervelde of Belgium, and so on through the list of those whose names are a part of the working class history of today.

In spite of the vast crowd and the great enthusiasm there was never the slightest disorder, and the German government found no cause to use the large body of police and troops which we afterwards learned had been assembled to meet the "emergency."

BEBEL'S REPORT.

The next morning the Congress assembled for its opening session, the principal feature of which was the speech of Bebel, which was largely a report of progress since the Congress of Amsterdam three years before. And it was a wonderful report of progress. At the previous Congress the quarrels of the French delegations had taken up a large portion of the proceedings and left a feeling of discouragement as to the future of socialism in France. But today the French delegation comes as a unit from a single solidified rapidly growing party. The Amsterdam Congress met in the midst of the Russo-Japanese war

and with Russian workers almost motionless beneath the autocracy. Today the Russian revolution is in full swing and all realize that the days of Czardom are numbered. Austrian socialists have gained universal suffrage since the last International meeting and used it so well that they are now the first party in the Austrian government.

Finland was scarcely upon the Socialist map at the Amsterdam meeting, but took its place at Stuttgart close to the first rank, with the proud distinction of being the first European country to secure genuine *universal* suffrage, with even the distinction of sex abolished. It too had used its new gained privileges so effectively as to conquer a larger measure of power for the proletariat than is possessed by the workers in any save one or two parliaments of the world.

England too, that has so long been the discouraging exception to socialist progress has taken a great leap in the last three years and now bids fair to be henceforth one of the foremost countries in the socialist army. In Germany Comrade Bebel assured us that while the opponents of socialism spoke of the defeat of the Social Democrats at the last election, they spoke with fear in their hearts and a knowledge that a few more such "victories" would sound the doom of German capitalism. The United States, too brought its message of cheer by the victory in the Haywood case and the growing solidarity displayed in that struggle.

When all these advances were presented simultaneously it conveyed to the hearer a new idea of the resistless, world-wide, onward march of the proletarian army, and gave renewed confidence in the early coming of the day of international victory.

After a few other preliminary speeches, and the report of the International Secretary, the Congress set about its work. Before discussing this work, however, mention at least must be made of the splendid concert furnished to the delegates by the Stuttgart comrades on the evening of the opening day. Soloists that would have done credit to Grand Opéra, supported by a magnificent orchestra and Männerchor, provided an evening of musical enjoyment such as it would have been hard to duplicate in any country but Germany.

The real work of the Congress is done in the numerous committees, one of which is formed for each of the questions on the order of business. There were five of these committees at Stuttgart—one each on Militarism, Relation of Trades Unions and Political Parties, Immigration, Colonization and Woman's Suffrage. Each country was entitled to four members of each committee. This made the committees rather large, in fact they were each miniature Congresses, and their deliberations proceeded rather slowly, especially since each speech had to be trans-

lated into two languages, after having been delivered in the original.

MILITARISM.

The main fight of the Congress centered around the military question. As this was one in which the American delegates were perhaps least interested, they could take the position of spectators and enjoy the battle. And it was a royal battle, into which the European countries sent their best representatives. Here were Bebel, and Jaurès, and Adler, and Vandervelde, and Rosa Luxemburg and a long list of other tried and able warriors on the socialist battlefield.

But the figure that attracted the most attention was one hitherto largely unfamiliar to the International Socialist movement, but one of which it is safe to predict much will be heard in the future. This was Gustav Hervé, one of those electric dashing figures of which France has produced so many. This man, almost unheard of at the time of the Amsterdam Congress, has added a new word to the Socialist vocabulary—Hervéism, and whatever we may think of his position and tactics, has given a sort of electric shock to the whole European Socialist movement.

It had always been taken for granted that while Socialists were opposed to war and militarism, yet that they favored an "armed people" democratically officered on something resembling the Swiss plan. But Hervé declared that socialists should declare immediate and relentless war on every manifestation of militarism, nor did he believe that this war should consist simply of official resolutions and editorial denunciation. Borrowing a leaf from the "direct action" tactics now so popular among a portion of French trade unionists, he called upon the soldiers in the present standing armies to desert, for the drafted to refuse to serve, while he demanded that in case of war the organized laborers should declare the general strike and use every other means in their power to prevent war. Such tactics as these were bound to produce some sort of result, especially in a country where the cry of revenge for Alsace and Lorraine is still a sure phrase with which to gain the applause of the populace, and Hervé was soon serving a term in prison.

So far from this dampening his ardor or weakening his influence it but placed the martyr's crown upon him, and gave him a ten-fold larger and more sympathetic audience. It was reported that disaffection was spreading in the French army and that the refusal of the troops to act against the wine growers and in some cases against workingmen was cited as an evidence of the growth of Hervéism.

So it was that he was able to secure what was practically

an endorsement of his views by the French Congress which met at Nancy the week before the International Congress, and came to Stuttgart with a resolution demanding that the workers should use every means in their power, even to the "general strike and insurrection," to prevent war.

To all this the German Social Democracy offered a sharp antagonism. Groaning beneath the most perfect and most oppressive militarism the world has ever known, they felt that to offer a simple policy of opposition would be suicide. It would only serve to bring the mailed fist down upon the daring few who should seek to carry out the policy of Hervéism, while the magnificently and painfully built up organization of the party would be shattered and destroyed.

Hervé opened the discussion in the committee with a brilliant, witty, eloquent appeal that aroused his hearers now to anger and again to laughter and then to indignation. But it kept them continually aroused. He hurled the shafts of his ridicule not only at bourgeois patriotism and national ideals, but at what, in the minds of many of his hearers was far worse, at the German Social Democracy. He taunted the German Socialists with being sunk in the bog of parliamentarism, with being mere vote gatherers and doing nothing with the votes when gathered. He declared that German socialism had become conservative, had lost its revolutionary character and was more concerned with saving itself and its organization than the working class. So far his criticisms had just enough of the sting of truth in them to bring forth some applause and much laughter. But when he went further and hinted at personal cowardice as a restraining motive on the part of the German party leaders he was met with a storm of "Nicht Wahr's" that told him he had gone too far.

Naturally Bebel was the next speaker, and it was a striking tribute to the power of Hervéism that the German Social Democracy thought it necessary to send their strongest champion against him.

Needless to say Bebel's speech was a magnificent effort. In every way a most striking contrast to Hervé, he began with a careful fundamental analysis of the premises upon which the question was based. He examined into the idea of patriotism and denied that it included nothing but the class-ruled state and capitalist institutions. In glowing words he painted the culture, education, art and literature of Germany and declared that these were the heritage of the race—the property of the proletariat to come—and that to love and defend them from attack was no false patriotism, no treason to the workers. He declared that to disarm at the present time was only to place the most advanced nations at the mercy of the more backward ones, and that vic-

tory for socialism by an unarmed nation would be but a signal for other still capitalist nations to descend upon and subject the socialist-ruled state.

He declared that capitalism was being crushed by its own military load and that such a great war between Germany and France as Hervé had foreseen was impossible, or if possible would mean the downfall of both governments.

With careful statistical analysis lit up by brilliant oratory he showed the crushing cost of modern militarism. He pointed out that a peace footing was straining every energy of Germany and France at the present time. To put their tremendous armies in action, he declared, would not leave sufficient workers in the shops and mines and farms and factories to maintain a capitalistically organized society. The millions of women and children left behind in the families of the soldiers would be suffering and no relief could be furnished by local governmental institutions robbed of every source of revenue by the central military establishment. "That would give you things far worse than a general strike," he said, turning toward Hervé. "It would be a nation in desperation." Nor could the armies themselves be long maintained. Marshalling once more an array of figures on the cost of mobilization he demonstrated that no source of revenue accessible could support such an expense for more than a few weeks and that the averages of such an army upon the financial institutions of its own country would be worse than the march of a hostile army across its territory. "Each army would have whipped its own country before it reached the frontier, and such a war would be not only the last of wars, but the last of capitalism," he exclaimed amid thunderous applause.

He then protested against laying down rules in advance, that could not possibly provide for the unknown exigencies of such a possible situation, and showed that to adopt the tactics of Hervéism would be fatal to the German Social Democracy.

For nearly three days the battle waged on in committee, and the capitalist press began to talk of a possible split on the Congress. Of course this was the veriest nonsense, as Hervé had not expected an endorsement of his views, but was only seeking to secure their consideration and discussion, while the well drilled German Social Democracy would as soon think of deserting International Socialist movement as of joining the German Clericals.

Finally a sub-committee was appointed to draft a resolution which should most nearly express the common sentiments. The result was, as is generally the case, a rather long somewhat indefinite and unsatisfactory product. As a matter of fact it leaves rather more to Hervéism than anyone in the Congress had expected in the beginning. It has no definite endorsement of the

citizen army, although it is indirectly endorsed. It does not advise the general strike, insurrection, or desertion, but denounces militarism unreservedly, makes no concession to Bebel's "patriotism," or his necessity of armament, and leaves the methods to be pursued in case of war to the Socialist parties of the nations concerned.

As the resolution was adopted unanimously by the committee, it was decided to permit no discussion on the floor of the Congress and to move the previous question upon the presentation of the resolution. To this Hervé strenuously objected, and in a ten-minute speech nominally upon the question of adopting the closure of debate, gave another refreshing shock to the Congress. He declared that the Germans had been opposed to nearly everything in the resolution, and expressed a desire to have them explain their sudden conversion. He declared this would be an excellent opportunity for some of the foreign delegates to speak their minds openly without fear of police interference since it was the last day of the Congress and all the delegates were going home, and the worst the police could do would be to close the Congress summarily and order the delegates beyond the frontier of Germany, two things that would be already accomplished by the time the governmental machinery could be put in motion.

But while the delegates were moved to laughter and interest by his wit and brilliancy they decided to vote for the previous question, and the following resolution was accordingly unanimously adopted:

MILITARISM AND INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS.

The Congress confirms the resolutions passed by the former International Congress against militarism and imperialism, and it again declares that the fight against militarism cannot be separated from the socialist struggle of classes as a whole.

Wars between capitalistic states are as a rule the consequence of their competition in the world's market, for every state is eager not only to preserve its markets, but also to conquer new ones, principally by the subjugation of foreign nations and the confiscation of their lands. These wars are further engendered by the unceasing and ever increasing armaments of militarism, which is one of the principal instruments for maintaining the predominance of the bourgeois classes and for subjugating the working classes politically as well as economically.

The breaking out of wars is further favoured by the national prejudices systematically cultivated in the interest of the reigning classes, in order to turn off the masses of the proletariat from the duties of their class and of international solidarity.

Wars are therefore essential to capitalism; they will not cease until the capitalistic system has been done away with, or until the sacrifices in men and money required by the technical development of the military system and the revolt against the armaments have become so great as to compel the nations to give up this system.

Especially the working classes from which the soldiers are chiefly

recruited, and which have to bear the greater part of the financial burdens, are by nature opposed to war, because it is irreconcilable with their aim: the creation of a new economic system founded on a socialistic basis and realizing the solidarity of the nations.

The Congress therefore considers it to be the duty of the working classes, and especially of their parliamentary representatives, to fight with all their might against the military and naval armaments, not to grant any money for such purposes, pointing out at the same time the class character of bourgeois society and the real motives for keeping up the antagonisms, between nations, and further to imbue the young people of the working classes with the socialist spirit of universal brotherhood and with class consciousness.

The Congress considers that the democratic organization of national defence, by replacing the standing army, will prove an effective means for making aggressive wars impossible, and for overcoming national antagonisms.

The International cannot lay down rigid formulas for the action of the working classes against militarism, as this action must of necessity differ according to the time and conditions of the various national parties. But it is its duty to intensify and to co-ordinate as much as possible the efforts of the working classes against militarism and against war.

In fact, since the Brussels Congress, the proletariat in its untiring fight against militarism, by refusing to grant the expenses for military and naval armaments, by democratizing the army, has had recourse with increasing vigor and success to the most varied methods of action in order to prevent the breaking out of wars, or to end them, or to make use of the agitation of the social body caused by a war for the emancipation of the working classes: as for instance the understanding arrived at between the English and the French trade unions after the Fachoda crisis, which served to assure peace and to reestablish friendly relations between England and France; the action of the socialist parties in the German and French parliaments during the Morocco crisis; the public demonstrations organized for the same purpose by the French and German socialists; the common action of the Austrian and Italian socialists who met at Trieste in order to ward off a conflict between the two states; further the vigorous intervention of the socialist workers of Sweden in order to prevent an attack against Norway; and lastly, the heroic sacrifices and fights of the masses of socialist workers and peasants of Russia and Poland rising against the war provoked by the government of the Czar, in order to put an end to it and to make use of the crisis for the emancipation of their country and of the working classes. All these efforts show the growing power of the proletariat and its increasing desire to maintain peace by its energetic intervention.

The action of the working classes will be the more successful, the more the mind of the people has been prepared by an unceasing propaganda, and the more the Labor parties of the different countries have been stimulated and drawn together by the International.

The Congress further expresses its conviction that under the pressure exerted by the proletariat the practice of honest arbitration in all disputes will take the place of the futile attempts of the bourgeois governments, and that in this way the people will be assured the benefit of universal disarmament which will allow the enormous resources of energy and money wasted, by armaments and by wars, to be applied to the progress of civilization.

In case of war being imminent, the working classes and their parliamentary representatives in the countries concerned shall be

bound, with the assistance of the International Socialist Bureau, to do all they can to prevent the breaking out of the war, using for this purpose the means which appear to them the most efficacious, and which must naturally vary according to the acuteness of the struggle of classes, and to the general political conditions.

In case war should break out, notwithstanding, they shall be bound to intervene for its being brought to a speedy end, and to employ all their forces for utilizing the economical and political crisis created by the war, in order to rouse the masses of the people and to hasten the downbreak of the predominance of the capitalist class.

TRADE UNIONS AND SOCIALISM.

Perhaps the second most important question before the Congress, and the one of greatest interest to the United States, was the one on the relations between Trade Unions and Socialist Parties. This committee also found considerable difficulty in arriving at an agreement. Three separate points of view were presented: (a) The French, strongly tinged with syndicalism and suggesting the general strike and direct action and almost complete independence of the unions, and no direct connection between the unions and political parties; (b) the Belgian, advocating almost complete amalgamation of the two forms of working class activity, and (c) what might be called the German and Austrian view calling for co-operation with a large amount of autonomy.

On the whole, it was the latter view which prevailed, although the resolution presented by the German and Austrian delegates was very much modified before its final presentation and adoption by the Congress.

To this committee the Germans sent Kautsky and Legien; the Belgians, Ansele and Broukere; France, Renaudel, and others, the men who have helped to make the history of labor in their various countries.

Here it was that De Leon made almost his only appearance in the Congress and presented a resolution filled with references to the A. F. of L., "Labor Lieutenants," the Civic Federation, and other matters having only the most local reference and utterly meaningless in an International Congress. He presented a minority report and addressed the Congress in a soap-box speech on the evils of the Socialist Party and filled with more personalities and personal allusions which served only to mystify the Congress in so far as they listened to him at all. It so happened that some of the French syndicalists were opposed to a portion of the minority resolution, so that some 19 votes were cast against it. Some of the S. L. P. delegation were claiming these as votes *for* their resolution. But a hasty inquiry among these delegates revealed the fact that none of them were in the least interested in the S. L. P. resolution and had no idea of voting for it. Of course De Leon's resolution never came to a vote, so it is impossible to say how many were of his way of

thinking; but three votes in addition to his own delegation would be a reasonable estimate.

The resolution itself is so lengthy as to be self-explanatory and is given herewith:

RESOLUTION ON THE RELATIONS BETWEEN TRADE UNIONS AND SOCIALIST PARTIES.

I.

To enfranchise the proletariat completely from the bonds of intellectual, political and economic serfdom, the political and economic struggle are alike necessary. If the activity of the Socialist Party is exercised more especially in the domain of the political struggle of the proletariat, that of the unions displays itself in the domain of the economic struggle of the workers. The Unions and the Party have therefore an equally important task to perform in the struggle for proletarian emancipation. Each of the two organizations has its distinct domain, defined by its nature and within whose borders it should enjoy independent control of its line of action. But there is an ever widening domain in the proletarian struggle of the classes in which they can only reap advantages by concerted action and by co-operation between the Party and Trade Unions.

As a consequence the proletarian struggle will be carried on more successfully and with more important results if the relations between the Unions and the Party are strengthened without infringing the necessary unity of the Trade Unions.

The Congress declares that it is to the interest of the working class in every country that close and permanent relations should be established between the Unions and the Party.

It is the duty of the Party and of the Trade Unions to render moral support the one to the other and to make use only of those means which may help forward the emancipation of the proletariat. When divergent opinions arise between the two organizations as to the suitability of certain tactics, they should arrive at an agreement by discussion.

The Unions will not fully perform their duty in the struggle for the emancipation of the workers unless a thoroughly Socialist spirit inspires their policy. It is the duty of the Party to help the Unions in their work of raising the workers and of ameliorating their social conditions. In its parliamentary action the Party must vigorously support the demands of the Unions.

The Congress declares that the development of the capitalist system of production, the increased concentration of the means of production, the growing alliances of employers, the increasing dependence of particular trades upon the totality of bourgeois society would reduce Trade Unions to impotency if, concerning themselves about nothing more than trade interests, they took their stand on corporate selfishness and admitted the theory of harmony of interests between Labor and Capital.

The Congress is of the opinion that the Unions will be able more successfully to carry on their struggle against exploitation and oppression, in proportion as their organization is more unified, as their benefit system is improved, as the funds necessary for their struggle are better supplied, and as their members gain a clearer conception of economic relations and conditions and are inspired by the socialist ideal with greater enthusiasm and devotion.

II.

The Congress invites all the Trade Unions that accept the conditions laid down by the Brussels Conference of 1899, and ratified by the Paris Congress of 1900, to be represented at the International Congress and to maintain relations with the International Socialist Bureau. It charges the latter to enter into relations with the International Secretariat of Trade Unions at Berlin so as to exchange information respecting working-class organization and the workers movement.

III.

The Congress directs the International Bureau to collect all documents which may facilitate the study of the relations between trade organizations and the socialist parties in all countries and to present a report on the subject to the next Congress.

IMMIGRATION.

The immigration question was another in which the United States is most deeply interested—much more so, in fact, than any other single country, and well nigh as much as all other countries combined. Yet on the whole the resolution was formulated by other countries which really have no immigration problem and who approached it almost wholly from a doctrinaire point of view.

The Congress was decidedly opposed to all restrictions of immigration based upon racial or national distinctions, and favored restrictions only for contract labor and professional strike-breakers. The resolution as finally formulated was unanimously adopted and provides for a positive program of action toward immigration and emigration rather than any negative prohibitive or restrictive features.

The resolution as adopted follows:

The Congress declares:

Immigration and Emigration of workingmen are phenomena as inseparable from the substance of capitalism as unemployment, overproduction and underconsumption of the workingmen, they are frequently one of the means to reduce the share of the workingmen in the product of labor and at times they assume abnormal dimensions through political religious and national persecutions.

The Congress does not consider exceptional measures of any kind, economic or political, the means for removing any danger which may arise to the working class from immigration and emigration since such measures are fruitless and reactionary; especially not the restriction of the freedom of migration and the exclusion of foreign nations and races.

At the same time the Congress declares it to be the duty of organized workingmen to protect themselves against the lowering of their standard of life which frequently results from the mass import of unorganized workingmen. The Congress declares it to be their duty to prevent the import and export of strikebreakers.

The Congress recognizes the difficulties which in many cases confront the workingmen of the countries of a more advanced stage of capitalist development through the mass immigration of unorganized workingmen accustomed to a lower standard of life and coming from countries of prevalently agricultural and domestic civilization, and also the dangers which confront them certain forms of immigration.

But the Congress sees no proper solution of these difficulties in the exclusion of definite nations or races from immigration, a policy which is besides in conflict with the principle of proletarian solidarity.

The Congress, therefore, recommends the following measures:

I. For the countries of Immigration:

1. Prohibition of the export and import of such workingmen who have entered into a contract which deprive them of the liberty to dispose of their labor power and wages.

2. Legislation shortening the workday, fixing a minimal wage, regulating the sweating system and house industry and providing for strict supervision of sanitary and dwelling conditions.

3. Abolition of all restrictions which exclude definite nationalities or races from the right of sojourn in the country and from the political and economic rights of the natives or make the acquisition of these rights more difficult for them. It also demands the greatest latitude in the laws of naturalization.

4. For the trade unions of all countries the following principles shall have universal application in connection with it:

a. Unrestricted admission of immigrated workingmen to the trade unions of all countries.

b. Facilitating the admission of members by means of fixing reasonable admission fees.

c. Free transfer from the organizations of one country to those of the other upon the discharge of the membership obligations towards the former organization.

d. The making of international trade union agreements for the purpose of regulating these question in a definite and proper manner and enabling the realization of these principles on an international scope.

5. Support of the trade unions of those countries from which the immigration is chiefly recruited.

II. For the country of Emigration:

1. Active propaganda for trade unionism.

2. Enlightenment of the workingmen and the public at large on the true conditions of labor in the countries of immigration.

3. Concerted action on the part of the trade unions of all countries in all matters of labor immigration and emigration.

In view of the fact that emigration of workingmen is often artificially stimulated by railway- and steamship companies, land-speculators and other swindling concerns through false and lying promises to workingmen, the congress demands:

Control of the steamship agencies and emigration bureaus and legal and administrative measures against them in order to prevent that emigration be abused in the interests of such capitalist concerns.

III. Regulation of the system of transportation, especially on ships. Employment of inspectors with discretionary power who should be selected by the organized workingmen of the countries of emigration and immigration. Protection for the newly arrived immigrants, in order that they may not become the victims of capitalist exploiters.

In view of the fact that the transport of emigrants can only be regulated on international basis, the congress directs the International Socialist Bureau to prepare suggestions for the regulation of this question, which shall deal with the conditions, arrangements and supplies of the ships, the air space to be allowed for each passenger as a minimum, and shall lay special stress, that the individual emigrants contract for their passage directly with the transportation companies and without intervention of middlemen. These suggestions shall be

communicated to the various socialist parties for the purpose of legislative application, and adaptation as well as for the purposes of propaganda.

The colonial question was the only one on which the actual struggle took place on the floor of the Congress. All the others were settled in the committees, and the reports of the committees were adopted after a short or no discussion. This did not mean that the Congress accepted the work of the committees without knowledge or criticism, but the work of the committees was closely followed by all the delegates, and frequent national gatherings gave an opportunity for those interested to affect the work of the committees.

But the colonial committee could not agree and presented a majority and minority report. The majority, largely under the influence of Van Koll of Holland, presented a resolution which was taken as at least a condemnation of capitalist colonization, and which spoke of a possible socialist colonial policy, which might "become a work of civilization." This aroused strong opposition from many points and a minority resolution from Ledebour, one of the most able and revolutionary members of the German Reichstag, and other members of the committee, was presented. A somewhat heated discussion followed, in which Kautsky, Ledebour and others opposed Van Kol's resolution, which was supported by Vollman, Bracke and others.

The result of the vote, which was one of the very few roll-calls of the Congress, showed that Van Kol had been defeated and that the Socialist movement was unalterably opposed to all colonization. On this point the entire United States delegation voted as a unit with the majority of the Congress.

The other question before the Congress was on Woman Suffrage. Here the only difference of view was presented by some of the English delegates, who wished to defend a limited woman suffrage bill which is now before Parliament and which gives the right to vote to rate payers under the same conditions that the ballot is now granted to men. Against this position the Congress set its face with the greatest firmness and denounced all bourgeois woman's suffrage movements in no uncertain terms. It was the universal testimony of all the speakers that in every nation as soon as the proletariat began to show signs of class consciousness the middle class woman's movement showed a hostility to granting the suffrage to the working woman.

The report of the committee was presented by Clara Zetkin, and the appearance of this veteran of the Socialist movement was greeted with resounding cheers. She pointed out the industrial evolution that had taken woman from the home and placed her in the factory, compelling her to become a part of the wage-working proletariat. This had created a class struggle between

possessing and non-possessing women that broke across sex lines. As this class struggle grows sharper and takes on various forms there comes ever greater and greater need for the co-operation of the proletarian women on the political field. "We do not look upon a limited woman suffrage," she declared, "as the first step in the emancipation of woman, but as the last step in the emancipation of property. It will not free the great majority of propertyless women. It will only cause the propertied few who are enfranchised to lose all interest in the struggle for universal suffrage, while it will strengthen the forces of reaction."

After some further discussion the following resolution was carried with but one dissenting vote:

RESOLUTION ON WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE.

The International Socialist Congress resolves as follows:

The congress greets with the utmost pleasure the first International Socialist Women's Conference, and expresses its entire solidarity with the demands concerning Woman's Suffrage, put forward by it. The congress, in particular, declares:

It is the duty of Socialist Parties of all countries to agitate most energetically for the introduction of universal womanhood suffrage.

The Socialist Party repudiates limited Woman's Suffrage as an adulteration of, and a caricature upon the principle of political equality of the female sex. It fights for the sole living concrete expression of this principle, namely, Universal Womanhood Suffrage, which should belong to all women of age and not be conditioned by property, taxation, education, or any other qualification which would exclude members of the laboring classes from the enjoyment of this right. The Socialist Women shall not carry on this struggle for complete equality of right of vote in alliance with the middle class women suffragists, but in common with the Socialist Parties, which insist upon Woman Suffrage as one of the fundamental and most important reforms for the full democratization of political franchise in general.

It is the duty of the Socialist Parties of all countries to agitate strenuously for the introduction of Universal Womanhood Suffrage. Hence, the agitation for the democratization of the franchise to the legislative and administrative bodies, both national and local, must also embrace Woman's Suffrage and must insist upon it, whether it be carried on in Parliament or elsewhere. In those countries where the democratization of manhood suffrage has already gone sufficiently far or is completely realized, the Socialist Parties must raise a campaign in favor of Universal Womanhood Suffrage and in connection with it put, of course, forward all those demands which we have yet to realize in the interest of the full civil rights of the male portion of the proletariat.

Although the international Socialist Congress cannot dictate to any country a particular time at which a Suffrage campaign should be commenced, it nevertheless declares that when such a campaign is instituted in any country, it should proceed on the general Social Democratic lines of Universal Adult Suffrage without distinction and nothing less.

The regular order of business having been finished, a number of miscellaneous resolutions were adopted of a more or less formal character and without debate. These included resolutions

of sympathy with the Roumanian and Russian revolutionists, and, what is of especial interest to American readers, of congratulation to William D. Haywood on his fight and victory. The trial of the Western miners is something which the European socialists have followed with the closest interest and which they rightly believe to be an epoch-marking event in American working class history.

A. M. SIMONS.

First Impressions of Socialism Abroad.

I have been impressed this year abroad with nothing so much as the influence of Socialism in the various parliaments. I had thought before coming abroad that that conspiracy of silence, which is used with such effect against us in America, was also general throughout Europe. But I have seen that no matter how much the press may wish to ignore Socialism it is forced by the trend of events to give it the most conspicuous place in its columns. Even the most reactionary journals dare not ignore the progress of the movement. It matters not what journal one may pick up in Paris, in Berlin, in London or in Rome, one is sure to find the latest news of the Socialist movement in the various countries of Europe. One reads of the latest action of the Labor Party in England, the last manifesto of the Social-Democrats of Russia, some extracts from a speech of Bebel or Jaurès. Whenever there is an election in one of the countries, columns of the press are filled with the subject and with speculations as to the effect of the election upon the Socialist movement. Indeed so much is written that it is quite impossible, if one wishes to do anything else, to read all of the news concerning the movement.

In France and Italy one can say, quite without reserve, that Socialism occupies the foremost place in the thought of the entire community. Its influence is out of all proportion to its actual strength. The fear of socialism on the part of the upper classes in these countries is almost a mania. Even in talking with well-to-do men one frequently hears it said that socialism is inevitable and among the masses it arouses the most extraordinary enthusiasm. As the movement is usually badly organized in these countries and as the mass of its adherents rarely read socialist books or pamphlets, it is difficult at first to account for its extraordinary influence. But one sees that the real basis of the fear of the capitalist class lies in the revolutionary tradition of the Latin peoples. There is hardly a capitalist in Italy or in France who does not fear that the slightest change in events may bring the Socialists into power.

But while Socialism exercises a more dramatic effect among the Latin peoples it is really in Germany that it wields its most powerful influence. Nothing is more unjust than to picture the Social Democrats as a ponderous mass, inert and aimless. To demonstrate the enormous influence of Socialism in Germany, it would be necessary to write the history of the political

life of the last forty years. If Germany occupies the first place in the world in social reforms, it is due solely to the power and influence of the working class movement. Any one seeing superficially the Germany of to-day with its model institutions for social welfare and for the protection of labor might feel, if he were not a socialist, that the social problem is largely solved. Municipal and national ownership of public utilities exists to such an extent that little remains to be done in this field. The Governmental Compulsory Insurance has reached out until now its benefits are felt in every working man's home. The vast slums which existed in Germany twenty years ago have been destroyed and new ones will never be permitted to grow up. Parks, gardens, open spaces, and clean streets are as plentiful among the poor as among the rich. Tuberculosis, that disease of poverty resulting from insanitary homes and workshops, will very likely be as rare in Germany thirty years from now as Cholera or Smallpox are at the present time. In other words Germany has become almost a model country where everything is done for the working classes except the abolition of their industry! dependence. This is certainly a most extraordinary achievement and I do not exaggerate when I claim that it is due entirely to the growth and development of the Socialist party.

It must be remembered that the parliamentary influence of socialism is older in Germany by far than in any other country. In 1867 there were eight representatives of the working class in the Reichstag. In 1884 there were twenty four representatives. One may not realize the age of the German party unless one considers that France did not begin to exercise a parliamentary influence until 1887, that the Belgian movement obtained some seats only in 1894 and that Holland gained its first representation as late as 1897. The beginning in England was really made only two years ago and in America we have not yet commenced. Over thirty years ago the German capitalists began to fear the rising tide of socialism. Prince Bismark told the Reichstag in 1878 "I will further every endeavour which positively aims at improving the condition of the working classes As soon as a positive proposal comes from the socialists for fashioning the future in a sensible way, in order that the lot of the working man might be improved, I would not even at any rate refuse to examine it favorably and I would not even shrink from the idea of State help for those who would help themselves."

This quotation shows the influence of the Social-Democratic party in the very beginning of German social reform. With this statement of Bismark came a proposal for the Compulsory Insurance of the working class. In 1884 Bismark proclaimed the doctrine of the "right to work". He said on that occasion "Give the working man the right to work as long as he is healthy, assure

him care when he is sick; assure him maintenance when he is old; if you do that, and do not fear the sacrifice, or cry out State Socialist, directly the words 'provision for old age' are uttered, — if the State will show a little more Christian solicitude for the working men, then I believe that the gentlemen of the Wyden (Social Democratic) program will sound their birdcall in vain, and that the thronging to them will cease as soon as workingmen see that the Government Legislative bodies are earnestly concerned for their welfare."

Referring to Bismark's political manoeuvring Bebel said in the Reichstag at that time "I will frankly tell you something. If anything has furthered the Social-Democratic agitation and the Social-Democratic tendency, it is the fact that Prince Bismark has to a certain extent declared for socialism and social reform; only we are in this case the master, and he is the scholar. People are saying everywhere: when to-day Prince Bismark with his great authority comes forward and not only acknowledges the existent of a social question — which was a few years ago emphatically denied by the ruling parties — but declares for socialism, and regards it as his duty to introduce measures on the subject, then it may well be concluded that Social-Democracy is at bottom right."

At this time the German Social Democracy had two wonderfully able parliamentary leaders. Liebknecht was of course the older and ablest. He was a man of exceptional education and had from his youth fought in the revolutionary movement of Germany. Bebel on the contrary was a workingman. He was a master turner, and his education is almost entirely the result of his own efforts. He is an incomparable agitator, and many years in prison have given him ample time for study. But in the early days of Bebel's parliamentary career his unpolished language and his occasional grammatical errors were invariably hooted at by his opponents. To face the scorn and ridicule of the representatives of the educated classes demanded that bravery and fearlessness, which are characteristic of Bebel. That crude, rough, working man of forty years ago is to day one of the best debaters and orators in Europe. Certainly no one will deny that Bebel is the ablest parliamentarian in Germany. He is now one of the oldest and most experienced men in the Reichstag. One of his most fortunate gifts is an extraordinary memory and few men in the Empire know better than he the details of its history. When he debates he is always followed with interest not only by those in the Reichstag but by all Germany. Despite the fact that he represents at present a small minority no one exercises a personal influence equal to his. When he arises in debate a thrill of excitement passes through the Chamber and everyone moves forward to follow every word.

It would be impossible in a short paper to treat in detail of the great debates that have occurred in the Reichstag between the socialists and their opponents. It would be even more impossible to show fully the influence of the socialist movement upon the old parties, and the way in which legislation for the benefit of the working class has been forced upon them by the Social-Democratic Party. As I have said the German movement is the oldest and therefore it has more to its credit; but the influence of the Socialists in Parliament is quite as clearly seen in other countries. In my article upon the British Labor Party I have told of the remarkable power exercised by that party during the last two years. The gain for labor is considerable even in this short time. During a debate on the unemployed the lack of all real consideration on the part of the Liberals and the Tories led Hardie to call out to his opponents, "You well-fed beasts." The mere phrase in connection with the subject under discussion had a dramatic and powerful effect, significant in itself of the class struggle.

On another occasion, when a bill was before the House for the feeding of school children, the superior gentlemen of the old parties said over and over again that children were hungry not so much because of poverty as because their mothers did not know how to cook or preferred gossiping and drinking in the saloons to their household duties. After some time of this sort of discussion Hardie arose and said that it was embarrassing for the Labor members to sit quietly in their seats while hearing their wives described as slatterns. One can imagine the electric effect of this quiet remark of Hardie. Another striking instance of the effect of Labor representatives are words of Will Crooks in answer to the Liberals and Tories who said that the unemployed were mostly lazy, lounging vagabonds who did not want work. With fire in his eyes Will Crooks retorted that he had observed numerous worthless vagrants about Rotten Row, (a fashionable English promenade) but he said "they were dressed in top hats and spats." These are of course the merest incidents of the debates, but they show that the working class in England begins to have some defenders.

It is unnecessary for me to repeat here what I have said in a previous paper about the influence of the Belgian Labor party in Parliament. Probably no man exercises a more irritating effect upon capitalist politicians than Edouard Anseele. At the same time Vandervelde has for years taken part in all the great debates in the Belgian Chamber. His energy is extraordinary and his record in at least one debate — that concerning the Congo — will give him a place in the history of his country among its foremost men. An even greater influence is exercised by Victor Adler in Austria, while Ferri in Italy has at times

wielded a greater power than any other Socialist in Europe. About ten years ago his exposure of fraud and corruption among the officials of the Government, his passionate statements of the demands of the working class and his bitter denunciation of the crimes of the capitalist class threw all Italy into a state of intense revolutionary feeling. Passionate in debate, careless of consequences to himself, he has again and again routed the whole of the opposition.

But of all countries France seems the most fortunate. Both Guèsde and Jaurès are skilled parliamentarians. Unfortunately Guèsde was forced last winter because of ill health to be away from Paris so that I did not see him at work in the Chamber. I was fortunate enough however to hear Jaurès many times and it would be difficult to imagine a person who possessed in a larger degree the necessary qualities of a parliamentary leader. Jaurès is not a small man among small men, he is a big man among big men. I mean by that, that the French Chamber contains more brilliant orators and debaters than any other parliament in the world. First and foremost among them is Clémenceau. He has a remarkable attraction for the French people. He is radical and fearless. He is personally disinterested. He has always fought the popular fights. No one is better informed than he upon the traditions of the French people or more sympathetic with their aspirations. He has led them again and again on their never ceasing quest in search of their holy grail of liberty. He has destroyed government after government. His record in the Dreyfus affair was brilliant and not to be forgotten. He is a man of education and cultivation; of skilful phrase and powerful epigram. His burning satire is his best weapon and his worst enemy and he uses it quite as often against his own courtiers as against his enemies. He seems given to cynicism. In other words he is the kind of a man that a genial, golden-hearted idealist like Jaurès might well fear. But again and again these two extraordinary men, as different the one from the other as the poles of the universe, cross swords in battle. Debate after debate takes place between them and last winter I sat day after day in the Chamber watching the battles of these two parliamentary giants.

I once heard Jaurès speaking to an audience of perhaps 7000 people. In that great hall he seemed a different man from the one I knew in the Chamber. His voice had the power of a great organ, with endless changes of tone and expression, with modulations without limit and with a sustained emphasis and climax that seemed to me as extraordinary as anything I had ever heard. His finished oration has the roundness and perfection of a poem. On another occasion I heard him speaking to the men of the street. His power in this instance was of quite a different cha-

racter. He became a mob orator equal to John Burns in his best days. The power he exercised over his audience was such that if he had desired to lead this small group of men to storm the streets of Paris, I think not one would have failed to follow him.

In the Chamber Jaurès is a different man. He is clever and adroit. For years he has been in the very midst of every important parliamentary crisis. He knows the secret of parliamentary influence and he uses his knowledge of parliamentary tactics and his skill as a debater in a manner that attracts and fascinates the whole of Paris. When it is known that Jaurès will speak, the galleries are crowded and hundreds and sometimes thousands will beg for admittance. During the few last years he has fought in every fight that has arisen in the Chamber. His interpellations have covered a wide range of subjects and in every case he has demonstrated to the public the desire of the Socialists to support the Radical Ministry in all the reforms that it can be induced to carry through. At the same time with extraordinary skill he has put forward the difference between the Radical and the Socialist program.

It is hardly too much to say that Jaurès has done as much as any man in France during the last few years to lead the French people from the Kindergarten through the University of Politics. The French are convinced now that the Royalists, the Bonapartists, the Liberals and the Nationalists are their enemies, but they still feel that the Republicans, the advanced section of the Capitalist parties, and especially those which call themselves Radical Socialists wish to bring relief to the nation and to carry out certain fundamental reforms. The last elections placed the Radicals in control of the Government by an enormous majority. The present government is the most radical that France has known. I was in Paris at the time it was formed and its first utterances were so much of a Socialistic nature that it seemed as if the Socialist Party itself could not have done more.

It declared for the separation of the church and the state; for the suppression of martial law; for the abolition of the dangers of the white-lead industry; for the nationalisation of the Western Railway; for the strict enforcement of the law providing one day rest in each week, and finally for old age pensions and a graduated income tax. Besides the program, Clémenceau invited three Socialists to take positions in the Cabinet. Mille and refused an important post, but Briand and Viviani both accepted responsible positions. It would be difficult to convey an idea of the immense popular enthusiasm that reigned in Paris at the announcement of the program and the composition of the new Ministry. The situation seemed critical for the Socialist Party, for, if the program were carried out and if the Ministry were fearless and uncompromising in their support of the work-

ing classes, the Socialist Party might have been forced into a position where it would be impossible for the people to distinguish between its immediate work and that of the Radicals.

It would be difficult to imagine how any party could have met the situation better than the Socialist Party. Without expressing confidence in the Ministry it definitely held that it would support all reforms of a truly fundamental character. In the Chamber it has pursued a most skilful course. The Socialist group has forced the fighting. The Ministry has been prodded and goaded. Its program, which now it almost wishes to forget, is placed before its eyes and before those of the country on every possible occasion by the Socialists. The Socialists want to keep the Radical Ministry in power. On one or two occasions it would have fallen if it had not been for Socialist support and assistance. The French Socialists see that nothing is so important at the present moment as to prove to the French people that the Radicals will not carry out a program of fundamental reform. It is necessary to keep them for a considerable period in a position of responsibility so that they may be tested in the most thorough and definite manner.

So long as Radicals are always in the opposition (as for instance Hearst and Bryan are with us) they appear almost as revolutionary as the Socialists themselves. But now that the French Socialists are fortunate enough to have them in power it only remains to demonstrate the impossibility of their accomplishing any important reform. In other words the French people are being conducted through the last stage of their illusions. When it is once proved that the Radicals will not carry out its wishes, the people will turn to the Socialists. Even now the French party is beginning to expose the barren record of Radicalism. *Le Socialiste* in its last number has asked: "Where are we now?"

The suppression of Martial Law? Multilated! The Law about White Lead? Stillborn! The nationalisation of the Western Railways? In danger! The Law about Sunday closing? Nerveless and weak! Old age pensions? Adjourned! Graduated Income Tax? Proposed! But so absorbed are the Radicals in fighting the working men that they can not spare the time or effort to transform the proposition into an act."

If the Radicals can be kept in power for a few months more and if they fail, as they have failed up to the present, in carrying out a single one of their economic reforms, it seems as if the Socialist Party will be the only one that can hope to win the adherence of an actual majority of the French people. The situation in France, from the point of view of the parliamentary power of Socialism, is at the present moment the most dramatic in Europe.

What I have been saying may give my readers an exaggerated idea of the actual numerical power of the Socialist

movement in Europe. As a matter of fact the Socialist parties are in a great minority in all parliaments; but with the exception of Spain and Switzerland, every European parliament has now a group representing the working class. At the moment I am writing our Austrian comrades are gaining victory after victory, and at one stroke they have taken the second position in parliamentary representations. The following table shows the present power of the Socialist representation in the European parliaments:

Russia	132	Italy	24
Austria	84	Sweden	14
Finland	79	Norway	10
France	52	Holland	7
Germany	43	Luxemburg	7
Belgium	32	Bulgaria	6
England	30	Switzerland	2
Denmark	24	Servia	1

In Belgium the Labour Party has also 7 representatives in the Senate, and little Denmark has 4 socialist Senators.

What is true of the national parliaments is also true of the Municipal Councils. In a few cities the Socialists are in control and almost everywhere in Europe there is a strong minority representation. But when one considers that nearly all the parliaments of Europe have as many representatives as our Congress it will be seen that the Socialist representation is up to the present very small. For this reason it is all the more astonishing that the Socialist movement should create such widespread interest and be considered; as I can say without the slightest exaggeration, the most important political movement in Europe.

It is generally thought in America that a third party is powerless to accomplish anything of consequence. In the big way that we Americans have, we feel that anything short of capturing the entire Government is unimportant. This theory is perhaps the most difficult that Socialists have to meet. It has been the cause of the destruction of almost every popular movement that has arisen in America. In our own time we know that the Henry George movement and the Populist movement were so destroyed. Hearst's Independence League was destroyed at the moment it compromised in the State of New York with the Democratic Party. In all these instances the independent movement grew in power. As soon as it began to exercise a really important influence one of the old parties adopted its program with the result in every case of destroying the independent movement. But unfortunately we Americans have learned no lessons and therefore we have not been wise enough to see that an independent movement which could compel one of the old parties to take its program, might continue to exercise a similar power in

other directions. But at the very first victory the independent reform movements have been taken into camp and destroyed. In every country of Europe similar tactics have been pursued for the purpose of destroying the Socialist movement but as I have shown in the case of Germany and in the case of France, the tactic has utterly failed. The Socialist movement has forced the old parties to adopt nearly all of its immediate demands but it has nevertheless remained independent and as a result the power it exercises, even when in a small minority, is almost equal to that of the older parties.

I can illustrate what I mean by a conversation that I had last winter with the secretary of the Minister of Labor of France. I told him that I wanted to study the influence of socialism upon legislation. "The Socialists have had no influence whatever" he immediately declared. "But," I asked, "how can that be? Surely the laws for reforming present industrial conditions are a result of the socialist movement." "No" he maintained, "that is not true. Let us take the laws passed in the last ten years. For instance, this law was introduced by Mr. so and so, a Royalist, and this law was introduced by a Nationalist, and this law," he continued pointing to another, "was introduced by a Progressist, and this law," pointing to still another, "was introduced by Millerand. You see", he said, "the socialists have had no influence upon labor legislation." "But surely you will grant", I said, "there are two necessary causes of tuberculosis. The first and most important is a state of health. Unless a person is in a certain physical condition tuberculosis makes no headway. Then there is a second cause which is the tubercula bacilla which introduces the disease into a physical state suitable for its acceptance. To my mind it is much the same way with legislation. The socialist movement produces a political condition which makes labor legislation, to say the least advisable and Millerand and similar men are merely bacilli. Is it not a fact that the restlessness of the proletariat and its dissatisfaction with the monstrous conditions of our present day life, are forcing the capitalists to become the bacilli of their own destruction?"

But I need not dwell on the point. The game is clear to every one. The capitalist parties first take over the program. If that fails to destroy the independent movement they then introduce a few laws, so that they can come to the people with the question; who is responsible for this legislation for the benefit of the working class? They then proceed to demonstrate that it is Mr. so and so, the Progressist, and Mr. so and so, the Royalist, and Mr. so and so the Radical. In this way they try to prove to the workers how generous the capitalist class is in its measures for the benefit of the workers. There is no question but that this often has an effect chiefly because the socialists, being in the minority,

can very rarely pass measures upon their own initiative. The power of the Socialist movement lies in the fact that it is really independent and that it works for the destruction and not for the permeation of the old political parties.

Let us contrast for a moment this political policy with that pursued by the American Trade Unions. It is almost incomprehensible how men who have learned so well the lesson of their industrial battles should find it so difficult to see the value of the same tactic in their political struggles. The Trade Unions do not elect as their secretary some clever lawyer or one of their more benevolent appearing bosses and yet this is what they invariably do in politics. As a result let us compare what the Unions have gained in America and what their brothers have gained in Europe. Take Germany for instance. The Imperial Government Insurance distributes each year to the working classes about a hundred million dollars to assist them in making provision against accident, old age, invalidity or death. With us this entire burden rests upon the Unions. Every possible provision is made against dangerous machines and insanitary workshops. A legal working day has been established in almost every country and in England during the last year picketing has been legalized. All of these gains have been made by labor in "the old country" where Industrial conditions have been at their worst. If a like political movement existed in America there is almost no limit to the benefits which might be obtained for Labor. Yet we all know that during the last ten years Labor has lost almost every legal battle, and instead of getting advanced legislation they find themselves at an even greater disadvantage in their industrial struggle.

It is unnecessary to continue the comparison which after all is not strictly in keeping with my subject. Besides it would be absurd to think that the Trade Unionists of America will not soon see the importance of independent political action. So far as the political movement of the working class in Europe is concerned it is safe to say that its leaders rank in ability with the ablest of its opponents. The number of socialist adherents is growing year by year. The little minorities in each parliament slowly but surely increase both in number and in power. As a result Europe is beginning to wonder, if the day is not near when the Socialists will be called to the power of Government.

The most beautiful thing in the whole movement is its solidarity and to the governing class that is the most fearful thing. The capitalists begin to appreciate that somehow, and they can not understand how, this new movement seems to represent the aspiration of the masses. They see it take hold of the working people. They see, no matter how dimly, that it has the significance of a new religion. It passes from man to man in the shop, it unites in bonds of brotherhood the men in the field, in the shops,

and in the mines. The capitalist class begins to realize that as soon as the masses comprehend socialist ideas, it loses the power to attract or to retain their adherence. The power of its political leaders, of its press, of its conception of life and social order seems no longer to wield an influence. The morals of yesterday are the barbarisms of to-day. Their power over the people wanes, so that now we see the day not far distant when the leaders of the politics of Capitalism will be generals without an army.

ROBERT HUNTER.

The Russian Revolution.

IV.

THE ELECTIONS.

The immediate results of the suppression of the proletarian uprising of December was to transfer the center of political interest from the workingmen to the middle class. Thought centered on the Election and the Revolutionists sank into relative insignificance beside the Liberals and Radicals.

Out of the numerous political parties which had been announced during the Days of Freedom only a few kept the field and principal among these were "The Party of October 17th" and "The Constitutional Democratic Party".

The Octobrists, as the members of the first party were called, expressed their absolute loyalty to the Tsar and, for a program, restated the reforms, which had been promised in The October Manifesto. They maintained that the Tsar had been sincere in his desire to regenerate the Empire, but that his beneficent intentions had been thwarted by the Revolutionary agitation among the masses. They wished to aid the Tsar to realize his "liberal" policy. Their force was drawn from the officials, prosperous nobles and big landlords.

The Constitutional Democrats—nicknamed the Cadets—require a closer analysis as they later dominated the Duma. They were never a homogeneous party with clearly defined ideals. They stood for opposition to the Government by Constitutional and parliamentary means as distinguished from Revolutionary action. And they numbered among themselves all grades of The Opposition between the loyal Octobrists and the Socialists. But from all their various and often conflicting elements, two main streams can be disentangled—the land poor gentry and the professional men.

Scattered all over the Empire there were thousands of landlords on the verge of bankruptcy. The fiscal policy of the government in the last quarter of a century has been increasingly hostile to agriculture. And the peasant disorders—more threatening every year—have done much to decrease the income of the landlords. The Cadets proposed to expropriate all land and divide it among the peasants. Church and State domains were to be confiscated and the private estates bought by the Government. This was very attractive to those landlords who wished to sell out but could find no private buyers, and almost all of those Liberals, who had been

prominent in the Opposition of the Zemstvos Councils, joined the Cadets.

But the preponderating influence in the Constitutional Democratic Party came from the professional men. They wanted a progressive and prosperous country; it mattered little to them whether it was a Republic or a Constitutional Monarchy. The Technical professions wanted a government strong enough to develop the immense reserves of national resources. The Liberal nation rich enough to support them. These men—whom I have professions—lawyers, doctors, teachers, journalists—wanted a called Radicals—had little interest for, or against, the economic propositions of Socialism. They were not hostile to any demands made by the workmen or peasants which would increase the common-wealth, but their main interest was Political Reform.

Being more fitted for public utterance, on the platform or in the press, they dominated the conventions of their party and gave it a more radical tone than its membership warranted. They were, however, inveterate compromisers—opportunists to the extreme. In order to win the support of the Mohamedan voters they struck woman suffrage from their program. In order to conciliate the Government they relegated the Republic to the dim future and contented themselves with a demand for a Constitutional Monarchy.

Besides these two main parties there were a host of lesser ones. "The Polish National Party" carried great weight in its district. "The Party of Law and Order" and "The Merchants' Party" were of general organization but of no great importance. The first, supported by the Capitalists, wanted a government strong enough to put down the labor movement as effectively as the United States handled the Pullman and, more recently; the Colorado strikes. The Merchants also wanted Law and Order so that their shops might keep open.

The Socialists were of little weight in the campaign. They had decreed a "boycott" on the Elections. They did not nominate candidates. And their only activity was obstructive.

There was only one issue before the Nation, should their support go to The Government or to The Opposition. At last the statement, so often made, that the Revolution was the work of a few malcontents and that the vast body of the people were loyal would be tested by fact. It was the first general election in Russia, and the people had too little political experience to interest themselves in the minor parts of the various programs. The candidates made their appeal directly on this issue. And they stood before the voters on the sharply drawn line of opposing or supporting the old regime. The result of the election would be either a vote of confidence in or condemnation of the Government.

The Cadets were the most active party during the campaign.

Even while the workmen were dying on the December barricades, the Cadets were holding Committee meetings. Wherever and as often as the police allowed they held public meetings. Their efforts were centered on the intelligent middle classes. And it was here that they won most of their support. They made some efforts to reach the workmen or peasants, but with little success. Lacking in political experience the Cadets did not understand popular agitation. Their speakers were learned professors or scholarly journalists who failed to reach their hearers. Those of the common people who understood the long words they used or the intricate subjects they discussed, owed their education to the Socialist agitators and were sure to be disgusted by half-way opportunist measures, which the Cadets urged.

The Octobrists and other parties published manifestos and posted up placards asking for votes; but did little more. The Socialist through their illegal press and secret meetings were active in their propaganda of obstruction.

Early in March the Government began to worry about the results. If they were to win at the polls, it was evidently necessary for them to do something. They organized "The League of Real Russian Men".

In almost every city there are bands of toughs—hooligans—who for the price of a few drinks are willing to do dirty work for the police. They had served the Government in the Jew slaughters and in mobbing the students so often that they had won for themselves the name of "The Black Hundreds". As a matter of fact popular rumor had given them more importance than they really deserved. They were generally regarded as definitely organized and I have often heard detailed statements as to how much wages they received, one ruble for each Jew or revolutionist they killed, and so forth. But it is improbable that any such organization existed previous to this time. The police knew, as they do in every large city, the haunts of these toughs and how to get their services in any particular matter. But now the Government brazenly organized these gangs into "The League of Real Russian Men". They were allowed to have public meetings, and their speeches were more violent than any the most desperate Revolutionists ever gave vent to. Their papers advised the killing of Jews and urged the loyal adherents of the Tsar to rid the land once and for all of the Tsar's enemies—and murder was the method generally suggested. In many places they were armed by the police with army revolvers. Their Central Committee was received and decorated by the Tsar, and thanking them for their loyal services in the past he urged them to continue their good work in defense of "God, The Fatherland and The Tsar". They took active part in the campaign, breaking up liberal meetings, clubbing leaders of The Opposition and

trying to frighten the rank and file of the voters. The ballot was not secret, which of course increased their power in this effort of intimidation.

The police also took part in the campaign, Constitutional Democratic meetings were forbidden, their papers confiscated, their pamphlets suppressed. The election law said that no one under arrest could stand as candidate. So the police locked up every one they thought dangerous. At one time there were fifteen prominent lawyers in jail in Moscow for this cause.

On the eve of the elections, the forces were aligned as follows:

The Left—Socialists—for obstructing the Elections.

The Center—The Cadets—for utilising them.

The Right—Government—for emasculating them.

As a measure of police precaution—to allow the movement of troops from one district to another, and under pretense of preventing disturbances, the better to intimidate the voters—the voting took place at different times in different districts. The elections were spread over all of March and the first half of April.

The results came in slowly, but by the end of March the victory was evidently to The Center.

The Boycotters had failed dismally. In the cities their influence was confined to the factory workers. In some cases the men stayed away from the voting places or indulged in such pleasantries as electing deaf mutes or cows. But in general they voted. "The Duma won't amount to much", they said, "but it is better to have honest men in it than police spies". The peasants, almost without exception, took the elections very seriously and chose their best men. They had not interested themselves in party politics and voted for personalities rather than for principles. Their delegates were not attached to any party.

The Right—considering the forces which the Government had put at its disposal—had surprisingly little success. In a few places The Black Hundreds succeeding in pushing their candidates into office. But of the city deputies two thirds were Cadets.

But even in the first flush of their victory; the Constitutional Democrats themselves realized that their votes had been won not because of any general love or understanding of their program, but simply because they were the party standing furthest to the Left. (The Socialists not having any candidates). It was not so much a Cadet victory as a Government defeat.

When the results were all in, the delegates were divided as follows, 10 per cent. reactionary, who wanted the Tsar to retract his October promises, 15 per cent. Octobrists, 40 per cent. Cadets, and 35 per cent. unattached peasants. There were so

many insignificant parties with one or two delegates that it is impossible to give the exact division but this was approximately the complexion of the Duma. If either the reactionaries or the Octobrists won the support of the Peasants, the Cadets would be in the minority.

The Peasants suddenly sprang from age-long obscurity into the very center of the political limelight. The balance of power was in their hands. They were wooed by every faction. The Government started a club for them in Petersburg and gave them a picture of the Tsar and hoped in this way to win them. Silver tongued orators from reactionary police to violent Anarchists addressed them. Every minute a new deputation presented itself at their headquarters armed with an engrossed memorial or an invitation to dinner. At last the peasants, out of self-defense, hired a doorkeeper and excluded all outsiders from their club. Gradually, as the day for the opening of the Duma approached, news of the peasant party—"The Labor Group"—leaked out through their closed doors and began to fill the papers.

The Labor Group was the child of The Peasant Union.

Shortly after the October Manifesto—in the first flush of the Days of Freedom—a group of intellectuals were attracted to a peasant named Kurneen. He had educated himself and was a clerk in the Moscow branch of the Standard Oil. It was his idea to develop a Union of Peasants like the Union of Unions. The organization was to avoid the didactic form of the political parties, it was to seek information instead of giving it. Its aim was not to tell the peasants of what they theoretically ought to want, but to find what they really did want; and as far as possible to correlate these wants and help the peasants to realize them. Before the December Insurrection had ended the Days of Freedom, the Peasants had enrolled over a million members. It had many times as many sympathizers. And by this sane and tactful attitude the leaders of the Union had won the respect and trust of the peasants to a much greater extent than had the Socialists.

So in the fury and excitement in the first days in Petersburg when everybody was giving conflicting advice, the peasant deputies turned to their known friends in the Peasant Union. Much preliminary advice they got from this source; but once on their feet, the Labor Group was able to stand alone.

The dignity with which the raw and inexperienced peasants carried themselves in the new, strange life of the Capital was remarkable. Those were trying days, on all sides seducers were trying to deceive them or to buy them or to coax them aside, but they kept straight on their way. They kept their own counsels, and not until three days before the Duma opened did the public know what to think of this infant party. But then

when their program was published, the hoary old lie—that the peasants were loyal and contented — was killed. The program of the peasants' deputies placed The Labor Group at the Extreme Left of the Duma.

VII.

THE DUMA.

On the 27th of April, fifteen months after the slaughter of Father Gapon's men, all eyes were turned once more to The Winter Palace. The Tsar had returned to Petersburg — the first time since the massacre — to receive the newly elected deputies and to formally open The Duma. The red stains of Bloody Sunday had long before disappeared from the pavements, but the memory of that slaughter must have been fresh in the minds of the Deputies as they crossed the square.

Twenty thousand soldiers were massed about the palace, with the grandeur and power of the Tsar. By two o'clock all were in their places. On one side of the Throne Room were stationed the most loyal supporters of The Crown—generals and admirals, privy councilors and high officials—clothed in all the splendor of an oriental court. Down the center of the Hall was a narrow lane left for the royal procession. Beyond it was the dense mass of the people's deputies. The contrast was striking. On one side the scarlet coats, gold lace and jewelled decorations of the Autocracy. On the other side somber suits of black mingling with the dark gray cloaks of the peasants. The contrast in the faces and attitudes was even greater. The supporters of the old regime — faces puffed and eyes bleared by excess of luxury — exchanged loud flippancies or stared insolently and cynically at the commoners across the room. There clean-cut intelligent-faced deputies conversed gravely with their colleagues. The peasants mostly were silent, their serious—almost mystical—eyes questioned everything. No word, no greeting crossed the Hall. The enmity between the two sides of the room was too apparent to permit even a semblance of courtesy.

With a flare of trumpets the Tsar entered and walked down the narrow lane dividing the two factions. There was a tedious religious ceremony and then the Tsar read his Speech from the Throne.

It was barely three minutes long, — not one word of weight. The Tsar loved his people and trusted in God. That was all. Not one word of amnesty, not one word about the land, not a word about any of the hundred odd questions which were burning in the hearts of the people.

"And may God bless Me and you". So he ended. Officialdom cheered but the Duma was as silent as Death. If any deputy

was there who had been able to keep his faith in the benevolence of the Tsar as he crossed the blood soaked ground in front of the Winter Palace, he could no longer hold the illusion. A few words of sincerity would have put Nicholas firmer on his throne than he had ever been, but he let the opportunity pass.

The deputies filed out in sullen silence and went to the Tavride Palace where their sessions were to take place. On its way to the Palace, the boat which carried them up the river, passed under the shadow of the Central Prison. From each window the prisoners — those who by their heroism had made the Duma possible — waved handkerchiefs and cheered the deputies as they passed.

Under such auspices Russia's first Parliament met. Sneered at by the officials, snubbed by the Tsar --- cheered by the prisoners.

Evidently the first thing for them to do was to make a Reply to the Throne Speech. A commission of thirty three was appointed for this work, eleven from the Right, eleven Cadets, eleven from the Labor Group. Every one expected that the Cadets would control the peasants and that the Reply would be moulded by them. But the report of the Commission when it was delivered was a surprise. It was an astounding document. Never in history has so respectable a body of men put their names to so revolutionary a paper. Beside it our own "Declaration of Independence" and the French "Rights of Man" sink into pallid conservatism. It demanded, besides the liberties promised by the Tsar in the October Manifesto, the abolition of the Upper House, the responsibility of the ministry, complete amnesty for all political prisoners, the expropriation of all property in land, and a new assembly elected by universal suffrage with power to constitute a democratic-republic. It was an elaboration of the program of the Labor Group. The Cadets, instead of managing the peasants, had been managed. The Reply was unanimously adopted by the Duma, the eleven members of the House opposed to it left the room not daring to vote against it.

The document having been adopted, several days were spent in discussing how it should be sent. One peasant deputy suggested telegraphing it to the Tsar, who had returned to the seclusion of his Palace at Tsarski Celo. Another proposed a resolution binding the deputies not to leave the House, nor take any food, until Amnesty had been granted. But in the end, more moderate and roundabout methods were adopted and The Reply was despatched with due formality.

The following days were spent in oratory. It is not the custom in Constitutional Monarchies—like Germany or England — for the Sovereign to answer the Reply to the Throne Speech. And no one knew what the Tsar would do. Speech making was

the order of the day. Deputies from all quarters of the Empire, from the Baltic Provinces and Siberia, from the frozen districts of the North, and from the shores of the Black Sea, exposed the grievances of their constituents. One after another they had their say, but the prisons were not opened, the crops were no better, and the clamour of the "unemployed" increased steadily. At length, to the surprise of every one, Gouremekin, the Prime Minister, took the floor and outlined the policy of the government. His tone was that of an irritable school master lecturing unruly boys on their deportment. His speech, denying point by point, the demands of the Nation, poured fresh oil on the fire of oratory and the Tavride Palace rang with angry eloquence. It became the custom to hiss down Ministers when they rose to speak. And once the Prime Minister of Agriculture replied to the demand of expropriation by offering to sell some fragments of the Crown Lands, The Labor Group left the Chamber in a body.

Denunciations of the Government waxed daily more bitter and came to a climax over two points. While the deputies were at work elaborating a law to abolish capital punishment, the news came that eight men had been condemned to death in the Baltic Provinces. Despite the protests of the Duma, the men were executed. At the same time there was a slaughter of Jews in Bialostok. The Duma sent a commission to investigate the affair, and their careful report traced the blame of the disorders to high officials in the central government.

During all this fruitless cursing of officials, the peasants deputies were becoming restless. They had been sent to the Duma with one main mandate — to get the land for their constituents. Week after week slipped by and no progress was made. The peasants began to send new deputies to see what was the matter, some 20,000 letters and telegrams from village meetings and groups of electors came to the members of The Labor Group, asking why the new law giving land to the peasants had not been passed.

As the pressure from without grew, they became more and more insistent on the floor of the House for the immediate discussion of the land question. This was a dangerous point and the Cadets wished to avoid it as it threatened to cause a split between them and The Labor Group. The Cadets were pledged to repay the landlords from the public coffers. The peasant, having always considered the use of the land as a natural right and the landlords as having cheated them out of it, were loath to pay for what they thought their own. Therefore the Cadets sparred for time and enforced more delay.

Not being able to accomplish any of the objects for which they had been sent to the Duma, The Labor Group decided on

"An Appeal to the People". Their proposed Appeal stated that the Duma was an impotent body, without power to get the reforms demanded, and as they were unable to accomplish anything against the Government, it devolved upon the people to overthrow the Government. It was a call to arms.

It was treason on the face of it. And the Cadets were faced by a dilemma of an open breach with the Labor Group or the abandonment of their constitutional tactics. They tried, as always, to avoid the crisis by compromise; and proposed a "statement" to the people, telling of their efforts to gain reforms and their failure to do so, but without any appeal for a revolt. What the outcome of his debate would have been nobody knows.

The scene shifts to Vibourg, a little town over the border, usual one night, and the next morning they found the Tavride Palace occupied by troops and the Dissolution Manifesto, nailed to the door.

The sceneshifts to Vibourg, a little town over the border, in Finland beyond the reach of the Russian police. Hither flocked most of the expelled Deputies. The Dissolution was a surprise and no plans had been made. Some wanted to declare themselves a revolutionary government — *the* government, — and to call the people to their support, others said more could be accomplished by returning to their homes and explaining conditions to their constituents. Several sessions were held and no plan adopted, when news came that the Finish Government had decided to cooperate with Russian authorities and that arrest was imminent. What they were to do had to be done in haste. They decided on a Manifesto.

It was decidedly revolutionary in its tone, but incoherent and weak. It displayed the crimes of the government, the vain efforts of the deputies to get reforms and described the act of dissolution as treason against the Nation. It declared the Government outlawed, and in the name of the people repudiated all debts which it might acquire in its war against the nation. But it made no suggestion of a combined effort to overthrow the government. It called for passive resistance. It urged the people to refuse to pay taxes or to give recruits to the army. It ended with the pompous phrase, "Russians, in the approaching struggle your deputies will be with you".

The concrete suggestions were two: to refuse taxes and recruits. Very few people were foolish enough to act on these suggestions. The people as a whole do not pay taxes or enter the army — these are individual acts. And each person who refused was pitting his strength single handed against the whole force of the Tsar. The general verdict now on this Manifesto is decidedly adverse. The Deputies should have either found some issue on

which the people could have risen en masse or should have advised patience till such an issue arose.

In the Duma the Constitutional Democrats were weighed and found wanting. They controlled the Duma but accomplished no single reform. And it is not fair — as has been done in many foreign papers — to account for their failure by the interference of the Labor Group. During the first two months of the Duma's life, the peasant and the workingmen deputies cooperated heartily with the Cadets. And it was not until two long months had demonstrated the impotence of the Cadets that they broke away from them and turned to their own leaders — Aladin, Anikin and Jilkin. They had not been sent to listen to academic essays or pretty speeches. And when long inaction proved that nothing better could be hoped for from the intellectuals they began to do things themselves.

The Cadets — representative of Russia's bourgeoisie—failed to develop a "leader" — what Carlyle calls a "king-man". A glance over the names of their best known deputies shows their impotency to face an active crisis. Muromsev, the President of the Duma, was a university professor, mild, kind and lovable. Roditchey and Betrunkevich were orators of a high quality, brave and upright men. Hertzstein; murdered after The Dissolution, by the henchmen of the government, was a scholar, an undisputed authority on the agrarian questions. But none of them were leaders. Outside the Duma, Milikoff, Struve and Kovalevski were their strongest men, editors all of them; but not leaders. In the face of the gravest political crises they read scientific papers, delivered glittering orations, or wrote rhetorical editorials. There was no Mirabeau amongst them.

But besides having no leaders, a graver weakness was that they had no conscious, well defined class behind them. The deputies at their right spoke clearly for all the forces of privilege and reaction, to the Left the Labor Group voiced unanimous demands of eight million peasants. But what did the Cadets represent? Russia has no bourgeoisie like that of France in the Great Revolution; no capitalist class such as we have in America. The large part of the capital employed in Russian industry is owned by foreigners. The Constitutional Democrats in the first Duma had no class consciousness; some spoke in behalf of the poorer nobles, others voiced the discontent of the "intellectuals" and they had nowhere near the power back of them which a middle class party has in Western Europe or America.

Long before The Dissolution, the Cadets must have realized that their own strength was insufficient to force the granting of their demands. They had two courses open to them; to give up their program and support the government or to admit their own impotence and step aside. But they did neither and clung to

the opportunity to hear themselves talk. And when at last the peasants, impatient of vain words, said: "This farce must stop. We will appeal to the people," the Cadets neither made way for them nor went with them, but hung obstructively about their necks, crying "Peace, Peace" when there was no peace.

As the suppression of the December Insurrection showed the insufficiency of the industrial workers to overthrow the government single handed, so the Vibourg fiasco demonstrated the incapacity of the Russian equivalent of a "Bourgeoisie".

The Peasants have not yet tried conclusions with the government.

VIII.

THE KRONSTADT MUTINY.

The week following the Dissolution was a week of arrests. The police drew in their nets quickly about all the Revolutionists who had come out into the open during the sessions of the Duma. Papers were suppressed and the whole of their staffs were arrested.

There were intermittent peasant disorders but no general uprising and the officials were beginning to congratulate each other on the calm — which they considered a sign that the Revolution was dead—when the flames of revolt sprang up at Sveaborg.

Sveaborg is a group of fortified islands, off the coast of Finland,—the Gibraltar of Russia. The soldiers and sailors, under the leadership of the Revolutionists had mutinied and a large part of the fortifications were in their hands.

Of even greater importance than Sveaborg is the Fortress of Kronstadt at the mouth of St. Petersburg Harbor. The police at this moment discovered a gigantic military conspiracy of which the Sveaborg mutiny was only a part. Kronstadt and the Military Encampment to the north of the city; together with many other garrisons were involved. A soldier from the Military Encampment turned states evidence and told all he knew. The date set for the uprising was two or three weeks later. Sveaborg had exploded ahead of time. Cossacks were rushed to the Military Encampment and the disaffected regiments were broken into small sections and scattered to distant parts of the country.

Kronstadt was a more difficult problem, as there was no way of telling which of the vast number of troops stationed there were implicated in the conspiracy. Under pretext of being needed to suppress the Sveaborg uprising, the most suspected regiments were ordered to move. The revolutionary soldiers were fooled and intending to join forces with their Sveaborg comrades as soon as they got there they went willingly. Their places were filled by loyal Guard Regiments. Then the Government falsified the news

from Sveaborg. In reality the revolt there had been short lived and was already suppressed. But the report was circulated that the mutineers controlled all the forts and had captured the war ships in the harbors, and that these vessels were on their way to help the revolutionists to secure Kronstadt. Police spies, pretending to be revolutionists went among the men at Kronstadt and told them the news, saying that it would be a shame for the men from Sveaborg to see the Russian flag flying when they sailed up the harbor in the morning. They urged the men to revolt at once and to raise the red flag. Some of the more intelligent of the soldiers suspected a trap, but the big majority were inflamed by the news and at the ringing of a church bell—the signal agreed upon—they rushed to their barracks to seize their arms. The firing pins had been removed from their rifles, the ammunition for the machine guns had been hidden. The artillery men found that the breeches had been taken from the cannon.

The loyal troops then began the slaughter. The revolting soldiers fought with desperation, with their clubbed muskets and bare hands they captured two of the group of forts. But, as their cannons would not work, they were helpless against the concentrated fire of the loyal forts and battle ships at anchor. For two days the rumble of the cannonade could be heard in Petersburg. The noise of the infantry fire as squad after squad of the prisoners were executed did not reach so far. But for weeks afterward the fishermen in the harbor brought gruesome tales of mutilated bodies floating out to sea. And fresh fish did not appear on the menus of restaurants for many months.

The real details of this conspiracy have never been published, but fresh information comes to light from time to time, which shows the breadth of its reach. Similar agitation had undoubtedly been made in the fortresses of the Black Sea — Sebastopol and Odessa, and it had penetrated in very many of the inland garrisons. It was the biggest military conspiracy which has yet been tried.

The Army has an importance in the life of Russia which is hard for an American to understand. It is the chief bulwark of the Autocracy and more and more the Revolutionists are centering their attention on winning the Army.

Never before has so deep a revolutionary movement grown in a country where there is compulsory and universal army service. Modern times have developed two military systems—the volunteer and the conscript.

The vounteer system—as exemplified in England and America—produces a military caste. The officers and men are soldiers because they want to be. They tend to look upon the Army as their career and so losing all economic interest in other walks of life, become more or less consciously a military class.

A conscript army, as in Russia and most European countries, has much greater numerical strength, but less "esprit de corps". Army service is not looked upon as a career, but as a necessary segment from each man's life, and generally a very distasteful home and "do time" for the government. He gets no more joy out of his military service than out of his civil taxes. It is just so much time and energy — so much earning capacity — confiscated by the State. And in all the interlude he never learns to think of himself solely as a soldier. His memories and affections are centered in his home, as are all his hopes of the future. Born a peasant or a factory worker, he stays so — in spite of uniform and army discipline. The fact of solidarity with his particular class is of little or no importance in a foreign war. But it immediately becomes a dangerous weakness in an internal struggle — especially in the suppression of a popular revolutionary movement. Logically the sympathy of a conscript army lies with the people rather than with the government — and in Russia with the rank and file of the Revolution. All the wrongs and miseries which are stirring the great mass of peasants are buried just as deeply in the hearts of the soldiery.

The Government tries to counteract this weakness in many ways. By calling the Revolutionists traitors and enemies to the Fatherland, by insinuating that their funds are received from the Japanese and other hostile nations, it tries to give the present crisis the appearance of a foreign war. The placing of the army is the result of carefully developed plans, the recruits from Poland being placed in the heart of Russia — their hereditary enemies. The peasants of the South are garrisoned in the North, the intention always being to make each recruit serve as far as possible — geographically and psychologically — from his home. The great variety of races which go to make up the Empire aids the Government in this policy.

Then by bribes and promises of special privileges the Government tries to buy the loyalty of the troops. During the Insurrection at Moscow, for instance, some soldiers were paid two rubles a day — an increase of 150 per cent. on their regulation war pay. There are also innumerable tempting semi-military appointments, such as door-keepers in official buildings, place servants and museum custodians. All these inducements are held out to foster loyalty.

But the high card of the government is "Fear". In the hands of the officers there is absolute disciplinary power. There are some, theoretic limits of their brutality, but these limits are never enforced when they are dealing with mutiny. Fully half of the mutinies have been — if not caused — at least precipitated by the brutality of the officers. Paragraphs are common in the newspapers telling of such circumstances as these. In some garrison

the troops are discontented because of bad food or the unjust arrest of some comrades and draw up a petition. Some one is chosen to hand it to the Commandant. The officer interrupts the reading of the petition by shooting the delegate in his tracks. For a few minutes the soldiers "see red", kill some of the officers and wreck the barracks. Such disorders are so common that they hardly attract notice.

The mutinies have always been stamped out with the utmost cruelty. Beside the anger of the officers, there are not only court-martials and executions, but, what is far worse, years of service in the "disciplinary regiments". George Kennan has written with relentless accuracy of the horrors of the political prisons in Siberia, but no one has yet uncovered the fearsomeness of these disciplinary regiments. Since Kennan told the world about Siberia, the Government has hidden its atrocities. Stories of horror creep out from time to time of these places. In 1905 the soldiers—with a fury of despair—revolted in one of the disciplinary camps of the Far North, and the hideousness of their revenge brought to light the hideousness of their servitude,—orgies of cruelty arranged by degenerate officers to inflame their jaded mistresses. The fear of the Disciplinary Regiments is as the fear of the Seven Hells.

For a civilian to join a Socialist party in Russia demands a degree of courage utterly uncalled for in the orderly life of Western Europe and America, but for a soldier to become a revolutionist requires a three fold allotment of courage.

The army propaganda of the revolutionists takes the form of combating these efforts of the government. They carry on an active campaign to demonstrate to the soldiers their basic solidarity, telling them that if they shoot the peasants in one village, other soldiers will murder and burn in their own homes. Everywhere and always the revolutionists are telling the soldiers that after their term of service they must return to their fields and factories to face the same conditions which are driving their brothers to revolt, that if they obey their officers to-day, other soldiers—following their example—will shoot them a year or so later. In reply to the Government's offer of bribes and benefits, they hold out the Social Dream, the Nationalization of the land, the substitution of a voluntary militia for compulsory army service—a life of sane organization instead of the existing moil of misery. In reply to the threats of the Government they give examples of unexcelled heroism. For the work of agitating in the Army is the most dangerous which falls to the lot of revolutionists.

The Russian army is divided into three main sections: the Cossacks, the Guards and the Line Regiments.

The Cossacks are the ideal police. This branch of the army

was organized long before the Government was faced by a revolution, but if the present crisis could have been foreseen by the early Tsars they hardly could have devised a better safeguard for their dynasty. From time to time in the Middle Ages military guards were formed on the frontiers to resist the raids of the Tartar hordes. Prisoners were given their liberty and outlaws and bandits pardoned, if they would go to these camps. Following the oriental custom these frontier guards stole women from their enemies and so generation after generation the blood of the Cossacks became more and more crossed with Mongol and Tartar strains. They were given standard land, freed from all taxes, and all government service except fighting—which they were taught to love. As the borders of the Empire extended beyond these encampments, the Cossacks were embodied in the regular army, but under special conditions. Each Cossack serves five years and then has five years free and can be called out as a reserve, alternate five years throughout his life. Having little Russian blood in their veins they have little sympathy for the Russian peasants, their ample allotments of land free them from any economic discontent, they are bred to fight, to love the Tsar and to butcher his enemies.

Next the Cossacks come the Guard Regiments. They are selected from the general draft of peasants for their unusual height. They are better paid than the Line Regiments, are generally stationed in the big cities, with fine uniforms, good food and light service. The soldiers of the Guard as a rule enter the Police or personal service after their discharge, and have less community of feeling with the common people.

The Line Regiments—by far the greater part of the army—have none of these favors, their barracks are vile, their food abominable, their service the hardest. They serve only through fear and their sole desire is to return to their homes.

The fact that the army as a whole has not gone over to the Revolution does not prove its loyalty to the existing regime. All over the Empire in almost every garrison and army station, mutinies—spasmodic and resultless as they have been—show that there exists in the army a turmoil of discontent far greater than in the life of the people at large. There is hardly a regiment in Russia which has not, during the last three years, shown itself disaffected. Despite the greater risks of mutinies, the revolts in the army have been, at least, as general as in the civilian population.

The Cossacks are on the whole loyal to the Tsar and probably will remain so. But a number of revolts have broken out among the Guard. Half of the "Tsar's Own Regiment"—the Prebojenskaia—had to be dissolved last year on account of its mutinous spirit. And the situation in the Line Regiments is one of general

discontent and especially of hatred toward their officers. Their sympathy with the demands of the Revolutionists have been repeatedly proclaimed.

But!

No general revolt can be expected under the present circumstances. They are ready to desert the flag of the Tsar, but they must have some other flag around which to rally.

The revolt on the battleship Potyomkin is a case in point. During the summer of 1905, the revolutionists had been agitating among the sailors of the Black Sea Fleet and had made such progress that a date had been agreed upon for a general revolt. It was to have been in the end of August. But things came to a crisis on the Potyomkin ahead of time. A special graft of the naval authorities is to feed the sailors cheap food, and one day a consignment of maggot-filled meat came on board. The sailors who handled it told of its condition to their mates. The next day they refused to eat the soup made from the rancid flesh. The Commandant construed this into mutiny. The crew was called to quarters and the officers ordered those who would eat what was offered them to step forward. A few stubbornly hung back and he ordered their immediate execution. This caused a real mutiny. Almost before they knew it, the sailors had control of the ship, the officers who resisted were killed or thrown overboard.

The mutiny was successful. What was to be done? The news reached the Admiral of the Fleet and he sent several ships to capture the Potyomkin, but the new sailors, although they did not join the mutineers, refused to fire on them. The Potyomkin was as safe as if it had been in dry-dock. But what to be done? They did not want to be pirates. They could easily have blown Odessa or other harbor towns off the map, but they had no desire to do so. They cruised about aimlessly for a week and deserted the ship in a Roumanian port. The Government of course "made examples" of all the mutining sailors they could lay their hands on, and the Black Sea mutiny was crushed.

But the fact remains that the sailors of the Potyomkin easily got control of their ship, and that in all their Fleet not a sailor could be found to fire upon them. If the revolutionary forces could establish an insurrectionary government and so raise a standard to which the revolting soldiers and sailors could transfer their allegiance, a practical army mutiny could be a possibility. The action of the troop during the December Insurrection in Moscow shows the same temper. Although none of them joined the revolutionists, the Infantry, almost without exception, was passively on their side. Their disloyalty was so apparent that their officers locked most of them in their barracks without their arms. The cavalry acted against the revolutionists, but in a most listless way, losing their cartridges or firing into the air. It is

almost certain that if the Revolutionists had captured the City Hall, or by any striking victory shown a probability of definite success, the soldiers would have come over in a body.

That discontent and the spirit of revolt are rife in the rank and file of the army and navy is too plain to be denied. The ease with which the Revolutionists have fomented the mutinies which have already taken place shows with what eagerness the soldiers accept their teaching. But the frightful cost and uselessness of sporadic and premature rising has become so evident to the troops, that no great or decisive army revolt can be expected until the Revolutionary Movement has crystallized into some form of government—until a new flag for them to follow has been raised.

IX.

THE ATTEMPT ON STOLYPINE.

Once more the country was "pacified". By bloody fusilades at Kronstadt and Sveaborg; the Government had crushed the army revolt. The revolutionary workmen were buried beneath the December Barricades or were rotting in the faraway mines of Siberia. The middle class protest of the Duma had been silenced by the Dissolution and the suppression of all liberal papers. There was nothing more to be feared—except The Terror.

All down the history of the ages tyranny when pushed to the extreme has been answered by assassination and acts of individual violence. It has not been different in Russia.

Immediately after the Dissolution, the Ministry had been changed and Stolypine was appointed Premier. He was a man of iron and undoubtedly the ablest official whom Nicholas has found among his servants. He asserted the principle that no concessions could be forced from the Autocrat. The Tsar could, in his good pleasure, grant reforms; in fact, by his October Manifesto had shown his inclination to do so, but they must come as free gifts and not as concessions to a revolt. "There can be no talk of reforms", he said, "until the country is pacified. When the last spark of revolution is crushed out, the Tsar may, if he wishes, throw you certain crumbs". And he went right vigorously to the work of pacification. He put three quarters of Russia under martial law, so many arrests were made that the prisons could not contain the crowd and in Rostovon-Don, the "pest-house"—every board of it saturated with cholera and the plague—was turned into a prison. It was Stolypine who inaugurated the field court martials, taking, not only the liberty but the life of the citizens out of the hands of the civil authorities and turning it over to irresponsible army officers. These courts were required

to render a verdict within twenty-four hours of the crime and to execute it within forty-eight. The average of their victims varied in different months from éve to fifteen a day. And it was during Stolypine's Premiership, that Hertzstein, one of the Cadets, was attacked by thugs of the League of Real Russian Men and done to death. The Moscow News—the paper of the League—announced his death three hours before it took place. But no one was punished.

After a few months of this regime of Governmental Terror, four young men went to Stolypine's villa—on his reception day—to kill him. For some reason they were detained in the ante-room and their bomb exploded prematurely. Fortunately or unfortunately, according to your point of view, the Minister escaped. But the four men, dying instantly themselves, took with them twenty odd of the throng of visitors—army officers, officials, police and spies. The foreign correspondent stationed in St. Petersburg moaned over the affair and sent to their papers gruesome accounts of the twenty-three victims. The Russians regretted this bloodshed as any civilized people regret the carnage of war. But they talked more of the supreme heroism of the four young men who had carried the bomb and had gone so willingly to death in their effort to rid the country of its most blood soaked tyrant. A quiet old gentleman a member of the Constitutional Democratic Party, said to me: "It is abhorrent—all this slaughter—and yet if the Revolution can continue to produce such heroism, the Autocracy must fall sooner or later". And the last part of his speech was the uppermost thought in the minds of most Russians. The Government can practice its terrorism to the utmost and yet not stamp out the heroism of revolt. And with such heroism and devotion to Liberty, the success of the Revolution is only a question of time.

Much has been written about Terrorism, but most of the arguments—for or against—are weakened by sentimentality. On the one side there is horrified talk of the lawlessness of it and its innocent victims. On the other side harrowing tales of the government's provocation.

Revolutions are in the very essence—lawless. Stolypine—the Premier—has himself admitted that a state of war exists in Russia. And war always claims its innocent victims. A person who is shocked with these things has no business with revolutions. On the other hand no serious minded revolutionist has a right to waste himself nor his energies on personal vengeance. Two wrongs do not make a right. And the barbaric atrocities of the Government—while perhaps explaining—do not in the least justify terrorism. A great revolution like this in Russia rises far above personal considerations. And the fact that a comrade or a blood brother has been killed, or a wife or sister

outraged by the janisaries of the Government does not justify a Revolutionist, he belongs to The Cause, and Terrorism can only be justified as it aids that cause.

At the bottom is the ethical question: is violence ever justified? Has a man a right to resort to violence to defend or to establish an idea? Not the most blood-spattered Terrorist in Russia will praise violence for itself. Violence is abhorrent to every right thinking individual, instead of convincing an opponent, it annihilates him. It is no argument. And yet is it never justified? Leo Tolstoi says "No". A few hundreds, at most thousands of his disciples, feebly echo "No". But all the rest of the world loudly answers "Yes". This is no place for a philosophic discussion of non-resistance. It is enough if everyone, who would judge the Russian Terrorist; will ask himself if he believes in violence. If he believes in the right of the United States to uphold the principles of popular government by force of arms, if he believes in police and prisons, if he believes, even, in compulsory education or sanitary laws, he can not deny that violence—the use or threat of force—has its legitimate place in human society. If he glories in the military exploits of our forefathers in our Revolution, or in any of the violent acts which go to make up the history of the past and the life of to-day, he can not condemn violence in the abstract.

And the question becomes "when is violence justified?" In the popular conscience it is not only justified but allowed when it is used in favor of the Rights of Man and against Tyranny. It is really a matter of expediency—of profit and loss. Has all this loss of life and blood in Russia resulted in a compensating increase of human freedom? However, in asking this question it must be borne in mind that the failure of terrorism to overthrow the Tsar is no more an argument against it than the same failure of the proletarian movement and of the Duma is an argument against economic or parliamentary action.

While failing in the ultimate aim of the Revolution—the freeing of Russia from Tyranny—the advocates of Terrorism claim that it has two very distinct and beneficial results: (a) the checking within certain limits the acts of despotism (b) encouraging and heartening the whole revolutionary movement.

Terrorism as an accepted revolutionary tactic was started thirty years ago by a young woman Vera Sassoulitch. A man named Trepov was then the military commandant at St. Petersburg. Some of the students of the University made a demonstration in favor of constitutional government, and to punish this treason, several of them were flogged in one of the public squares of the city. If some of the students of Columbia University had been publically flogged by the New York police,

it would not have caused more indignation in America than did this brutality in Russia.

Vera Sassoulitch lived in one of the small provincial towns. She was not a member of any political organization, she had lived a secluded and quiet life, but on account of these floggings—an insult to all civilized Russia—stirred her to action. Without consulting any one she traveled to St. Petersburg and shot General Trepoj on the street. She was tried by an ordinary court—the Government had not yet invented its administrative punishment, and its field court-martials—and such was the force of public opinion in her favor that the jury acquitted her. The flogging of students stopped.

The revolutionary tactics of this young woman were adopted by a section of the Socialist conspirators and many instances can be cited of terroristic acts which rank side by side with this deed of Sassoulitch, as eminently just, approved by public opinion and having a direct influence in creating a more liberal regime.

Finland is a private estate of the Russian Tsars, it has no organic connection with the rest of The Empire. Nicholas II. was the first to violate its ancient Constitution and to deprive the Finns of their accustomed liberties. To carry out his policy of Russification and oppression, he appointed Bobrikov to the Governorship. The Finns tried every constitutional and legal way to preserve their national life. And when these failed, a young man—the son of a senator—assassinated Bobrikov. And the oppression of Finland ended. To-day, thanks to this young man, who has become a national hero, his countrymen enjoy one of the most liberal Constitutions in the world.

The assassination of Von Plehve put an end to his oppressive regime, and Russia was ruled liberally until the access of Count Witte to the Premiership again plunged the land into reaction.

The psychological effects of these acts of Terrorism on the minds of the people at large is hard to define or foretell, but it is none the less important. The assassination of the Grand Duke Sergius had no noticeable effect on the policy of the Government, but it was good news to the revolutionists throughout the country. Every one was depressed by the period of governmental reaction and revolutionary inaction, which followed the suppression of the Gapon movement. And suddenly the news flashed all over Russia that Sergius, the most reactionary of the Tsar's advisers, Sergius, the most hardened and cynical of the Court Circle, had been killed. It was the news of a victory and put heart into all the scattered forces of Revolt.

The act of Marie Spiridonova is even a better example. In the Province of Tambov the peasants were suffering under the brutalities of an unusually vicious Vice-Governor. Three months before I had gone through this district and the famine

was so bad that the peasants were tearing the straw thatch from their huts to feed their horses. And with the coming of Winter they had need of fuel to keep themselves alive, and they had stolen wood from the landlord's forest. This was their crime. And the Cossacks had come to "pacify" them. In each village the men, hungry and smitten with cold, were lined up and the officer in command of the troops demanded the names of those who had stolen the wood. If the peasants refused to deliver the guilty ones, every tenth man was flogged. The next day the process was repeated, only every fifth man was flogged and so till the stealers of the wood were given up. It seemed like the Wrath of God, the peasants unarmed, unorganized, were as helpless against this brutality as against an earthquake. And Marie Spiridonova—a member of the Socialist Revolutionary Party—shot the Vice-Governor—the author of it all. She was brutally treated by the Cossacks, stripped naked in the public street and afterwards ravished in prison and is now dying up by the polar circle in faraway Siberia. But she became a saint among the people, a name to conjure with. And now in their distress the peasants pray God to send them another Spiridonova.

Although much can be said in favor of Terrorism, much can be said against it. It is the tactic of despair. It is fighting the Devil with fire. And therein lies its weakness. To win in this fight you must be as bad or worse than the Devil. And in this respect the Russian Revolutionists fail.

The following incident is one of many which show the Revolutionist's ability to use fire as effectively as the Government. During the spring of 1906, there was a congress of one of the smaller terrorist organizations—the Maximilists. They met—the better to avoid the police—in a secluded forest near Moscow. There were about forty deputies, and coming from distant cities most of them were unknown to each other, their introductions were by pass words and signs. During the course of the meeting, while matters of great secrecy were under discussion, one of the deputies became suspicious of two of those who were present. He went from one to another of his comrades and found that no one knew these two. They were told to produce their credentials and these not being satisfactory, they were searched. Papers were found on them which proved beyond all doubt that they were members of the secret police. Their death was demanded, not only because of their past careers, but because of their present knowledge. Their continued life was a menace to the forty odd revolutionists who were present. They were tied to trees and two men were chosen to kill them. The Committee disbanded and left these two men to their work. One did his duty thoroughly. The other after having fired several shots into his prisoner was so affected by the horror of the

situation that he turned away without making sure of his work. The spy was seriously wounded but not killed. The next day his cries attracted a passing peasant. He was carried to a hospital and on his recovery was able to cause the arrest of almost all those who had attended the meeting.

No one likes to shoot a man tied to a tree. But the agents of the Government would not have faltered under such circumstances. And unless the Revolutionists can bring the same degree of brutality and callousness to the work of Terrorism, they can not hope to beat the Devil at his own game.

The net results of Terrorism are hard to estimate. On one side many of the best and noblest Russians have lost their lives in this struggle. Numerically they have lost more than the Government. No one can doubt that the arrest and execution of those who caused the death of Alexander II. was a greater blow to the Revolutionary movement than the loss of the Tsar was to Autocracy. On the other hand the dread of assassination holds many an official in check. And time and again an act of individual heroism has given fresh life and enthusiasm to the whole movement.

And this last—the psychological effect on the nation at large—is to my mind the most important. And the question of its value is one impossible for a foreigner to estimate. To judge it rightly one must be native to the country and familiar with all the circumstances of the combat, familiar with all the subtle changes—of increase and decrease, in the intensity of the evolutionary sentiment in the mass of the people. And the Russian Comrades, almost without exception, believe that Terrorism, by its beneficial results, is amply justified.

EDITORIAL

Some General Tendencies.

From the reports of the various nations and the proceedings of the Congress three significant currents can be seen in the great international socialist movement as especially characteristic of the last few years.

Nearly every country had something to say of the progress of organization among the young,—and generally with especial reference to militarism. Dr. Karl Liebknecht, son of "Der Alte," is throwing nearly all of his energies into this movement. His work on "Militarism and Anti-Militarism," for the writing of which he is already under indictment, with almost a certainty of at least a year's imprisonment hanging over his head, is a brilliant and scholarly presentation of the deadly advance of militarism and the subtle ways in which it has pervaded every portion of modern society. It is a work which should be translated into English, for the increase in naval appropriations, the effort to enlarge the standing army, the nationalization of the state militia, the introduction of the features of the Deck Bill, and the whole Rooseveltian programme of increasing militarism foretells the coming of the same problem in the United States at an early date.

The method by which he proposes to meet this is by an organization of the young workers and their education in anti-military ideals. It is the young man and to almost an equal degree the young woman to whom the military ideal appeals. If these can be made to realize that militarism is but another name for organized butchery of human beings then militarism is doomed.

Within the last three years organizations of the young have sprung up in almost every country, and the list which he gives of these organizations and their membership and work is one of the most encouraging things presented to the International Socialist movement. If the men and women in the days of youth can be drafted into a self-governing thinking class-conscious army to fight the battles of their own class the proletariat will have wrested from capitalism

one of its most powerful weapons in the class struggle. If in the stirring times that are before us the same enthusiasm and devotion, that through the years have been given to the battles of capitalism can be turned into intelligent fighting for the working class a long step towards victory will have been taken. There is going to be need of daring and heroism and class patriotism (if such a phrase is not a contradiction) in the class struggle, and it is these battalions of the young who must furnish these elements.

A second and to a certain degree a somewhat analogous movement is the wide spread organization and the renewed activity of the women of the working class. For years the declaration for universal suffrage unrestricted by sex has stood as a sort of Platonic phrase in all Socialist platforms. But the party as such has taken little active interest in pushing this demand. It is significant that in all the wealth of socialist propaganda literature that has appeared in the United States during the past three years there is not a single pamphlet or leaflet bearing principally upon this point.

Moreover many Socialist women who were ardent woman suffragists have been inclined to give their energies to the support of bourgeois "Women's Rights" organization rather than to the campaign within the Socialist Party. This was true not only in the United States but in many other countries.

But the last few years has shown a striking change in this respect. As the army of working women grew larger and began to organize economically into unions and show a growing solidarity with the working-class movement it became apparant that the women who were going to make the first and most effective use of the ballot were working women,—and that they were going to use that ballot in the interest of their own class.

At once there was a striking change of front on the part of the bourgeois woman's movement. In every country they began to ask that a partial suffrage be granted,—generally with some sort of a property qualification. For a very short time some of the working-women, and even a few socialists were misled. This new move was held out as a "first step," as "something right now" which would make easier the attainment of universal suffrage for women. But quickly the whole scheme became apparant. Whenever such a suffrage was granted it at once became another bulwart of reaction,—not a stepping stone to better things, but an almost insuperable obstacle to further progress. The class struggle entered the woman's movement.

At once new life arose in the genuine working woman's movement. The rise of working-class organizations of women demanding complete and unrestricted suffrage regardless of sex has been a striking feature of almost every country since the Congress at Amsterdam three years ago. The remarkable result of the Finish elections, which enabled that country to send the first woman delegate to an international Socialist Congress, who was also a member of a national

parliament had an electric effect on this phase of the Socialist movement throughout Europe, and indeed throughout the world.

As a result there are few reports to the Congress that do not tell of multiplied activity in this field. Sweden has succeeded in obtaining suffrage for women in municipal elections and has sent some women into municipal offices upon the Socialist ticket. England is convulsed with the struggle for the right to vote for women and although with the well known English characteristic to compromise there is still some alliance with the former woman's movement yet on the whole it is a distinctly working-class and Socialist agitation, and must necessarily be still more so since the Congress rejected all the compromise proposals of the English delegation.

In all countries it is the women themselves who are carrying on the battle and who no longer ask for favors, even from a socialist party but are demanding and taking what is theirs and who are forcing the socialist organizations to recognize and work for this long neglected plank in their platform.

The third, and perhaps most striking general phenomena which appears in almost every country is one which is more difficult to define, but which is none the less equally certain and perhaps even more significant than the other two. This is what might be designated as a general revolt against pure parliamentarism and a demand for more immediate definite and direct revolutionary action. Almost every delegation came to the Congress with one or more delegates who were looked upon more or less as **enfants terrible**, or if they were not represented in the Congress there was some complaint of, or at least a reference to, their existence in the written reports submitted.

In France it was Herve and the syndicalists who gave repeated electric shocks to the proceedings and who were generally promptly rebuked, but were ever unabashed and sometimes found an amount of support that was unexpected. These same forces displayed considerable strength in Italy and indeed in all the Latin countries and undoubtedly influenced the wording of the military resolution at least, to a far greater extent than had been anticipated.

But this movement is not confined to the Latin countries. Even Germany, where the revolution itself has been made almost conventional, with all its metes and bounds most carefully staked out with clearly drawn Marxian premises, is feeling the new movement. There are many of the older ones who look with something of disapproval upon "young Liebknecht's" daring attack on militarism and there is still much talk of general strike and other things that would scarcely have been mentioned in polite Socialist circles five years ago.

In Holland, where the socialist deputies have been largely elected from country districts and where all has been decidedly reformist, a new revolutionary movement within the Party has gained such strength that it is only a question of a year or so when they will

be in control of the party. Here too the general strike has been tried and although it is claimed by its opponents to have failed, there is still much talk of such methods and of the ineffectiveness of purely parliamentary methods.

Sweden too has been trying new weapons in the class struggle since the last international Congress and has a movement within the Socialist ranks calling for more direct revolutionary action.

But it is from Russia, the nation where the revolution is even now in progress that the greatest impulse has been received. Russia has not only added overwhelming proof to the already great mass of evidence tending to show that the old maxim of Socialist action—"General strike is general nonsense" is in itself a good deal of nonsense, but Russia has also demonstrated by the Moscow insurrection that Marx was wrong when he said that the coming of the machine gun marked the end of barricades and violent popular revolutionary uprisings. Russia has shown that there is no weapon which the proletariat can afford to lay completely out of its reach as inapplicable in its battle for freedom. Russia has also shown that these various weapons so far from being contradictory or mutually exclusive are to a certain extent complementary and may be co-ordinated into one general tactic of class warfare.

Instead of the revolutionary army being split up into unionists, terrorists, parliamentarians etc. the best minds in Russia are seeking to co-ordinate organize and utilize all these methods,—each in the place and time for which it is suited.

It is still too early to generalize with any certainty concerning these tendencies and especially to give any definite explanations as to the manner in which this movement will affect us in the United States. Yet some tentative suggestions may be offered.

The Socialist movement in the United States, as in many other countries, has to a certain extent got away from the class struggle. It may hold to all the theories of the class struggle as firmly as ever, indeed it may repeat the phrases more glibly than at any period in its history, yet when there is a real battle on between the forces of capitalism and the laborers, few look to see the Socialist Party play any prominent part. The one great and gratifying exception to this has been the fight for the Western Federation of Miners, and this exception is most brilliant proof of the general rule. This fight has done more for socialism in the United States than anything that has taken place since there has been a Socialist movement on this continent.

Yet we are still far from the stage where at the outbreak of every strike, or on the occasion of every outrage against the working class, the first question on every lip will be "What will the Socialist Party do?"

Yet we must reach this stage before we can claim to be the real leaders in the class struggle. It may be still true in military circles

that the directing powers sit aside upon a hill, but it is not true of the class struggle. If the Socialist Party is to earn the right to lead it must learn by doing,—it must lead wherever the fight is hottest. Revolutions are never fought by phrases,—they demand deeds, action. We shall not attempt to elaborate this point further at this time, but believe that if these facts are carefully thought over we may find the reason why, when Socialist sentiment in America is growing by leaps and bounds, the Socialist Party is almost standing still.

Owing to the absence of the editor in Europe this number is not only somewhat delayed, but contains no department of Book Reviews or Foreign News. The latter, however, is amply covered in the body of the magazine, while the former will be resumed in succeeding issues. While in Europe arrangements were made for numerous articles on current subjects by leading writers. These will appear in early issues and will add to the value of the Review even above its present standard. It was interesting to note that the International Socialist Review was the only American publicaion with which European Socialists are familiar to any great degree.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

The acquittal of W. D. Haywood upon the charge of being implicated in the assassination of ex-Gov. Steunenberg was very gratifying to the working people of the country, irrespective of what organization they were members or whether identified with no union. From the very beginning of the persecution—the lawless kidnaping episode—those workers who endeavor to keep abreast of the times became imbued with a strong suspicion that the mine-owners and their politicians and Pinkertons had hatched a conspiracy to take the lives of the three men, and it was not very difficult, therefore, for the Socialist party and progressive trade unions to arouse the country and prevent the murderous plot from being executed. This incident of the class struggle also shows how easily and naturally the workers can cease their petty bickerings and present a solid front when a crisis approaches, and proves conclusively that there need be no fear that labor will fail to rise to every occasion when the hour strikes. We may have our family troubles, disputes and hairsplitting over details, yet when labor fully understands matters it is loyal and true to its class interests.

But while the termination of the Boise trial may be satisfactory to the country as a whole, what about the outrageous and vindictive treatment that is still being meted out to George Pettibone? When Haywood was placed on trial the persecutors declared they had the strongest case against him. The signal failure of the conspirators to convict him led to the logical conclusion that the other two defendants would be discharged from custody. But to the surprise of everybody the disappointed politicians of Idaho demanded a \$25,000 bond before setting Moyer at liberty, although it is generally admitted by the persecutors that they had no case against him, and poor Pettibone is being made the object upon whom the conspirators may heap their reptilian venom and revenge themselves. Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone suffered imprisonment for a year and a half while their persecutors reveled in graft. Is there to be no compensation for the miners? Apparently not. On the contrary Pettibone is to remain incarcerated for an indefinite period, innocent of crime though he undoubtedly is.

It must not be supposed that because the persecutors are quiet and refrain from giving out daily interviews, as was their policy up to close of the Haywood trial, that they are not continuing their plotting. They demand a sacrifice, and if McPartland, Gooding and Borah can take the most damaging testimony given in the Haywood trial and use it as a basis to verify the stories that may be told by some of their dastardly perjurers, they are going to "get" Pettibone. Their inglorious defeat has made Gooding, Borah and

McPartland more desperate than ever. Unless they can get some sort of vindication their race is run. Gooding is fighting for his political life, and so is Borah, and likewise to keep out of jail for land grafting, while the Pinkerton thugs have not been hit so hard a blow since Homestead when Haywood was acquitted. The longer Pettibone can be kept imprisoned, the longer the powers at Washington may be prevailed upon to abstain from proceeding against Borah upon the charge of land thievery; the longer time Gooding may have to fix his political fences, and the more boodle the Pinkertons can feed upon. Furthermore the conviction of Pettibone upon the charge of second degree murder or manslaughter would be hailed as a vindication by the conspirators, while the moral, or rather immoral, effect would give the plutocratic press the prayed-for excuse of continuing to denounce the Western Federation as a lawless and criminal organization. It is not unlikely that a jury can be selected in advance to agree to disagree, or since the miners won a victory in the Haywood case the said jury may be prevailed upon to give the other side a "square deal."

Because Secretary Haywood was acquitted is no reason why the working people of the country should enthuse and then go to sleep. The very act of keeping Pettibone in prison is conclusive proof in itself that the malevolent scoundrels who conspired to railroad innocent men to the gallows do not intend to acknowledge themselves defeated.

But what a travesty upon justice that three innocent men can be kept imprisoned for eighteen months and upward without recompense while their persecutors fairly riot in graft and enjoy the highest honors! Truly capitalism is the devil himself personified; it stamps the innocent guilty and the guilty innocent.

The expected has happened. The various employers' associations that stand for the open shop policy and refuse to recognize organized labor have formed a national federation for offensive and defensive purposes. A secret conference was held in New York the latter part of the past month at which the representatives of a score of associations made preliminary arrangements to combine to establish "industrial peace." President Van Cleave, of the National Association of Manufacturers, was in the chair, and, according to his declarations, the utmost harmony prevailed and all delegates were enthusiastic in their determination to build up a powerful "peace federation." The plans discussed and adopted, subject to ratification of affiliated bodies, include the collection of a huge war fund to be placed at the disposal of the organization in any trade that engages in a contest with the unions. Labor bureaus—or, more correctly, scab supplying agencies—will be operated in all the important industrial centers, and through such bureaus complete records will be kept of employers, union and non-union, as well as organizers, agitators and other undesirables. Another matter under consideration dealt with the legal and political phase of industrial affair. Certain national and state labor laws are to be attacked in the courts, and bills that are presented to law-making bodies will be closely scanned and defeated if possible where they aim to give labor an advantage. Plans will also be formulated to control candidates for office and to deliver their employes to the party or nominees most satisfactory.

Simultaneously with the New York conference a legal battle was precipitated in the District of Columbia by Van Cleave's attorneys which is destined to become one of the greatest contests that ever took place in this country and that is fraught with tremendous signi-

ficance to organized labor. Van Cleave moved that President Gompers and other A. F. of L. officials be prohibited from publishing or circulating the Federation's unfair list. Van Cleave is president of the Bucks Stove & Range Co., of St. Louis. About a year ago he locked out the metal polishers because they refused to go back to a ten-hour system from the nine-hour day. The concern was placed on the "We don't patronize list," and Van Cleave says he was injured by the boycott. The action is regarded as a test case, and no matter which side wins in the lower courts it is practically certain that the United States Supreme Court will have to pass upon it finally. The open shoppers maintain that many state and district courts have declared the boycott illegal and unconstitutional, but they forget that still other courts have ruled that boycotting is lawful. There is no doubt that the new employers' federation will make the litigation as expensive as possible to organized labor, and that the plaintiffs' attorneys will twist and stretch every law and decision bearing upon this question to win their battle, and the union people might as well prepare for a long contest. Van Cleave and his tribe understand full well that if the boycott can be outlawed they will have delivered organized labor a stunning blow between the eyes, for it is only through the fear of reprisals that many employers are compelled to treat their workers decently. On the other hand, if labor wins unions and individual members need not greatly fear injunctions, damage suits and imprisonment in the future. From every viewpoint this case is epoch-making and should be carefully watched by all union workers and students of industrial affairs.

In this connection it might be stated that when the United States Supreme Court meets next month it will be confronted with a case that is closely related to the action brought by Van Cleave, the suit for \$240,000 damages brought by D. E. Lowe, a hat manufacturer of Danbury, Conn., against officers and members of the United Hatters. Lowe charges that boycott circulars have been sent to his customers and that his business has been greatly injured. The case brings on the question whether the plaintiff can maintain an action under the Sherman anti-trust law.

You have probably read of injunctions to prevent men from going on strike, as in the Ann Arbor railway and other cases; to prevent unions from paying strike benefits, as in the Chicago press feeders' and Boston teamsters' strikes; to prohibit striking girls from "making faces" at scabs at Paterson, N. J.; to prohibit persons from organizing a union, as in the case of the electrical workers at Wheeling, W. Va., and similar freakish edicts that only tend to bring the courts into contempt; but the craziest distortion of justice that has ever come under my notice occurred at Tarentum, Pa. The non-union glass bottle blowers went on strike in a local plant, and against the advice of union men. Then the district court jumps to the fore and issues an injunction against the union and officers restraining them from doing everything that they didn't do or want to do. The strikers are not in the union or in any manner connected with the organization or its officers. The courts have been so much in the habit of hitting union heads whenever they bob up that this Pennsylvania judge naturally hurled his edict against the organization because the non-unionists revolted.

On the first of next month another national struggle for the eight-hour day will begin. The Brotherhood of Bookbinders will follow the example of the printers and order a general strike in all of-

ices that refuse to concede the shorter workday. About 85 per cent of the journeymen in the trade are organized, and it is believed that the union printing establishments will inaugurate the eight-hour system without much trouble. The fight will come in the so-called open shops. Up to the present the eight-hour day has been conceded to the binders in about 25 cities and towns. It is likely that a heavy assessment will be levied upon those members who gain the demands to support their fellow-workers on strike.

In all probability the printing pressmen the country over will also go on strike for the eight-hour day in the near future. At this writing the international officers are in conference with representatives of the employers' association known as the United Typothetae, which body as been waging desperate war upon the Typographical Union during the past two years to enforce its open shops and long hour policy. The pressmen had an agreement with the Typothetae conceding the open shop and the introduction of eight-hour day in 1909, but at the recent convention in New York that compact entered into by the officers was repudiated and those responsible for it were turned out of their positions. Now the pressmen demand not only the eight-hour day, but the closed shop as well. To grant those concessions would mean that the employers' association had completely reversed its former policy, and it is hardly probable that the bosses will yield to what they naturally regard as a humiliating position. It would mean the disruption of their organization, or what is left of it, for the printers drove many bosses out of the Typothetae.

Cornelius Shea was defeated for re-election as president of the Teamsters Union at the recent Boston convention, Daniel J. Tobin, of the latter city, being chosen as his successor. In fact the Shea administration was almost completely wiped out. An effort is now being made to harmonize the factions and build up the organization to its old-time strength. Shea is an able man in many respects and a hard fighter. Being only human, he made some mistakes, the crowning error being his support of Mayor Busse in Chicago at the last election. They say he was actuated by revenge because of Mayor Dunne's policy in sending the police against the teamsters during their strikes, just as though Busse won't do the same thing at the very next strike. It is this childish politics of "rewarding our friends and punishing our enemies" that has caused the downfall of a good many union officials and will undoubtedly do so in the future. Their opponents are bound to arouse suspicion against them and soon their influence is gone. If a man is conscientiously a Republican, Democrat or Socialist he is usually respected, whether we agree with him or not. But when he flaps around boosting a "friend" here and knocking an "enemy" there it is quite natural that the average person asks, "How much?" There are hundreds of ward-healers and bums in every city who play that game the year around and have no other visible means of support. Why should union officials attempt to compete with ward-healers and not only destroy their own usefulness, but bring disgrace upon the whole labor movement? Shea can thank the Gompsonian policy of "rewarding our friends and punishing our enemies" for his undoing.

The impression is steadily growing that there will be another showdown in the anthracite mining region next spring, when the present agreement expires. A district convention was held at Wilkesb̄arre, Pa., recently, and there it was shown that under the present open shop system dictated by Roosevelt the miners' locals are getting

an "unsquare" deal. The delegates complained that good union men are being constantly discharged and blacklisted, while non-unionists and backsliders are favored, openly and deliberately, in order to dishearten the union men and win lukewarm members away from the organization. An effort was made to secure the adoption of a plan whereby members in good standing were to refuse to work with those in arrears for dues until the latter paid up. But it was shown that such action would violate the open shop agreement, and consequently the plan was dropped. In the debate it was declared that the hands of the unionists are tied; that the operators can victimize union members, put a premium on scabbery, and yet nothing can be done. Hence there is plenty of talk of trouble next spring. But meanwhile Baer & Co. are having mountains of coal piled up in anticipation of a strike—and the dear people will pay the cost.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

HOW TO MAKE SOCIALISTS.

The raw material for socialists is being turned out as a by-product of capitalist production, a great deal faster than organized socialism has been able to use it. With dividends increasing, prices rising and wages about as before, it is not hard for the average laborer to grasp the idea that he is not getting all he produces. With one fight or another always on between trade unions and employers, and with the courts and police always at the service of the capitalists, it is easy for the trade unionist to get some glimmerings of the class struggle. The work of "agitation" is done for us; it is a useless task for us to duplicate it.

In other words, the non-socialist laborer already knows something is wrong with capitalism. We need waste no breath telling him. Many of our treasured arguments have thus become obsolete. What we need to do is to help him to see how things are evolving, and why a revolutionary class party is the most effective instrument to help HIM get what HE wants.

As the Stuttgart congress has definitely recognized, we can not overthrow capitalism with a party alone. There must not only be a clearly revolutionary party; there must also be a clearly revolutionary trade union movement to work with it, and there can be neither one nor the other without clear-headed revolutionists.

These revolutionists will not evolve without study. They can not study without books. To circulate these necessary books is the work of the eighteen hundred men and women who are organized in the co-operative publishing house known as Charles H. Kerr & Company. Eight years ago when we published the first American editions of Liebknecht's Socialism and Engels' Socialism Utopian and Scientific, the writings of European socialists were practically unknown to American workingmen, and there was no American socialist literature worth mentioning. Today we are publishing over a hundred different socialist books in permanent binding for libraries, besides more than a hundred pamphlets. Our list includes all the greatest books on socialism by the ablest writers of all countries,

and our co-operative plan puts them within the reach of workingmen at a fraction of the prices usually charged for sociological works. And all this has been accomplished practically without capital, except such as has been painfully raised in small sums from the people who want the socialist books circulated.

BOOKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

During the last year we have had exceptional chances for securing books of the utmost value to the movement on favorable terms, and we have therefore added to our list more rapidly than ever before. The consequence is that our sales, though larger than ever, have not been enough to cover the heavy outlay required by bringing out so many new books at once. Moreover, many of the comrades who have been accustomed to buying each new book as fast as published have not been able to keep up with us. The consequence is that though our total sales have been large the sale of each new book has been somewhat less than we had counted on. We will here name over the principal publications which we have added to our list during the last year, since many readers of the *Review* have doubtless overlooked some of them, and will want to send for them at once upon being reminded.

Marx's Capital. The first volume of this great work was published by us last December. Previous to that time we had been importing and selling the London edition, translated by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, and edited by Frederick Engels. Our own edition is an accurate reprint of this, except that it has been revised by Ernest Untermann so as to include the additions and changes made by Engels in the fourth German edition. It also contains a complete topical index, a feature never included in any previous edition, English or German. Typographically it is far superior to any previous edition, and the price is \$2.00, remarkably low for a book of 869 large pages. We issued 2,000 copies, and they are nearly all sold, so that a new edition will soon be needed.

We published the second volume last July. This is an entirely new translation, by Ernest Untermann. The volume, although published in the German language in 1885, has never until now been within the reach of American readers. The London publishers of the first volume have given us an advance order for 500 copies of the second. The sale of this volume up to the present time in the United States however, up to this time, has been small, considering the great importance of the work, and we hope that every reader of the *Review* who has not yet ordered the volume will do so at once. The price is \$2.00, the same as the first volume.

Comrade Untermann has nearly completed his translation of the third and final volume, which we hope to publish early in 1908. The

translation is paid for by Comrade Eugene Dietzgen as a gift to the American socialist movement. The printing will, however, involve an outlay of about \$1500, since the third volume is even larger than the first. A considerable addition to our working capital will therefore be necessary in order to bring out this volume.

International Library of Social Science. This series of important socialist works in large and handsomely printed volumes at a dollar each was started at the beginning of 1906, and we shall mention here only the later volumes, since the earlier one are more than a year old. **The Positive Outcome of Philosophy**, by Joseph Dietzgen, translated by Ernest Untermann, is a work only second to the masterpieces of Marx and Engels in its importance to the student of socialism. **Socialism and Philosophy**, by Antonio Labriola, is far simpler in style and expression than the author's earlier work, "Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History." It continues the discussion of the subject in the form of familiar letters to Sorel, a prominent socialist of France. **The Physical Basis of Mind and Morals**, by M. H. Fitch, is noteworthy in that the author, with no knowledge of the literature of socialism, has reached substantially the same conclusions as Marx, Engels and Dietzgen by an entirely different route, starting with the data furnished by Herbert Spencer and pointing out the errors of his bourgeois followers. **Revolutionary Essays**, by Peter E. Burrowes, is a well known work by a well known socialist writer, which has been added to our list within the last year. **The Rise of the American Proletarian**, by Austin Lewis, is a strong clear application of Marx's historical method to the recent history of the United States. Lafargue has lately pointed out that socialists have thus far been too ready to talk about historical materialism rather than to use the principle in a scientific way to explain facts and throw light on social problems. Austin Lewis has in this book done a work that was greatly needed, and his book is interesting enough and easy enough for a new inquirer, while it is original and searching enough to repay the study of the best informed socialist. **The Theoretical System of Karl Marx**, by Louis B. Boudin, is a statement of the Marxian system in the light of recent criticism. He shows how the various parts of the system are related so that the acceptance of one part involves the acceptance of the rest. The book forms an admirable introduction to the study of "Capital." **Landmarks of Scientific Socialism**, by Frederick Engels, is a translation by Austin Lewis of all the valuable portions, hitherto unpublished in English, of Engels' great work "Anti-Duehring." This is one of the indispensable classics of socialism.

Standard Socialist Series. This series includes the best obtainable socialist books that can be printed in convenient pocket form and retailed at 50c. They are handsomely bound in cloth in the same style as the larger volumes. Twenty-two of those volumes

are now ready, but we mention here only those published within a year. **Social and Philosophical Studies**, by Paul Lafargue, explains why the capitalists tend to be religious and the wage-workers otherwise, and also explains the origin of the ideas of Justice and Goodness. **What's So and What Isn't**, by John M. Work, is one of the best popular answers to the objections usually urged against socialism. **Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History** in the latest work of Karl Kautsky, the foremost Marxian writer in Germany. **Class Struggles in America**, by A. M. Simons, is a revision of the author's popular pamphlet by the same title, and includes references to authorities which give ample proof for the startling assertions made. **Socialism, Positive and Negative**, by Robert Rives LaMonte, is in many respects the clearest and most brilliant exposition of socialism yet written by an American author; it is a book for those who are not afraid to know the truth. **Capitalist and Laborer**, by John Spargo, is a courteous yet telling reply to the arguments recently offered by Prof. Goldwin Smith and W. H. Mallock against socialism. **The Right to Be Lazy and Other Studies**, by Paul Lafargue, is a new translation by Charles H. Kerr of the first study in the book, with five other studies now for the first time offered in book form. **Revolution and Counter-Revolution**, by Karl Marx, is the first American edition of one of Mark's easiest and most popular books, heretofore sold only in an imported edition at a higher price.

Ancient Society. This great work by Lewis H. Morgan has hitherto been kept out of the reach of workingmen by being held at the price of \$4.00. We have published an excellent edition at \$1.50.

The Ancient Lowly. A little over a year ago we purchased the remainder of the old edition of this great work of Osborne Ward from the author's heirs. We closed out the old editions, and within the last year we have published new and uniform editions of the two volumes at \$2.00 a volume, either volume sold separately.

The American Esperanto Book. There is an increasing demand from socialists for a text-book in the new international language, and we have lately published at \$1.00 an admirable book by Arthur Baker which will enable any student to master the language without the aid of any other book.

Pocket Library of Socialism. We have during the last year enlarged this series of five cent booklets from 45 numbers to 60 by the purchase of the pamphlets formerly issued by the Standard Publishing Company of Terre Haute, Ind. Some of these are excellent books, while others are of an opportunist or sentimentalist character. As fast as the supply of such booklets is exhausted we are replacing them with better ones. Among the new booklets thus issued lately are **Science and Socialism**, by Robert Rives LaMonte, **Marx on Cheapness**, translated by LaMonte, **What Socialists Think**,

by Charles H. Kerr, **From Revolution to Revolution**, by George D. Herron, **Why a Workingman should be a Socialist**, by Gaylord Wilshire, and **History and Economics**, by J. E. Sinclair. Any one of these will be mailed for 5c, and we are for a short time offering the full set of sixty 5c books postpaid with the *International Socialist Review* six months, all for a dollar.

Ten cent Books. We have within a year added considerably to our list of ten cent books by buying out the Standard Publishing Co. We mention here only the books of which we have printed editions within a year. The latest of these is Hillquit's official report on behalf of the Socialist Party of America to the Stuttgart congress. This is published under the title **Recent Progress of the Socialist and Labor Movements in the United States**. Other recent books are **The Right to Be Lazy**, by Paul Lafargue, **Socialism, Revolution and Internationalism**, by Gabriel Deville, and **Not Guilty**, a play in three acts by John Spargo.

Twenty-five Cent Books. Of these we have lately added to our list **The Civil War in France**, by Karl Marx, **The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte**, by Karl Marx, **Science and the Workingmen**, by Ferdinand Lassalle, and **The Passing of Capitalism**, by Isador Ladoff.

What Are We Here For? This book by F. Dundas Todd was originally published by another house at \$1.00. It is a book on ethics from the socialist view-point but with much of the old-time phraseology, which may make it all the more acceptable to some who are just beginning to break with capitalistic ideas. The author has contributed several hundred sets of sheets to the publishing house, and to get the books into circulation quickly, we have decided to offer them in paper cover at 50c, subject to our usual discounts.

AS TO FINANCES.

One copy each of the new books we have named would come to \$23.70 at retail prices. But we have issued on an average at least 2,000 each of the books during the last year, not to speak of many other titles which we have reprinted. This gives some idea of the expenditures we have had to make. There are many other books such as the movement needs that we want to bring out within the next few months, but to do this more money must be raised. Moreover, as we explained in the *Review* last month, we need to raise about \$2,000 immediately to put the business on a cash basis and avoid paying seven per cent interest, which the banks are now charging. These same banks are paying their depositors only three per cent. We can afford to pay four per cent, and to comrades lending money on thirty days' call at this rate we offer security good enough

for a bank. But we hope in a short time to have enough new co-operative stockholders to make borrowing unnecessary.

What \$10.00 Will Do.

Send us \$10.00 and we will send you a full-paid certificate for a share of stock and will also send you books to the amount of \$5.00 at retail prices by express at your expense or books to the amount of \$4.00 at retail prices by mail or express prepaid. The stock draws no dividends, but it entitles you to buy all books published by us, in small or large quantities as you want them, at a discount of fifty per cent if you pay the expressage, or forty per cent if we send by mail or express prepaid.

CONTRIBUTIONS ACKNOWLEDGED.

On page 127 of last month's **Review** Charles H. Kerr offered to contribute to the publishing house \$2100 provided an equal sum be contributed by other stockholders for the purpose of paying off the floating debt. He has decided to modify that offer so that if the contributions do not reach the sum of \$2100, he will contribute an amount equal to that given by all the others. The contributions thus far received are as follows:

D. P. Deely, Pennsylvania.....	\$ 1.00
William Bross Lloyd, Illinois.....	20.00
Henry Crab, Idaho.....	20.00
Mrs. Adam Patterson, Scotland.....	20.00
Dr. R. T. Burr, Panama.....	20.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois.....	81.00
Total	<u>\$162.00</u>

The other receipts of the month were excellent considering the season of the year,—\$154.72 from subscriptions and sales of the **Review**, \$220 from the sale of stock and \$1707.35 from book sales. But September's receipts must be far larger if we are to get through the month without serious embarrassment. The thing to do is for YOU to write us as soon you have read this, enclosing what money you can as a stock subscription, a contribution or a loan, or in payment for a **Review** subscription or for books. The time we need the money is not next month or next year but NOW.