

DECEMBER 1913

Ten Cents

The New Review

A-MONTHLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

The Elections	The Defeat of Tammany	<i>H. S.</i>
The Inferior Races		<i>Robert H. Lowie</i>
Russia and China		<i>Michael Pavlovitch</i>
Socialization of Saving.		<i>Arthur Wallace Calhoun</i>
Organization of the Unskilled (<i>Concluded</i>)		<i>Austin Lewis</i>
Social Significance of Futurism		<i>Louis C. Fraina</i>
John Spargo's "Syndicalism"		<i>Louis Levine</i>
Revolutionary Tendencies in the United Kingdom		<i>Tom Queloh</i>
New Zealand's Labor Movement		<i>P. H. Hickey</i>
Story of the Putumayo Atrocities :		
VI. The Position To-day		<i>W. E. Hardenburg</i>
A Baby's Epitaph		<i>Harry Kemp</i>
Hopelessdale		<i>Morrison I. Swift</i>
The Model		<i>Andre Tridon</i>
A Southern Socialist On the Negro Question		<i>Ida M. Raymond</i>

150 Nassau Street

New York

The New Review

Published Monthly

by the

New Review Publishing Association

150 Nassau Street, New York City

Alexander Fraser, *President*

Bertha W. Howe, *Treasurer*

Robert M. Lackey, *Secretary*

Herman Simpson, *Editor*

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

One Year, . . . \$1.00 Six Months . . . \$.50
Canada 1.20 Foreign 1.50

Single Copies, 10 cents

In Bundles of 5 or more 6 cents per copy

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

Exceptional Offers

Regular Our?
Price Price

The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	} \$2.00
The Larger Aspects of Socialism, Wm. E. Walling	\$1.50 \$2.50	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	} \$2.40
Socialism As It Is, Wm. E. Walling	\$2.00 \$3.00	
The New Review, 1 year and the Masses, or International Socialist Review, 1 year	\$1.00 \$1.00 \$2.00	} \$1.50
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	
Immigration and Labor, Issac A. Hourwich	\$2.50 \$3.50	} \$3.00

Send orders to

The NEW REVIEW
150 Nassau St. New York

Some New Notices

of

The Larger Aspects of Socialism

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

"A stimulating discussion, particularly on its intellectual and spiritual sides."

— "The Review of Reviews."

"The author has earned a right to a frank place among the American Socialist 'intellectuals'. . . A clear-sighted observer, and a reporter honest with himself and the public."

— "The Nation."

"An expert treatment. . . Of special value in the wide range of its quotation and comment. Mr. Walling has a quick eye and a sympathetic mind for new ideas and the latest theories in sociology, science and philosophy."

— "The Independent."

"Mr. Walling's book, which marks a return to the more fearlessly idealistic and less fearfully practical spirit of the early Socialists, is well worth reading for many reasons."

— "The Chicago Evening Post."

"Extremely interesting, thoroughly documented and unevasive. . . This book is the real thing. It makes no play for sentiment."

— "The St. Louis Mirror."

"You have been successful in understanding and expounding pragmatism — more so than many professed professional philosophers."

— Professor John Dewey.

"Wonderfully many-sided. . . The value of such a book is distinctly large both to the followers and the foes of the philosophies it presents."

— "The New York World."

"All Socialists are necessarily Pragmatists, and certainly all Socialists will find plenty to think over in this really important book, which would take the space of many issues of 'Justice' to deal with adequately."

— "Justice" — London.

"Mr. Walling's application of pragmatic methods to socialism is novel and effective. In connecting socialism up with a philosophy that is very popular to-day he has unquestionably rendered his cause good service."

— "The New York Globe."

"An earnest and not unskillful attempt is made to identify practices of socialism with principles of modern pragmatism. . . There is much that is instructive and significant in Mr. Walling's close study of existing conditions and current systems of philosophy."

— "The Philadelphia North American."

Cloth, 12mo., \$1.50 net; Postpaid \$1.63

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 Fifth Avenue

NEW YORK

The New Review

Vol. I.

DECEMBER, 1913

No. 23

The Elections

The managers of each and every political party profess entire satisfaction with the results of the past month's municipal and state elections, held mostly in the eastern part of the country. The Democrats point to the victories of their gubernatorial candidates in Massachusetts and New Jersey, and to their election of a United States Senator from Maryland, as popular endorsements of the Wilson Administration. The Progressives jubilate over their greatly increased representation in the legislatures of New York and Massachusetts, as well as over the fact that their candidate for governor in the latter state polled a considerably larger vote than his Republican rival, although the latter received the support of such Republican progressives as Senators Borah and Cummins. The Republicans have regained control of the legislature of New York; in New Jersey their candidate for governor came out far ahead of his Progressive opponent; while the Oliver-Penrose machine triumphed in Philadelphia over the reformers and in Pittsburgh over the Progressive machine of Flinn and Magee. Finally the bourgeois municipal reformers without party qualification are gloating over their great victory in New York City and over the re-election of Mayor Baker in Cleveland, while the unregenerate machine politicians can point to the disintegration of the reformers in Toledo and to the defeat of the Democratic reform Mayor Hunt in Cincinnati as a reaction in their favor.

To the disinterested observer, however, it must be obvious that where all parties boast of victory no party can have gained a distinct triumph. Victory or success in one place is offset by defeat or setback in another place. The elections, in accordance with their local and isolated nature, reveal no dominant and unmistakable trend in favor of one party or another. There

was much noise and confusion, agitation and ferment, but there resulted no definite crystallization. Local interests and personal predilections affected the result everywhere. Even the overwhelming defeat of Tammany in New York, state as well as city, was due to a mere accident. Signs of betterment may be discernible, but it takes a good dose of optimism to discern them.

* * *

As concerns the Socialist party, the results seem on the whole to have been very encouraging, although nowhere very striking. In Ohio several cities and towns, notably Hamilton, elected Socialist administrations. In several places in Pennsylvania, particularly Erie, a good vote was polled, but in New Castle the Socialist administration was ousted. The same fate befell the Socialist administration of Schenectady, N. Y., where the ticket headed by Mayor Lunn was defeated by a combination of all the parties of capital. The administration of Mayor Lunn has earned universal praise—particularly in the more honest and progressive capitalist organs, like the *Outlook*, and even in the *New York Times*—for its superior efficiency, honesty and moderation. But the capitalists of Schenectady, large and small, detest it not so much for what it has done as for what it symbolizes—the coming rule of the proletariat. This but repeats the experience of Milwaukee, where also the Socialist administration tried to conciliate “public opinion” by its moderation. Henceforth we may confidently expect a fusion of all capitalist parties against the Socialist ticket wherever the success of the latter against a divided enemy appears probable. In these circumstances, it seems to us that Socialist moderation ceases to be a virtue even from the point of view of “practical” politics. We say this, although we are fully aware of the fact that Socialist municipal governments cannot be expected to develop a bold initiative, to become centres of proletarian resistance and aggression, so long as they are elected by minorities and are the result of accident rather than of thorough preparation, and above all so long as they are few in number and scattered far apart—mere oases in a capitalist Sahara.

* * *

In New York City the vote for the ticket headed by Charles Edward Russell was by far the highest ever polled by the Socialists in a municipal election. This very gratifying result was undoubtedly due in large measure to the universally recognized

ability and wide popularity of the candidate for mayor. Even with this great advantage, however, the Socialist vote amounted only to five per cent. of the total vote cast in the metropolis. Of the cities in the neighborhood of New York, the vote in Paterson, N. J., is of especial significance. There the Socialist candidate for mayor (a member of the American Federation of Labor, by the way) received practically the unanimous support of the I. W. W. silk workers and polled 5,155 votes, as against 7,265 for the successful Republican candidate and 4,454 for the Democrat. If Comrade Demarest had obtained the same support from the A. F. of L. unionists as from the I. W. W. ones, he would surely have been elected. In view of the Paterson result, the argument in the *Call* of Comrade John R. Hobbie, Jr., that the poor vote in Massachusetts, which was smaller even than last year's small vote, was the result of I. W. W. influence in the party, sounds strange indeed. For several years past the continual decline of the Socialist vote in the most industrial state of the Union has remained a mystery. “What is the matter with Massachusetts?” has come to be a perennial question. We do not pretend to be able to lift the veil of that mystery. But may it not be due—to a very, very small extent at least—to such practices as caused last year's candidate for governor to desert the party? Sawyer, indeed, proved himself to be a most unworthy man, but the methods resorted to against him were equally unworthy. Nor can the Socialist party of Massachusetts expect to make headway until such methods have been eradicated and made impossible. After this has been done the Socialists of Massachusetts may perhaps find that the I. W. W. stands no more in the way of their political progress than it does in New Jersey (*see “Postscript” on p. 991*).

The Defeat of Tammany

Until the last two or three weeks before the election the Fusionists were in a state of utmost confusion bordering on demoralization. Defeat stared them in the face. Not even the death of Mayor Gaynor, their most formidable rival, or the belated adhesion of certain Wall Street elements typified by Jacob H. Schiff, appeared able to avert the inevitable doom. Like rats running away from a sinking ship, all the Fusion notables were scurrying after independent nominations, each one bent only upon saving his own precious skin. One of them even

accepted a Tammany endorsement. Then came Murphy's signal exhibition of brute force at Albany. The omnipotent Boss over-shot the mark. Sulzer and, above all, Hennessy did the rest. The unseated Governor stirred up the passions of the impressionable masses of the East Side, whose right instincts told them that this man was punished not because he was corrupt, but because he was not corrupt enough. Hennessy revealed, coolly and dispassionately, the immense net of corruption that Tammany had spread out over the entire state. He revealed the true relations of the "respectable" Judge McCall to the "Chief" who nominated him. The result cannot but be pleasing to all honest men, and particularly to all Socialists.

For, however backward the social outlook of the Fusionists may be, however little the working class may expect from their administration of the city, however certain the repetition during the next four years of the brutality of the police in all clashes between labor and capital, two things are indubitable. The first, though the less important one, is this, that narrow as may be the social horizon of the Fusionists, it extends infinitely beyond that of Murphy and the Tammany district leaders and their "respectable" tools of the type of McCall. Thus during the campaign, while McAneny, the Fusion candidate for president of the Board of Aldermen, was appealing for the votes of the poor on the strength of what little the city government had done for their relief from intolerable conditions of existence, the Tammany candidate for mayor appealed for the votes of the men of property on the score of his promised "economy." These two different kinds of appeal were quite characteristic of each camp. The Fusionists, on the whole, represent the more "respectable," more solid and substantial men of property. To gain and to keep the political support of the masses of the poor, they must promise (and to some small extent they must also keep their promises) a certain modicum of improvement, without which life in the great city would become utterly unbearable to those who are groaning under its burdens. On the other hand, Tammany counts upon the votes of the poor ignorant masses as its safe possession. All that its district leaders need to do to keep them to their allegiance is to bestow upon them the small and inexpensive favors to which they have grown accustomed—a Christmas dinner and a few pails of coal in winter, a picnic and chowder party and a few cakes of ice in summer, a kind word to the police magistrate in time of trouble. Hence the problem before Tammany, in ordinary times, is not to win

the support of the masses, but to gain the confidence of the rich and well-to-do. And this end is accomplished by the bestowal of franchises at little or no cost to the beneficiaries and by an economy amounting to niggardliness in the matter of necessary city improvements. The franchises gain the favor and the cash of the rich and powerful, the pretended economy (for it is all pretence—with the money that is stolen all necessary improvements could be made) is a never-failing bait for the small property owners.

This, then, is the first grand distinction between Tammany and the Fusionists. Tammany must court the rich, while the Fusionists must try to gain the good will of the poor. Hence the latter may, as a rule, be counted upon to do at least some of the things that in a modern city should be done for its inhabitants. But there is a still greater and more important distinction, and one that of itself is quite sufficient to cause every Socialist and every honest man to prefer the success of the Fusionists to that of Tammany.

It may be stated in very few words, for it is, or ought to be, notorious. Tammany stands for open, unashamed corruption. Tammany stands for antiquated, pre-capitalistic methods of looting the public wealth, for the systematic violation of even such law and such order as is vouchsafed to us by the present system of robbery and exploitation. As the brazen exponent of a perpetual system of "primitive accumulation," the continued existence and success of Tammany tends to pervade the entire community with rotteness and corruption. The young men just starting out in life succumb to its corroding influence. The labor movement is permeated with its evil and its stench. The entire public life of the community becomes degraded, pestiferous. In this foul atmosphere hardly any ideal social striving can long survive or remain pure.

Therefore all Socialists who are intelligent enough to look beyond the apparent advantage of the moment and who realize the tremendous intellectual and moral transformation of the masses upon which the success of the Socialist movement is conditioned, must hail with satisfaction every crushing defeat administered to Tammany by the bourgeois reformers. In the first place, we should always prefer an open-faced enemy, honest according to his own lights, to the insidious demagogues of Tammany Hall. But above all, a telling blow at Tammany, such as has recently been administered, is a warning to all and sundry that evil and corrupt ways are not the certain road to success

that they have been supposed to be, that the power of the machine and of the boss is not impregnable, that even in this world of capitalism there are definite standards of conduct which it is not always safe to violate. This is a clear moral gain, a gain that in the long run cannot but redound to the good of the labor movement, yes, even of the Socialist movement, of this great city and of the entire country. For Tammany is not confined to New York. Every considerable city has its political ring battenning upon the theft of public franchises, upon fraudulent contracts, upon the abuse of the police power, upon the liquor saloon, the gambling den and the brothel, in short, upon our primitive, vigorous, unscrupulous capitalism as well as upon our obsolete, decadent Puritanism. And everywhere the continued success of the political ring, the machine and the boss tends to contaminate the entire social atmosphere. The rout of the prototype of all these agencies of corruption cannot therefore fail to exert a wholesome moral influence far beyond the limits of the City of New York.

H. S.

The Inferior Races

From an Anthropologist's Point of View

By ROBERT H. LOWIE

Associate Editor of the American Anthropologist

The feeling of race superiority, so far as it is not admittedly mere prejudice, is defended on biological and psychological grounds. Biologically, it seems obvious that non-Caucasian races resemble more closely the non-human ancestors of man than do the Caucasians. Psychologically, the high civilization achieved by the white race seems to prove even more clearly its superiority over other varieties of *Homo sapiens*. A critique of these popular opinions in these pages cannot advance any novel points of view; it can merely serve to popularize those conclusions which have been attained by the deepest and clearest thinkers in the field of anthropology.

The biological argument seems at first sight to draw strength from the theory of evolution, to be a direct application of that theory to the human species. The problem of the evolutionist is to bridge the gap between man and the anthropoid apes. The easiest solution of the problem obviously is to conceive the path of ascent as a *straight* line and to interpolate between the ex-

tremes, that is, between the anthropoids and mankind in its highest form, a number of successively higher forms of humanity. If the Vedda were closer to, say, the chimpanzee than to the Caucasian, if the Australian, the Negro, the American Indian, the Mongolian, represented successively higher varieties, we should have such a straight line and our problems would be solved in the simplest possible fashion. Here, however, we meet with a difficulty. We may regard the Caucasian as the highest race only if it presents specifically human traits in a more marked degree than other races. But on this point the verdict of science is by no means unequivocal. Professor Boas, who has carefully weighed the evidence, arrives at the following conclusion:

* * * it must be strongly emphasized that the races which we are accustomed to call "higher races" do not by any means stand in all respects at the end of the series, and are farthest removed from the animal. The European and the Mongol have the largest brains; the European has a small face and a high nose.—all features farther removed from the portable animal ancestor of man than the corresponding features of other races. On the other hand, the European shares lower characteristics with the Australian, both retaining in the strongest degree the hairiness of the animal ancestor, while the specifically human development of the red lip is developed most markedly in the negro. The proportions of the limbs of the negro are also more markedly distinct from the corresponding proportions in the higher apes than are those of the Europeans.¹

Nevertheless, in one respect—and that the one commonly regarded as the most important—there is a decided difference between the European and the darker races. Whether we compare the size or the weight of the brain, Caucasian superiority seems demonstrated by a safe margin. While the capacity of the male European averages 1,560cc., that of the African negroes is only 1,405cc., and that of the dark-skinned natives of the Pacific Ocean, 1,460cc. But here we are led from the biological into the psychological sphere. The popular assumption is that the size and weight of the brain is a direct measure of intelligence. How has this principle been established? Doubtless by the observation that as we ascend the scale of intelligence in the animal kingdom we find an increasing complexity of brain organization. But how have we come to grade animals by their intelligence? Have we concluded that man is the most rational of animals *because* morphological examination has proved his brain to be the most complex? Obviously not, for man's knowledge of his own superiority far antedates his biological studies. Suppose that morphological research should reveal a difference in favor of the anthropoids. Should we then abandon our

¹Boas, *The Mind of Primitive Man*, (The MacMillan Co., 1911), p. 22.

relative psychological estimate of man and the apes? Certainly not. Our direct psychological estimate is the fundamental fact that cannot be altered by any additional determinations; if human intelligence were *not* coupled with a larger brain, we should simply be forced to abandon the rule that a correlation exists between brain and intelligence.

Now, there can be no doubt that in a general way a correlation does exist between mind and brain. The only point we must keep in mind is that very few correlations in biology—perhaps we might better say, no correlations at all—are absolute. We can determine fairly accurately a man's finger reach from his height, yet even in this unusually favorable case there is a variation of finger reach among men of the same height, so that we cannot make our prediction quite exact. When we examine the correlation of height and weight, prediction becomes impossible, despite the fact that there is, biometrically speaking, a rather high correlation between the two types of measurement. We all know of six-footers who barely weigh 150 lbs., and of men hardly above five feet who pass beyond the two-hundredweight mark. What does this mean? It simply means that over and above certain conditions that determine *both* height and weight there are additional conditions that affect weight but do not affect height. Precisely the same view must be taken with regard to brain and intelligence. From the wider biological point of view, intelligence is indeed a function of the brain weight, but it is not solely determined by brain weight. We find that eminent men frequently have a brain of more than average size, and we also find that some eminent men are below the average in this regard. We even find occasionally that men of mediocre or low intelligence have brains of superior capacity. Whether, therefore, a difference of 100cc. in the brain capacity of Europeans and Melanesians, or of 150cc. in that of Europeans and African Negroes, is significant as to fundamental differences of intellectual capacity, is, to say the least, a question on which the utmost skepticism is in place. The biological rule of correlation is far too crude to solve our problem of grading the races according to their intellectual worth. All that we know with certainty is that a very great difference in brain size is correlated with a difference in intelligence. We cannot predict with any degree of safety the effect of smaller differences because obviously there are causes other than mere size that affect the mental status of individuals and may cancel the effect of brain capacity.

We are thus driven to that *psychological* comparison which

we have recognized as the fundamental factor in our estimates of the several races of man. And here we seem to be in the fortunate position of possessing an objective criterion of racial intelligence,—the cultural level of the several races. The assumption that culture is an index of intelligence is so natural that it is rarely questioned, nevertheless science cannot take it for granted that such is the case.

It is true that, as in the case of brain weight, a rough correlation obtains between culture and intelligence. Animals have no culture and are mentally inferior to man. If we could find human races devoid of culture or lacking some of its most distinctive traits, we should be quite justified in denying that they are on a par with the civilized Caucasians. But if modern ethnology teaches anything whatsoever, it teaches the exact opposite. In innumerable cases where some of the most primitive elements of culture, such as fire-making, had been denied to a people by travelers passing through their country, more critical investigation has proved the contrary. We do not know of a single people on the face of the globe that has not something corresponding to each principal phase of our own culture; a definite mode of economic existence, industrial activity, a social organization and well-established social customs, ethical and philosophical conceptions, and religious practices of some sort. In point of language we find that many primitive languages possess not only a vocabulary of imposing proportions, but a morphological complexity that rivals the intricacies of German or Greek grammar.

Nevertheless, although all varieties of the species must be admitted to possess a culture of their own, it might still be possible to grade them by the *complexity* of their cultures. As a matter of fact, many attempts have been made in this direction, but without the least success. As the remark just made about languages indicates, complexity of language cannot be taken as a criterion of intelligence, for judged in this way the Iroquois and Algonkin Indians would tower immeasurably above the English-speaking peoples. But, no matter what criterion we assume in the place of language, the logical deductions from our assumption seem untenable. In prehistoric Europe, the iron age is known to have been preceded by the stone age. Taking this scheme of development as a basis for testing racial intelligence, what do we find? The Polynesians, whose intelligence all white observers have estimated very highly indeed, lived in the stone age at the time of their discovery. So did the Amer-

ican Indian tribes, with the exception of the Aztecs and a few others, who had learned to smelt copper. Only the African negroes, of all primitive tribes, are the ones who had learned to smelt iron when first sighted by white explorers. Shall we say that the African is mentally superior to the Polynesian and the Indian? Or shall we conclude that culture is not necessarily an index of intelligence?

The case of the Australian aborigines is equally illuminating. From the point of view of their industrial and economic life, these tribes rank very low indeed. Nevertheless, when we turn to their social organization we discover a complexity that has baffled the ingenuity of more than one investigator. In other words, culture does not develop uniformly in all its phases; a people may be very advanced in certain directions, yet may lag far behind in others. This might be illustrated by many examples. Thus the Polynesians seem to surpass the Melanesians in the complexity of social life and imaginative activity, but are wholly lacking in certain aspects of material culture found in Melanesia. The Eskimos have adapted themselves wonderfully to the exigencies of their environment and have invented a variety of ingenious contrivances, yet they are very primitive from a social and religious point of view. Least suited of all for a criterion of cultural level are our own ethical conceptions. According to these, cannibalistic tribes, for example, should rank very low in the cultural scale. Yet the exact reverse proves to be the case. Such a tribe as the Mangbettu in the northeastern Congo were indeed markedly cannibalistic when visited by Schweinfurth, but displayed an industrial skill and aesthetic sense that did not fail to impress him profoundly.

A hasty glimpse thus seems to indicate (1) that when we compare primitive peoples with one another, the level of their culture as determined by some selected criterion may be at variance with the direct psychological estimate made (Negro-Polynesian); (2) that it is exceedingly difficult to grade peoples by their culture, because of the absence of uniformity in cultural development. We may choose advancement beyond the stone age as the criterion of progress, and grade peoples accordingly, but such a choice would be arbitrary. Selecting another criterion, such as architecture, there would be a considerable shifting of positions.

It is therefore not admissible to regard one primitive people as mentally inferior to another on the basis of their cultures. But can we not compare *all* primitive races as a whole with the

Caucasians? Are not the cultural differences that result from such a comparison so great as to argue in favor of the psychological superiority of the Caucasians? In order to answer this question we must attempt a rapid analysis of our own civilization. When we consider those elements in our modern culture that most clearly distinguish it from lower cultures, we discover that they are elements in the development of which the vast majority of Caucasians played no part whatsoever. The technical devices that establish our conquest of nature, the application of electricity and chemistry to everyday ends, are things due not to the genius of the white race, but to particular groups of white workers whose specialized labors became possible through the organization of society. The average Caucasian who is transported at the rate of sixty miles an hour has had as little to do with the development of railroad transportation as the negro who nowadays boards a train in Uganda. If the possession of modern technical and mechanical contrivances proves the superior intellectual endowment of our race as compared with other races, it also proves our superior endowment as compared with our ancestors of a century or several centuries ago. But it is a biologically absurd assumption to believe that an actual change of native capacity could take place within this space of time. As a matter of fact, no one upholds the proposition that the great men of to-day surpass the Newtons and Galileos of another era in native ability. What we mean when we recognize a greater average intelligence among whites of to-day is simply that the blessings of culture have been more widely diffused than before; no one can doubt that, had the means of diffusion been equal at the time of Galileo, or for that matter of Aristotle, the general average would have been the same as to-day. Differences of culture at different periods of Caucasian history therefore do not prove differences of intelligence.

Our problem then narrows down to this. Are the differences between primitive and Caucasian culture of the same kind as the differences just noted in the history of Caucasian civilization, or are they of a more fundamental character? When we take primitive culture at its highest points, considering, say, the Aztec Indian state, we find conditions of approximately the same order as in our own ancient or even medieval history,—imposing edifices, the development of a written literature, a highly organized body politic. The Aztecs undoubtedly were of a higher cultural level than the Teutonic hordes that invaded the Roman Empire, yet the descendants of those hordes are now the dominant rep-

representatives of modern Caucasian civilization. We cannot dogmatically assert that the Aztecs, if left undisturbed, would have risen to the cultural level now occupied by Caucasians, but on the other hand, there is nothing in proof of the contrary supposition. An unbiased survey of the facts seems to show that marked progress is frequently an effect of fortunate accidents; for all we know, such accidents might have promoted the rise of Aztec culture, as their absence would have retarded it. The white race has advanced several centuries, say even a thousand years, beyond the medieval level of the Indian race. What significance, as Professor Boas asks, can we attach to this difference in the light of man's antiquity? As we do not regard a child of six as hopelessly deficient because its mental development is that of normal five-year-olds, so we cannot regard as incapable of the highest culture a race that in a life-history of one hundred thousand years is culturally a thousand years behind another race.

One additional point is of importance here. If there is a correlation between culture and racial psychology, we must nevertheless distinguish clearly between those who have originated the culture and those who are merely capable of adopting a culture originated by others. We give the Japanese credit for adopting our modern civilization, but that is something different from crediting them with an aboriginal culture of equal level. Nevertheless, history and sociology teach that our own civilization itself is a patchwork of borrowed elements,—borrowed by the Teutonic barbarians from classical antiquity, which in turn was not a little influenced by Egypt. When we of to-day intelligently avail ourselves of the labors of small guilds of engineers, mechanics, physicists, and chemists, we are psychologically in the same position of borrowers, and most of us are destined to remain *passive* borrowers who will never carry this work of others to a still higher goal. When, therefore, we examine the endowments of other races from a practical point of view, it seems unfair to insist on their having *originated* a culture of such or such a character. All we can reasonably ask is whether they are capable, like the Japanese and the one-time barbarous Caucasian peoples, of *borrowing* a culture originated, it matters not by whom.

Yet it would be equally unfair to neglect the probability that in the pioneer development of human culture the non-Caucasian races played an important part. One point in particular deserves to be emphasized. As stated above, the African negroes

are skilled blacksmiths. Now, a modern theory maintained by no lesser authorities than Professors Von Luschan and Schweinfurth not only states that the negroes originated their own iron technique, but Von Luschan is of opinion that they passed the knowledge of this art on to the Egyptians, who in turn transmitted it to the Mediterranean races of Europe. To be sure, this is an assumption that is not generally accepted. Nevertheless, there is good evidence in its favor, and if it should prove justifiable, one of the very greatest advances in human civilization would have to be credited to the despised Negro!

But to return to the essential problem. We have seen that a comparison of human cultures is not at all conclusive as to the inferiority of non-Caucasian races from the point of view of native psychological endowment. A more direct test could be undertaken by the methods of experimental psychology. Very little work has so far been done in this line, the principal researches being those of Rivers in the Torres Straits Islands and Woodworth's investigation of various races at the World's Fair in St. Louis. While these inquiries brought out certain interesting differences of minor character, they did not establish any fundamental difference of kind. The experimental methods referred to are perhaps subject to the criticism that they create artificial conditions and thus yield results, perhaps interesting in themselves but without bearing on the question at issue. For what we are especially eager to determine is, of course, not how a Papuan or an Andaman Islander reacts in a laboratory, but how he reacts in the practical problems that beset him in his normal surroundings and would confront his offspring if transplanted to modern conditions.

The latter is, of course, a very difficult problem, yet as the globe trotter's pronouncements are giving way to the deeper judgment of trained ethnologists, information is accumulating of which the general trend can be safely estimated. The more thoroughly we penetrate into the psychology of the scorned lower races, the more clearly we perceive their essential similarity with ourselves. Tribes reputed to lack any desire for steady application are seen to rear impressive edifices and create fine artistic products that challenge our admiration when we consider that the craftsmen had nothing but stone or bone tools at their command. Again, lack of self-restraint has been a charge against primitive man generally. Yet we find that an Australian (whom some race theorists place on the very lowest rung of the human scale) is so far master of his natural desires that marriage or inter-

course with a member of the same clan is out of the question for him. The *traditional* code restraining him is not our code, but everything points to the fact that at a sufficiently early age he could be imbued with one code as well as with another. So, the more deeply we penetrate aboriginal life, the more firmly we become convinced that while the manifestations of primitive tribes differ among themselves and from those of Caucasians in their form, which is prescribed by tradition, the elements of their psychological make-up do not differ. The psychological unity of mankind in all essential traits is one of the most firmly established generalizations of ethnological science. We have every reason to suppose that all races are capable, under proper guidance, of being fitted into the complex scheme of our modern civilization, and the policy of artificially excluding them from its benefits is as unjustifiable scientifically as it is ethically abhorrent.

But all argument is addressed to reason, and cannot affect racial snobbishness, which is founded in prejudice. Racial snobbishness can be combated not by reasoning against it when it has already been established, but by creating an emotional atmosphere that will not support it. Man bears the proud title of *Homo sapiens*, but experience shows that his reactions are dominated by dogmas passively accepted at a receptive stage. To this psychological deficiency the successful reformer must needs adapt himself. He will select for inculcation only such principles as the most rigid scientific criticism warrants, but he will impress them at an early age, not as carefully thought-out logical propositions, but with the force of religious dogmas. In exactly the same way in which a child now absorbs the current national and ethical prejudices, it may be taught instead to absorb a prejudice against prejudice, an abhorrence for racial and ethical intolerance that will resist any subsequent onslaughts of a reactionary sciolism. And when reason shall thus begin to invade the pedagogical sphere at home and in the schools, when her principles, no longer remaining abstract propositions, shall have saturated our entire emotional and volitional life, then racial and other prejudices will vanish and the name of *Homo sapiens* will not be an empty boast or a Mephistophelean sarcasm.

Russia and China

By MICHAEL PAVLOVITCH (Paris)

I. ALARM IN THE FAR EAST

For over a year Siberian papers have been systematically reporting China's strenuous preparations for war with Russia and her feverish arming in Manchuria and on the Mongolian border. The frontier press in Siberia claims that as many as ten divisions of the Chinese army, splendidly armed and equipped, are already concentrated largely in Manchuria and partly also on the borders of Mongolia. More and more regiments are daily marching along the highways to Tsitsihar and Aigun, that is, toward the Russian frontier, which is being fortified hurriedly;* and the Chinese scouting detachments are being reinforced. At the same time, as on the eve of the war of 1900, Chunchuse depredations are increasing at a dreadful rate. Large bands of Chunchuses, each frequently several hundred strong, are seizing all the country cross-roads. Out-of-the-way towns, infested with these bands of Chinese Cossacks, are in a state of terror and tremble at the spectre of a seemingly inevitable war. But this is not all. Even in sight of Harbin itself, around Blagoviestchensk and other large centres, there is general disquiet and alarm. Many Russian officials and army officers are sending their wives and children home or to Irkutsk, away from frontier points and from the probable seat of the first hostilities.

These reports of Chinese activities on the Russian frontier may be assumed to be exaggerated; the Chinese preparations are in all likelihood of a more modest character and are carried out on a smaller scale than Siberian press reports would have us believe. There is, however, no doubt that "Young China" is loath to acquiesce in Russia's policy toward China and insists that the Peking government repel vigorously the attacks of the "northern brigand". All China is under the sway of an anti-Russian movement; Young China ardently desires war. The whole country, especially the southern provinces, is covered with a dense network of riflemen's societies, scouting bands, and athletic organizations, which spur on and keep up the patriotic upheaval against Russia. At the same time, this anti-Russian

* Recent telegrams from Harbin tell of the most energetic preparations by the Chinese authorities for organizing manoeuvres on a grand scale over the territory between Kirin and Mukden. The object of this maneuvering is to be the defense of Chinese territory against an offensive army advancing from the Russian frontier.

feeling runs especially high in Manchuria, where the country is swarming with both secret and open anti-Russian organizations. The most influential among these are the Society for the Protection of Citizens (a new name for the Society for Saving Mongolia, officially dissolved), the Society for Unifying Patriots (formerly called Society for Raising Funds for the War with Mongolia), Society for Boycotting Russian Goods, Society of the Intrepid and the Terrorist Society whose aim is to assassinate Russian sympathizers.

Just as was the case in Japan on the eve of the recent war, all China is swayed by a growing, intense hatred of Russia, this "hereditary foe unwilling to allow the Middle Empire even the blessing of peace, and inciting all the other powers to dismember China." Japan had her great poets, like the celebrated Toko Fujitu, who depicted in his poems the frightful northern eagle, that monster of the skies, gathering in his sharp claws one kingdom after another, and hovering over the Japan Sea, ready to swoop down on the Land of the Rising Sun. There were also prominent scholars, like Shihei Hayashi and Sakuma Drodzana, who constantly warned against the danger from the north and urged their countrymen to bold action if they did not wish to become the slaves of Russia. In China also a whole literature is now growing up in the effort to solidify and intensify in the masses the consciousness of a formidable peril looming from the north, and to unite all classes of people, from the highest mandarin to the lowest coolie, in the common feeling of profound hostility to Russia. Here are the words of a recent song, popular among Young Chinamen:

Fathers, mothers, sisters, and you, brothers,
Beware, beware of Russia!
She mocks at all treaties.
If we march not to battle,
We shall be despised among men.

To-night, the third night of vigilance, we'll dash to the fray;
Noble swords, proud steeds, our priceless acquisitions,
It is you make us heroes!
Our swords are burnished, our hearts are daring,
We fear neither wounds nor death.

The loving wife urges her husband to battle.
Success to you, she cries, take the banner,
And go to the war which means death to oppressors.

The dangerous character which the bitter anti-Russian feeling in China has assumed is of recent origin.

Formerly, in the pre-republican period,* the Chinese hated all "white devils" as much as they did the Manchus who dominated and enfeebled their country. Now, after the fall of the dynasty, the Manchus are no more dangerous, and all the accumulated hatred is focussed against Russia. Curiously enough, though England does in Thibet what Russia does in Mongolia, the Chinese press assails only Russia and says little about Great Britain. The Chinese evidently look upon Russia as their chief enemy, attaching little weight to other powers. From the viewpoint of the Chinese press, the settlement of the Russian question means life or death to China. The population is increasing at an enormous rate and, crowded in their own country, the yellow race meets the united opposition of the white world when it seeks foreign shores. The United States prohibits the immigration of Chinese laborers, Australia does the same, South America is inaugurating a prohibitive policy. At the same time one territory after another is wrested from China: Korea, Manchuria and the Liautong Peninsula have passed into the hands of Japan and Russia. Chinese laborers have been compelled to quit the Amur territory. But all this does not satisfy China's enemies. In the trying transition days of internal reconstruction, when the people in revolt overthrew the Manchu dynasty and proclaimed the Chinese Republic, Russia gave the signal for attacking the enfeebled country, snatched Mongolia and prohibited the Chinese from settling in a territory, that of the Amur, which was but yesterday their own province. Next came England and claimed Thibet. This has excited fears that other powers, Japan, France, or Germany may attempt like encroachments. So now, while European complications offer a favorable opportunity, Chinese patriots seek to unify the whole nation in one common effort against Russia. If a decisive setback is given to Russia in regard to Mongolia it is argued that this will stop the incipient partition of China.

Since the underlying ground for the Russo-Chinese conflict is in regard to Mongolia, we shall make it clear what this question, fraught with grave international complications, really is.

II. THE "CARAVANSERAI".

In the town of Bodune, on the Sungari River, which geographically forms the gate to Mongolia, a company was formed

* In the pre-republican period, under the rule of the Manchu dynasty, five million Manchus played the part of a privileged caste among the three hundred million Chinese.

a few years ago, called the Caravanserai, upon which not only commercial but also political hopes were founded. It was conceived on a large scale, and the former editor of the Harbin *Viestnik*, the official organ of the Eastern Chinese Railway, was appointed its head. By means of this enterprise it was intended to monopolize Russian trade in Mongolia and promote the peaceful annexation of that province to the Russian empire. Another high official of the Eastern Chinese Railway secured the influence of the Russian Minister of Finance, while the direct management of the great enterprise was entrusted to two persons who resided at Bodune. One of them was a retired officer of the Guards, who had visited Africa, Turkey and Japan in search of adventure, and who, during the Russo-Japanese war, was in command of a detachment of Chunchuses; the other was the commercial agent of the Eastern Chinese Railway.

These managers soon proved their peculiar ability. The local newspapers were filled with reports of the alleged success of the Caravanserai, which was said to be forwarding huge consignments of goods from Russia into Mongolia and *vice versa*. All this was pure fiction. Through influential persons the Minister of Finance was prevailed upon to promise a subsidy of 100,000 roubles (\$50,000). Later it was discovered that the capital stock of the company, which was about to make Russia a present of Mongolia, amounted to exactly 620 roubles (\$310), split up into shares of ten roubles each. The managers had the effrontery to get their credit notes printed on the press of the official Chinese newspaper and at the expense of the Eastern Chinese Railway. No mention of the Caravanserai appeared on these notes, which were signed "The Mongolian Cattle Trade Society." They were issued to the value of 6,000 roubles in sums of 1 and 5 silver lans, with the following text in Chinese and Mongolian: "This note may be received in payment by private parties, as well as by state officials, institutions and communal authorities. It may also be received as a substitute for other money in payment of direct and indirect trade taxes. Exchangeable for silver at any time."

Simultaneously other notes were issued with Russian, Chinese and Mongolian texts, with this difference, however, that while in Russia the value of the note was given as one lan, it appeared as five lans in the Chinese and Mongolian texts.

According to the versions given at the time in Russian and Chinese papers, this promising company perished prematurely

owing to the carelessness of one of its members, all of whom had agreed to destroy all correspondence between themselves upon perusal. Certain letters in some way got into the hands of the Russian Minister at Peking, while another fell into the hands of the Minister of Finance. In one of these letters, addressed to the agent at Bodune, the chief manager of the company instructed him to manufacture invoices to the amount of 10,000 roubles, assuring him that the St. Petersburg people were too stupid to discover the trick, and would certainly grant the subsidy. In St. Petersburg, naturally, they did not relish the compliment.

This fraudulent enterprise, an imitation of the Yalu Timber Concession Company, which played so ruinous a part in events leading up to the Russo-Japanese war and managed to obtain from the government a concession of 3,500,000 roubles, thus fell to the ground. But the idea on which it was based, to separate Mongolia from China, has survived.

III. DEFENDER OF MONGOLIAN AUTONOMY

In order to put its plans into practice, the Russian government has taken advantage of the internal troubles of China. Ten days after the proclamation of the Chinese Republic, an official communication was issued in St. Petersburg to the effect that the Mongols had proclaimed their independence at Urga, electing their spiritual head, the Khutukhta, as Khan, and had applied to Russia for support against China; it was added that the Russian government would grant such support. Thus Russia, so merciless to her own malcontents rising in defense of their rights, takes the position of a kindly mediator between a foreign government and its revolted subjects. While denying the claim to autonomy raised by the highly civilized Finns, it assumes the noble role of defender of the autonomy of the semi-savage Mongols.

By this intrusion into the internal affairs of her independent neighbor, Russia intended to finally wrest Mongolia from China. But she did not stop there. Ignoring all international rules and denying China's sovereignty over Mongolia, Russia signed a treaty with the latter, promising support of Mongolian autonomy against China. This was interpreted as entitling the Mongols to maintain a national army of their own and to refuse admission into their territory to Chinese officials and colonists.

The real meaning of the Russo-Mongolian treaty of October, 1912, has not been cleared up in the Russian press. It is significant that the word "independence" figures neither in the text of the agreement nor in the government *communiqué* by which it was accompanied, and that in spite of all their efforts the Mongol princes failed to obtain the inclusion of that word in the document. Russian diplomacy regards the treaty as an act of recognition of an "autonomous" Mongolian government, with which it henceforth establishes direct relations. Russia refuses to tie its hands by using the word "independence", explaining to the Mongols, not without irony, that the very fact of its concluding a treaty with them constituted a recognition of their independence. The imperial audience, granted at Tsarskoe Selo to the Mongolian deputation headed by Handa-Van, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, was indeed a denial of Chinese sovereignty, but not a renunciation on the part of Russia of her intention to establish in the future a protectorate over Mongolia.

In spite of the recent date of the treaty, the Russo-Mongolian honeymoon seems to be nearing a close. Russia has taken occasion to increase the strength of the Cossack forces attached to her consulates in Mongolia. At Urga there are now five hundred men armed with rapid-firing guns. Several differences have arisen between Russia and the Mongolian Minister of the Interior, Dalama Tchimid-Tsiren. Fired with the prospect of his country's complete independence and regeneration, Tchimid-Tsiren insisted that the Mongols should be left free to carry out reforms in conformity with their own interests, without dictation from outside. Such energy, disinterestedness and patriotism on the part of the minister were distasteful to Russia, and the Russian minister to China, M. Krupensky, demanded not merely his dismissal, but also his expulsion from Urga. This episode throws light on Russia's attitude toward Mongolian "autonomy". The Mongolian ministers are expected to be the obedient agents of Russian authority.

Side by side with this policy, openly pursued by Russian agents, there is going on a secret movement, which is calculated not only to render Russia's relations with China exceedingly acute, but also to estrange the handful of Mongolian princes and high ecclesiastical dignitaries who are now favorably disposed toward Russia. I refer to the so-called Uriankhay question. Although the European press is unfamiliar with it as yet, it will give it attention seriously enough in the near future.

IV. THE URIANKHAY QUESTION

The imperialists of no other country display such perfidy, violence, and disregard of promises, combined with insatiable greed, as do the directors of Russia's foreign policy. Undaunted by the Mongolian attitude of aloofness and antipathy, they plan to deprive "independent" Mongolia of a whole territory, the so-called Uriankhay country. The Uriankhay question was expounded very clearly for the first time in a secret book, which no one has been permitted to publish, "Across the Layanans and Mongolia," by Captain Victor Popoff, of the Russian General Staff. It is also treated in another equally confidential work, entitled "An Account of a Journey to Northwestern Mongolia and the Uriankhay Country," by Captain Mikheyeff, also of the Russian General Staff. The import of these books is the extreme importance of the Uriankhay country to Russia. It is said to be a great strategical base in case of a conflict with China, which is represented as inevitable in the near future, and the imperative need of getting hold of the territory at all costs is insisted upon. This idea now runs like a red thread through all the effusions of the Russian nationalist press on the Uriankhay question.

Documents have been discovered which show that as long ago as 1689 some of the inhabitants of Uriankhay, the Laites and the Shulenge, became Russian subjects, taking an oath of allegiance for themselves and their children and employing the following picturesque language: "The treaty of allegiance to the Russian Tsar having been read out, the Laites and Shulenge have kissed the muzzle of a gun and cut dogs with a sword, from which they have licked the blood, and have afterwards each drunk a cup of cold water." This ancient declaration of allegiance to Russia is a sufficient basis, according to the nationalist writers, for the ceding to her by Mongolia of an enormous tract of land embracing 100,000 square miles. It is contended that it is hers already. Because of those few drops of dog-blood shed two hundred and twenty-four years ago, Russian imperialists to-day consider themselves legally entitled to enter simultaneously into a bloody conflict with countless millions of Chinese and with the Mongolians upon whom Russia has just been showering her benefits.

If we are to believe certain wild dreamers, Uriankhay is a sort of Klondike, where gold is found on the surface of the ground. But the Russian jingo press sees the great importance

of the region to consist in its strategical position. In Russian hands it would become a menace to China, should she attempt to restore her former rights in Mongolia, and an engine of war wherewith to strike Mongolia if she shows disobedience to Russia's will. The Uriankhay country, which like a wedge extends into Siberia, will, when controlled by Russia, no longer threaten the great Siberian railway and communication with the Far East. Instead of being a potential advance post of China in the impending struggle between the two great races, it will be transformed into a base of operations for the extension of the frontiers of the already boundless Russian empire.

The impression which a realization of Russia's plans is calculated to produce upon the Mongolian population may be imagined. The theft of a vast province from an "autonomous" country would rouse the Mongols more than anything that has happened during the last few decades; it would open the eyes even of these semi-savages to the real character of Russian friendship and to the doings of their corrupt spiritual leaders, who are delivering the country into the hands of foreigners.

Thus the continuance of peace on Russia's Asiatic frontier is by no means assured. Not only has Russia provoked against herself China, with whom for centuries she has lived without war, but even the Mongols she has made suspicious of every step she takes in their country. The Mongolian adventure has already had its effect on Russia's international position. It cannot be doubted that the timid attitude of Russian diplomacy in the Balkan question and Russia's unprecedented fear of becoming entangled in a European war, were inspired in no small degree by the apprehension of a sudden attack in the rear on the extended Asiatic frontier of the empire. With all China's military backwardness, Peking is less than a thousand miles distant from Kiaktha, whereas the distance between the latter and Moscow is over four thousand miles; and while only eight hundred and sixty miles separate Peking from Aigun, the latter is five thousand miles from Moscow.

These facts alone should have emphasized the need for caution with regard to China and Mongolia. Russian diplomacy, however, cannot stem its headlong course of aggression. Far from appeasing the imperialists, every new acquisition only whets their appetite. Russian imperialism is an insatiable monster, ever demanding more food and fresh prey.

The Socialization of Saving

By ARTHUR WALLACE CALHOUN

Professor of Sociology and Economics, Maryville College

It is worth while to consider the logic of the renewed interest at present manifested in Poor Richard's gospel of frugality and the simple life. What is the significance of the emphasis that certain economists have been putting on the virtue of saving on the part of the masses? and how much value should be attached to the doctrine?

The first thought that suggests itself in this regard is that the doctrine in question is calculated to be a stout prop for Capitalism, about whose future some of its own adherents seem to be more dubious than the more hopeful Socialists are certain. It is well known that the man with a few dollars invested is likely to be more possessed by the capitalist spirit than the man with a much bigger stake. And even the workingman with no savings, if only he have sufficient hope, is likely to stand, not with the class to which he now belongs, but with the class to which he hopes to belong when he shall have saved enough to make him, as he fancies, a capitalist. If, then, the practice of saving can be diligently cultivated among the masses, a reactionary tendency may be injected into the ranks of labor that will make the frugal workingman more or less immune to the advances of the Socialist who wishes to convince him that he belongs on the proletarian side in the class struggle. It is evident, therefore, that, whether intentionally or not, the advocates of general saving are playing into the hands of Capitalism, as against the assaults made by Socialists on the present custom of interest and profits. Of this fact the Socialists are aware, hence their tendency to disapprove any general propaganda made in behalf of the doctrine of "saving."

It is a commonplace that in so far as saving is for the purpose of investment, and not merely as a safeguard of the future, its advantage consists in the fact that it gives the saver the privilege of participating in the fruits of other men's labors. Its benefit depends largely on the fact that relatively few are able to save. If everyone were saving, the result would be that everyone would be taking toll of other people, and would himself be giving part of the proceeds of his labor to other people, resulting in a state of affairs not unlike that of the castaways on the famous island who lived by taking in each other's washing.

For if everyone were saving, the supply of capital goods would soon become a white elephant, and would be largely sterile, because far in excess of the needs of society.

Such considerations suggest some criticisms of the traditional philosophy of saving.

Shall a man save in order to have abundant means of enjoyment in his later years, when he is less capable of work? But as his capacity for work decreases, in like manner does his capacity for enjoyment decrease, and he finds himself convicted of irretrievable folly in missing enjoyment when he might have had it, in order to make it financially possible at a time when his sensibilities have so lost the keen edge of youth that he can enjoy in only a feeble degree.

Shall a man save in order to give his posterity an easier time than he had? Experience shows that beyond a certain very moderate amount, such unearned godsend are deadly rather than helpful. They blight the talents of the children to whom they come, or maintain in high places weaklings unfit for survival. The experience of the past in this regard shows that unrestricted inheritance is one of the blights on our supposed democratic equality of opportunity. The man that cares to perpetuate this system of special privilege may be a kind father, but he is not a wise father, and assuredly he is an execrable citizen.

Shall a man then save in order to lead an easier life, by taking tribute of the industry of others? Surely it will be agreed that the citizen that refuses to employ his own capacities for social service is in his way as despicable as the man who, with fewer opportunities, turns his talents to preying on society by criminal violence. Or, if it be granted that he intends to engage in some dilettante philanthropy, or other polite employment, with intent to benefit society, what reason have we to suppose that his aristocratic self-confidence is a better credential of fitness for such work, than was the vision of the rustic who saw in flaming letters P C in the sky his call to Preach Christ but was informed by a kind friend that it probably signified rather "Plow Corn." It would surely seem that we need some better test than individual fancy for the selection of our social workers.

Shall our incipient capitalist, then, save in order to gather into his hands the power to dominate, firstly in the industrial world, and thereby in the world of government, culture, and ecclesiastical activity? Certainly the situation in which society

finds itself at the present writing would suggest to the friend of social well-being that there is no need of encouragement to accumulation with this end in view. And it is scarcely honest to encourage a host of petty savers by holding out before them such hopes of dominance, which are as certain to make shipwreck as were the chances of the traditional American boy to attain the Presidency of the United States. The minority stockholder is the joke of American finance.

To what end, then, and to what degree, is saving commendable? Was the old gospel of frugality erratic and delusory? By no means. Private saving had its place in its day, just as did slavery. It will be granted that, in an age of deficit, when man's utmost efforts were, on account of the lack of proper instruments of production, incapable of accumulating a surplus for the whole people,—it will be granted that in such an age of deficit, slavery which secured a surplus to the few, whereby they could enjoy leisure and thereby develop the instrumentalities of civilization, was a means of social progress, preferable to a state of primitive equality and stagnation. But slavery was a system appropriate only to such an age of deficit. Similarly, the accumulation of capital by private individuals was appropriate to an age of deficit, when society was too ignorant and crude to be able, out of its scanty production, to safeguard the interests of all and provide a permanent capital for future production. But its validity in such an age of social poverty does not prove the necessity for private saving in an age such as that upon which we are entering,—an age in which mankind is coming increasingly into possession of all the means to an abundant life for all. It would be strange if, in such an age of social surplus, society should remain content to gather its capital in the same old whimsical haphazard way that prevailed in the ages of economic barbarism. We are waking to the fact that saving is appropriately a social function that may not safely be left to the caprice of a host of unsocial individuals.

To what degree does society benefit from individual "saving" as it now proceeds?

In the first place, much of the money accumulated by our blessed savers goes into real estate speculation. Now, whatever may be the consequences of such deals, assuredly they do not add to the amount of productive equipment of society. They may stimulate the opening up of new fields, but there is no indication that America needs stimulation to the hasty exploitation

of her natural resources. Whether the flow of funds into real estate swells prices in a given locality or helps to lower the rate of returns on money, there is no indication that it adds one iota to the equipment by which society makes its living.

Again, much of the money saved goes into the needless duplication of already existing capital. Our mills and factories running at half pressure, our railroads hauling half-empty trains along parallel tracks of supposedly competing lines, our hordes of starving grocers and other small dealers, all testify to the fact that it is possible for a society to overcapitalize, to encumber itself with an excess of equipment. Certainly savings turned into such wasteful duplication is of no benefit to society. It adds nothing to the real means of production. It is fictitious capital, unworthy of the name.

Moreover, when a man saves and puts his money in the bank, it may be loaned out to some spendthrift, who squanders it forthwith. Obviously such an event is not saving at all, but is merely vicarious spending. The fact that B has spent wealth belonging to A, and that A has thereby a claim against B, has done nothing at all to augment society's productive equipment. The "saving" has been of no social benefit.

It is scarcely necessary to mention the type of saver that simply hoards his funds away in some place of fancied security. Such saving is obviously without social benefit.

We are thus reduced to the conclusion that the only case in which private saving is of social advantage is when the money saved is invested in some form of capital goods of which society is in actual need, that is, when the investment goes into some line that is not only undeveloped, but is, at present, in need of development.

It is doubtful whether those that so confidently urge everyone to save have taken all the foregoing considerations into account.

It remains to consider what method of saving is to be recommended in the one case in which saving is socially beneficial. Shall the task of providing the capital actually needed for legitimate industrial development required by present needs of the community be left to the uncontrolled impulses of miscellaneous individuals actuated by purely selfish motives, or may we hope to develop a class of savers actuated by philanthropic motives and guided by some well-defined principles, or shall the saving in question be effected collectively?

Surely social evolution has gone on at haphazard long enough. We have long enough suffered the regime of chaotic individualism, with the social machinery at the mercy of the chance activities of numberless irresponsible individuals uninformed as to social needs, uninformed as to what steps others were taking. The riot of reckless enterprise, seeking gain by financial juggling, by investment in needless or even destructive undertakings, by the encouragement of uncontrolled squandering, and by all the other devious ways of capitalistic finance, has surely by this time brought us to our senses. Saving and investment are, conspicuously, social functions not to be left permanently to private judgment.

Already much saving is being done by collective agencies. A well-ordered corporation takes pains to create a surplus, even contrary to the short-sighted preference of its dividend-greedy stockholders. Collective saving has in so far superseded individual saving. Moreover, numberless enterprises under public ownership yield returns sufficient not only for maintenance (which is in itself a form of saving), but also for extension, or for the development of new public enterprises. These two forms of collective saving, corporation and municipal, point the direction of future social policy. The time may not yet be ripe for the replacement of the old method of private saving by the new method of corporate saving, but it is bound to be more and more recognized that saving is essentially a public function and must be performed by some agency representing the whole public.

The upshot of our inquiry into the logic of saving rather dismantles the familiar ethic of frugality. The way to social progress is not along the lines of individual saving. Other considerations of great import intervene. If saving is in itself a virtue, we ought to praise the frugality and simple life of the Chinaman and the Italian immigrant, who subsist on nothing and save everything. Our disapproval of them grows out of our recognition of the pulling power of a high standard of living. Instead of trying to teach people to get along on as little as possible, we ought to teach people to want as much as possible. It is by the introduction of new wants in ever increasing number that we may hope to spur the populace to the elimination of waste and exploitation from the productive process and to the development of constantly improving implements of production, in order that we may realize in actuality what we now see as potential,—the transition from the pain economy to the pleasure

economy. Saving is a virtue appropriate to a regime of capitalism and industry for private profit. Under a regime of socialized industry, it need not be stressed as a virtue. It will not be a matter of private concern. It will not be thought of as meritorious. It will be a matter-of-course, conducted by society, not left to individual discretion. Its place in the list of personal virtues will be taken by eager, wise expenditure. Thus does industrial evolution reverse values.

Organization of the Unskilled

By AUSTIN LEWIS

(Concluded)

It must be admitted indeed that there is an undercurrent of hostility towards the American Federation of Labor among the unskilled of the West. The labor leaders in the reports quoted refer to the distrust with which their efforts are received at the hands of the migratory laborers. Occasionally, indeed, at the meetings of the Industrial Workers some one gets up and proposes to "scab the A. F. of L. out of existence." The suggestion always receives a certain amount of support and is accorded more or less applause. But the influential members are practically a unit against such sentiments, taking the ground that the solidarity of labor would be irreparably injured by such behavior and the morals of the working class destroyed. They carry the audience by the ethical appeal. But it is obvious that such an appeal has its weakness, and that the time might easily come when pressure might destroy its effect.

Distrust on the side of the unskilled is met by scorn on the part of the organized. For, however sagacious the leaders may be, and however skillfully they may conceal their feelings, in view of the advantages of organizing the unskilled, they are in advance of the membership. The mechanics and the carpenters have a snobbish disdain of the unskilled laborer and they are at no pains to hide their feelings. Thus the writer heard Mr. Paul Scharrenberg, Secretary-Treasurer of the California State Federation of Labor, make the statement to the

convention of his organization in 1912, that the skilled organized men would not go on strike for the benefit of the unskilled.

This is a blow at the very foundation of the organization of the unskilled in the A. F. of L., for its real value consists in the support which the individual unions may expect from the unions associated with them in the Building Trades Councils or in the Central Labor Councils. Without that support organization is nothing, particularly in the case of a labor union which does not form a fraction of an international union.

Yet the attitude of the ordinary trade unionist in such case is not at all incomprehensible. In fact, viewed from the standpoint of personal self-interest it is eminently commonsense and commendable on general business principles. Why should a trade unionist put himself to the inconvenience of a strike to benefit a poorly paid and generally negligible member of the unskilled proletariat, with whom he has no intimate relations and to whom the members of his family consider themselves vastly superior in every way? Viewed from the mere economic side the idea must seem absurd to the average skilled workman. Hundreds of men earning respectable wages of four or five dollars a day cannot be expected willingly to expose themselves to financial loss to secure three dollars a day for the unskilled. The property notion is uppermost. The fact can be readily appreciated. The possession of an infinitesimally small piece of property will stand between the possessor and the recognition of labor fraternity. The skilled workmen will not strike on behalf of the unskilled, nor will they make any other sacrifices in his behalf as long as they hold an economic position which they regard as secure.

Neither will the skilled men consent to recognize the methods which the unskilled must employ in order to achieve their ends. The contract with the employer is the very essence of the unionist position. An agreed scale of wages and hours, to terminate at a given time, with due notice and proper legal formalities constitute a very essential part of trade unionism. The business agent exists to get and maintain these contracts, which are generally religiously and scrupulously observed. In fact, if they are broken, it is not usually by the workers but by the employers. This does not necessarily imply bad faith on the part of the employer, but is usually merely due to the very obvious fact that the latter can obtain better legal advice because he is better able to pay for it. A contract is a legal document, to be con-

strued in legal terms, subject to the operation of legal technicalities. The employer is quite at home here, for the bourgeois always cheat one another in the name of the law.

But these agreements and delays mean death to the unskilled worker, who is compelled by the necessities of the case to strike rapidly and hard. His life is so uncertain, he always stands so perilously near the edge, that he can waste no time. Under such conditions he is bound to come into collision with the law of procedure established in the trades union movement.

Recently, for example, the unskilled workers in my neighborhood in California demanded a three-dollar-a-day scale. They proceeded to enforce their demand forthwith and were fairly successful. Thereupon they fell under the condemnation of the Building Trades Council with which they were affiliated, because they had not given the requisite sixty days' notice. Their action was declared irregular and the council accordingly refused its endorsement. Subsequently, some five months after, the demand was sanctioned by the State Building Trades. Such tactics are simply fatal to the unskilled. They cannot endure them. Yet the basic underlying notion of the A. F. of L. rests upon a hypothesis which renders such regulations actually necessary.

The methods pursued by the organizations of the unskilled are admittedly not the methods which the regular trade unions employ, for the conditions are entirely different. That which might be of use to the skilled laborer of the building trades is worse than useless to the unskilled. This unavoidable difference in necessary tactics proceeds from an equally unavoidable and essential incompatibility in economic position. This incompatibility in turn renders any alliance between the unskilled and the skilled workers in the A. F. of L. in the long run impossible.

Neither does the fault, if that which is unavoidable can be called a fault, rest with the skilled worker alone. The unskilled worker when he is organized wishes to improve his position. He does not desire, as we have already pointed out, to be eternally doomed to the role of the unskilled. He wishes to break into the more highly skilled trades, and he will try to do it. Already the tile setters in the vicinity of San Francisco have complained that the unskilled men organized in the United Laborers and carrying an A. F. of L. card have "scabbed" upon them, and have set tiles without carrying a card in the tile setters' union. There has been much discussion about it.

It is expecting too much of human nature that these men should refrain from doing work which they and their employers consider that they can do. Carrying a union card they consider themselves union men, and think that they are ill-used if their card does not entitle them to make as good a living as opportunity affords.

It is very difficult to meet their argument effectively. The only reply is the admission that the tile setters' union is an organization intended to secure a monopoly of tile setting and its emoluments to the limited number of men who belong to the union. This may be satisfactory to members of the union, but hardly to those not members.

As the organization proceeds these disputes will grow more common, and the incompatibility of the union of skilled and unskilled will become more and more obvious. Of course, if the A. F. of L. becomes more thoroughly industrialized this argument will not apply. But such industrialization will not be accomplished by the proclamation of any particular doctrine, for the work of the industrial process will first have to be more clearly manifested to the rank and file of organized labor. In the meantime there will be no secure place in the A. F. of L. for an organization of the unskilled.

III.

It may be noted however that the old form of trades unionism appears to be undergoing a transformation. Even the political Socialists express a hesitating but distinct preference for the industrial form. They couch their language, indeed, in discreet terms, so as not to give offense to the leaders of trades unionism and to avoid the risk of losing votes. They admit that the unskilled workers are syndicalists because they cannot help it and that the first point in the program of English and American syndicalists is the propaganda of industrial unionism in place of the existent craft unionism.

If syndicalism offers the only opportunity to these unskilled men they are surely not to be condemned for taking it, and the use of the word "syndicalism" by them to describe the form of their organization can certainly not be considered as sufficient reason for condemnation.

We have already tried to show that the unskilled cannot function in any form of organization of a craft nature. The crafts will not move for them.

It is necessary therefore that they move the crafts.

They can only do this by forcing the crafts which will not strike on their behalf into such a position that they must cease work whether they will or not. In other words, the unskilled must be so organized that they can compel the highly paid workmen to share in their fight.

Tremendous and, in some respects, almost hopeless as it appears, this is the strategic position in which the unskilled must place themselves, if they are really to impress themselves upon the labor movement and force the consideration of their claims upon the more fortunate and better organized workers.

The recognition of this fact has impelled the unskilled worker towards syndicalism, and has given an impetus towards the recognition of French unionism. This is not altogether satisfactory, for it must be admitted that much of the activity of French unionism makes no appeal to those who have been accustomed to the handling of large bodies of men under conditions industrially in advance of those in France. Some of the French manifestations are simply ridiculous, as are indeed some manifestations of the great unions elsewhere. Judging by recent experience, on the other hand, it can hardly be said that the German unions, even with the assistance and co-operation of the Social Democratic leaders, are altogether admirable.

Be that as it may, the unskilled are being organized in no other fashion than by an approach to syndicalism. The unions so organized must go through their experiences, must face actual conditions, and will either survive and be all the stronger for their experiences or succumb. They must prove their worth in terms of their own life, like any other organization. So far, however, we can say of the syndicalist movement, as Marx said of the Socialist, that it is "*puer robustus sed malitiosus.*"

The unskilled must help themselves and the only way that they can do so is by forming an organization apart and distinct from that of the skilled workers, one which is in fact the antithesis of that of the skilled worker in concept and design. The unskilled must constitute themselves the nucleus. They cannot be grafted on to the existent form: they must take a form for themselves. Their organization must be representative of common unskilled labor and not of accidentally skilled labor. Therein lies their power.

The realization of that power will come from the inherent and unavoidable hostility of the skilled trades.

Had it been possible for the unskilled laborer to have made

an alliance with these trades, he might have remained in a subservient position and leaned for help upon the crafts. Disappointment would then surely have awaited him. The red tape of organization and the slow processes of the propertied crafts would have throttled him, and would have helped to keep him in an inferior position. The impossibility of such an organization has, however, made it imperative for the unskilled laborer to seek his own organization.

Industrial unionists so-called, and even American and British Socialists, are still obsessed with the idea that the unskilled may be made an instrument for keeping up the standard of the skilled and maintaining the latter in their small property rights. But the unskilled cannot allow themselves to be so used. They have no need to make concessions, because actually they hold the strategic position and can in the long run shake down the house of cards of organized craft labor.

This statement may seem absurd in view of the great number of unskilled and the apparent impossibility of welding them into a harmonious and effective organization. But it will soon be easier to organize the masses of the so-called unskilled than it was only a few years ago to organize the carpenters, who worked by threes and fours in small shops scattered here and there under various competing employers.

The machine industry rules the mass of unskilled proletarians. It drives them to work together in unison. It forces them to keep time with the industrial machine and in so doing teaches them the goose step of industrial organization, for organization by the employer is the first step to the self-organization of the employed. In that fact lies the real significance of the teachings of Marx and Engels, who showed that apart from all philosophical abstractions and ethical considerations and apart altogether from any humanitarian notions, the machine industry itself creates the brain-stuff of the revolution. Preaching cannot put the idea into the mind of the worker. Facts themselves force him to revolt. Facts also teach him the method of revolt. This method takes more and more the form of spontaneous mass action. This is the reflex upon the mind of the workers who have nothing in common and never have had anything in common except the fact of common environment, a common subjection to the machine industry. This is the reason that the unskilled are goaded into mass action wherever the machine industry has become established.

The unskilled are in the basic industries. They really hold the strategic position, for they can hoist the whole industrial fabric into the air by abstention from work. No sentimental bonds control them. They are not subject to the ethical and patriotic concepts which have drugged the minds of the organized skilled workers. They have no illusions about the value of political action, for they have no vote. They can be organized, indeed they are, apparently slowly, but really very rapidly being organized.

They are learning the trick of concerted action. They will not wait to be organized by the skilled workers, in fact, the skilled workers cannot organize them. They will nevertheless have an organization, for they will organize themselves, and they will organize themselves as syndicalists.

Unskilled workers have an identity of interest with each other, but no identity of interest with the skilled. Identity of interest, however, is the impelling force to organization. The political Socialists, particularly the left wing, are making their fundamental mistake at this point. They argue that the interests of the proletarians are identical as against the capitalist, as in fact they are, but they ignore the fact that the interests of the so-called proletarians are not always identical with one another. When a matter of property is involved, even if it be only the transient and uncertain property in skill, interests become differentiated and there can be no united or really purposeful action.

But these unskilled, by virtue of their very proletarianism, are able to move even the mass of the skilled, for as soon as they organize and enter upon their right they challenge the existing system at its very base.

Here, again, they fulfill all the conditions of the Marxian proletariat. On this account they are able to move large masses, even of the skilled, in times of industrial struggle and to appeal to the fundamental and underlying proletarianism which the craft form of organization obscured. The small-property notion of the skilled under these circumstances becomes subordinated. This would happen more readily but for the hostility of the labor leaders, who continually warn their followers that an independent organization of the unskilled must be discouraged. Where the A. F. of L. controls, the leaders are able to make their prohibition effective through their control of the jobs. But for this, many thousands of skilled men would

willingly throw in their lot with the mass and demand an organization that required but one card and gave them an opportunity of solidarity in an industrial movement.

The time for such a consummation is, however, not yet. The craft unions must be subjected to still further pressure and their inefficiency must be made patent. How far the unskilled unions can assist in the work of destroying craft small property depends altogether upon the particular circumstances of each case, and involves too many factors to be successfully examined at this point.

In the meantime they are driven to a syndicalist form of organization. They are of necessity impelled to direct action, not by any means, however, in the sinister sense in which the term is employed by many Socialists. That this is so is now receiving practically universal acceptance even among the ultra-parliamentarians of a decade ago.

What is this syndicalism, then, to which the unskilled have been obliged to turn? We cannot find a better statement than that which appeared in a recent number of the *London New Age* as follows: "The object of syndicalism is to induce in the workers a sense of solidarity and concurrently to electrify the mass for corporate action."

Whatever objections may be made to this method cannot have any weight, as regards the unskilled, for it is admitted that no other can be followed by them. It is clear also that the pursuit of such a method on the scale which its use would imply must be fraught with tremendous consequences to the labor movement.

On Broadway

By Harry Kemp

Rather a quiet country lane
 I knew of yore,
 A face against the window-pane,
 An open door.

The Social Significance of Futurism

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

"The ideals of mechanical progress will influence his heart."—F. T. Marinetti.

There is a type of mind, conservative as well as radical, which has a stereotyped conception of new ideas in art. The conservative indiscriminately condemns; the radical as indiscriminately praises. There is another type, more grotesque still,—the man who traces new ideas in art and literature to pathologic causes. Disciples of this "pathologic" or "physiologic" interpretation are many, even among Socialists. The social *milieu*, which determines ideas and movements, seems to these folks a closed book or a mere figure of speech.

The New Art, of which Cubists and Futurists are the most characteristic representatives, is being interpreted in this pathologic spirit. This art is said to be the product of abnormal, pathologic brains; of men who suffer from neurosis and downright degeneracy. But even if we assume that "decadent" manifestations in art are pathologic, does this account for their *form* of expression, for the movement itself? Was Francois Villon's art identical with that of Paul Verlaine or Oscar Wilde? "Degenerate" artists never cease; if at a given moment they produce movements, it is because they express a cultural urge conditioned by the social *milieu*.

Byronic Romanticism, that legitimately exaggerated revolt against the crushed ideals and conservative reaction succeeding the French Revolution, was, and sometimes still is, considered pathologic. Not a few critics ascribed Wagner's revolutionary music to pathologic degeneracy—that music which expressed strident, inchoate revolt amid the discordances of industrial civilization, a music cast in the mold of Nietzsche, human-symbol of Wagner's stormy generation. The music of Richard Strauss is generally considered decadent. Yet Strauss' music expresses the Pagan spirit now transforming our moribund culture. That Strauss does not express the Greek spirit full-orbed is due to the Pagan spirit being immature and corrupted by contact with capitalist degeneracy—a bourgeois and not a proletarian manifestation. Whosoever mentions pathology in this connection must consider pathologic the vital, universal Pagan urge of our generation.

Three men symbolize, artistically and socially, the Russia of recent times—Tolstoy, Gorky, Artsibasheff. Tolstoy's passive resistance doctrines flourished in Russia during the revolutionary ebb of the eighties; the passive theory expressed social discouragement, failure, despair. Gorky's virile, revolutionary literature coincides with a virile, active revolutionary movement. Since Bloody Sunday and its reaction, the Russian youth, discouraged, hopeless, expressed its spirit and energy in an orgiastic saturnalia, a mood voiced in Artsibasheff's "Sanin". A multiplicity of "Sanin Clubs" attests the social urge. The revolutionary reaction expresses itself in another form in Andreiev's morbid gloom, corrosive doubt and revolutionary paralysis.

Art reflects life; it is social and not individualistic. Therein lies the value of art and literature to the student of history. Vital art expresses the vital urge of its age. Aspirations continually change with changing social conditions; art changes in harmony therewith, not only in spirit but also in methods. Art appears deadly opposed to pouring the wine of new aspirations into the bottles of old methods.

Considered in this light, the New Art expresses capitalism. It is the art of capitalism—not the "art of decadent and dying capitalism", as some would have it, but of capitalism dominant (Cubism) and capitalism ascending (Futurism). The aggressive, brutal power of Cubism and Futurism is identical with the power and audacity of capitalism, of our machine-civilization. The New Art is as typical of capitalism as the architecture of the sky-scraper. Paul Lafargue somewhere says that machinery induces in the worker a disbelief in God, while the mechanism of stock exchange operations develops a sort of fetichistic religion in the bourgeois. If machinery affects such a spiritual matter as religion, small wonder that the spirit and power of machinery should transform art.

Cubism, as I said, is the art of capitalism dominant; Futurism the art of capitalism ascending, struggling for ascendancy. This accounts for the Cubists having a definite technique, while Futurists are vague and indefinite, failing largely to embody creed in artistic productions. Futurism paints the spirit of machinery,—energy, motion, aggression. Cubism does more. Cubism transfers the technique of machinery, so to speak, to the canvas. In the words of a writer who sees a glimmer of the truth: "The line of grace has been replaced, in the Cubist pictures, by the lines of utility and strength. Curves have been

discarded for angles. The Cubists paint as if there were nothing but mechanism in the universe."

Futurism is the most interesting manifestation of the New Art. While Cubism simply expresses artistically the spirit of capitalism, Futurism in Italy, its birthplace, is a utilitarian movement seeking to establish the supremacy of capitalism. In an article in the *St. Louis Mirror* (May 16, 1913) on "Futurism in Italy", the first sociological interpretation of the movement, I said:

"Italian aspirations for industrial progress and the effort to throw off the dead, fossilized hand of the Medieval past, have largely crystallized the Futurist movement.

"In the fourteenth century Italy's industrial and commercial supremacy produced the cultural efflorescence of the Renaissance. When the center of commercial power shifted to North Europe, Italy sank into the slough of Medieval darkness. The serfs who had been freed from the soil and migrated into the towns as proletariat, Marx says, 'were driven *en masse* into the country, and gave an impulse, never before seen, to the *petite culture*, carried on in the form of gardening.' Once a purely 'geographical expression', Italy has since the *Risorgimento* been largely an agricultural expression. Italy needs industrial expansion. Petty agriculture hampers national growth. Semi-feudal conditions remain to be overthrown. But the Italian bourgeois are inept, cowardly, narrow-visioned. They possess little initiative, nor the courage to conceive large projects. In addition, Italy lacks natural advantages—coal and iron, factors indispensable for industrial development, the abundant possession of which makes China an ominous portent in the world market. Italy, accordingly, has thrived on its petty agriculture and its past, feeding on tourists and making cash out of the 'grandeur that was Rome'. Virile Italians are in revolt at this social degeneracy. Instead of worshipping the past and exploiting its grandeur, Futurists demand overthrow of the past, the forging ahead of industrial progress. Their slogan is, Down with the grandeur of the past! Up with the grandeur of the present and the future! Futurism is the apotheosis of industrialism."

Futurism, accordingly, emphasizes all that is distinctively capitalist as against that which is feudal or semi-feudal. The following passages from F. T. Marinetti's manifesto, published in the *Paris Figaro* in 1909, briefly and comprehensively express this spirit:

"Literature having up to now glorified thoughtful immobility, ecstasy and slumber, we wish to exalt the aggressive movement, feverish insomnia, running, the perilous leap, the cuff and the blow.

"We declare that the splendor of the world has been enriched by a new form of beauty, the beauty of speed. A race-automobile is more beautiful than the Victory of Samothrace.

"There is no more beauty except in struggle; no masterpiece without the stamp of aggressiveness. Poetry should be a violent assault against unknown forces to summon them to lie down at the feet of man.

"We will sing the great masses agitated by work, pleasure or revolt; we will sing the multi-colored and polyphonic surf of revolutions in modern capitals; the nocturnal vibration of arsenals and docks beneath their glaring electric moons; greedy stations devouring smoking serpents; factories hanging from the clouds by the threads of their smoke; adventurous steamers scenting the horizon; and the slippery flight of aeroplanes."

In these vivid, incisive words Marinetti expresses the *cultus* of capitalism.

Industrially, capitalism produces a new economic power, "the collective power of masses" (Marx); esthetically capitalism produces a new beauty, the "beauty of speed". Futurists idealize motion, speed—the very essence of industrial society. Futurist art attempts to express motion, much as the impressionists portrayed light in action and nature's evanescent moods. Futurist art, accordingly, even though not fully materializing its ideal, possesses a nervous force and power startlingly vivid, oppressive, characteristic of our machine-civilization, of our wireless age.

Terrible as are its evils, capitalism is superior to the cemetery-civilization stifling Italy. Capitalism at least carries within itself the germs of its own destruction, hence of a nobler civilization. Even in North Italy, where capitalism flourishes, traces of feudal psychology persist, encouraged by bourgeois sloth and the Roman Catholic Church. Not only Futurism, virtually all forces in Italy are making for capitalist progress. The imperialistic burlesque in Tripoli may react upon and encourage industrial development. The Camorra trial some years ago marked an epoch: the struggle of capitalist civilization, and all implied thereby, with the remnants of feudal disorder, barbarity and psychology of the masses, centralized in the Camorra, a political machine exploiting and intensifying feudal mentality. As the *Rome Tribuna* said at the time, "It looks as though the trial would mean the regeneration of Southern Italy".

The fight of the Futurist, however, is not merely for industrial progress. The demand is for a new culture, based on a new civilization. It is a fight against mental sloth and corrosive romanticism, against the *dolce far niente* spirit. Action! Motion!

Progress! In his fight against the remnants of the past, the Futurist expresses the material facts of capitalist necessity as abstract truth; and insists upon this truth, the sublimated expression of bourgeois aims, as the regenerative power. The Futurist prates of this Truth in typical bourgeois strain,—as something sublime, eternal: "There is no conscience, there is no noble life, there is no capacity for sacrifice where there is not a religious, a rigid, and a rigorous respect for truth." (Prezzolini, *La Voce*, April 13, 1911.) Romain Rolland, in the last volume of *Jean Christophe*, illumines this phase:

"It might be thought that the fire had died down with the closing of Mazzini's eyes. It was springing to life again. It was the same. Very few wished to see it. It gave a clear and brutal light. * * * The etiquette of parties, systems of thought, mattered not to them: the great thing was to 'think with courage.' To be frank, to be brave, in mind and deed. Rudely they disturbed the sleep of their race. * * * They suffered, as from an insult, from the indolent and timid indifference of the elect, their cowardice of mind and verbolatry. Their voices rang hollow in the midst of rhetoric and the moral slavery which for centuries had been gathering into a crust upon the soul of their country. They breathed into it their merciless realism and their uncompromising loyalty."

All very fine! But this Truth is the sublimated expression of capitalist necessity; this fervent idealism the reflex of capitalist struggle; this Future the dawn of untrammelled capitalist supremacy.

The Futurist demands, figuratively, the destruction of museums and libraries, of the art and literature of the past. This is not a demand for artists and writers alone, who should not "see life through a mist of souvenirs", but must form standards in harmony with their generation. It is also a social demand. For Italy socially is much of a museum; Rome lives on its classical tradition; Florence is nothing but a picture gallery. This state of things breathes social death. In their place the Futurist demands factories and commerce. And not the Futurist alone. Therein lies the social significance of Futurism. Non-Futurists demand the identical thing. Signor Nathan, the mayor of Rome, uttered the same wish recently:

"Rome must no longer be merely a great hotel, as it was when crowds came to visit the head of Catholicism; Rome must become a great city sufficient unto itself, with its manufacturing quarters and its agricultural zone extending from the mountains to the sea."

The Futurist spirit is broader than the Futurist movement. It is a spirit that has spread over all Italy. It demands a sweeping out of Italy's feudal rubbish. The Futurist movement does not consist of artists alone; among its most zealous adherents

are sociologists, journalists, politicians, men and women in all walks of life, bound together by the ideal of industrial progress. Much as the Futurists condemn the past, they are hypnotized by the past. They dream of reviving the Imperial Italy of the days when Rome ruled the world, and strive for a *terza Roma* which shall hold the world in awe.

Futurism is consequently imperialistic. Not merely because of peculiar conditions in Italy; any art which reflects capitalism is necessarily imperialistic; witness Rudyard Kipling. Futurism glorifies war. War is a "measure of political sanitation", to use Marinetti's phrase, who believes that "nations should follow a constant hygiene of heroism and take every century a glorious bath of blood". Marinetti identifies Futurism not only with Italy's industrial future, but with her imperialistic aspirations as well:

"Our national destiny depends on the Futurist propaganda. As inevitably as the sun rises and sets we shall have to struggle for our life against Austria. If the contest comes when Venice is still sunk in the lethargy of its old romanticism, when Rome is living on its classical traditions, when Florence is nothing but a picture gallery, we are doomed. Furthermore, Tolstoyism and passive resistance are so debilitating the workmen of Italy that I believe if it is not checked by the awakening spirit of Futurism, the Italian people will be as helpless as sheep before a herd of wolves when Austria marches over the frontier."

Austrian invasion of Italy is a mere catch-phrase of the politician. Indeed, there is much more possibility of Italy invading Austria in an effort to seize Trente and Trieste. But Marinetti, in his "religious, rigorous and rigid respect for truth", inverts the problem and falsifies it.

Futurism is the product of peculiar and transitory political and economic conditions in Italy. In this sense, Futurism is comparable to the French Romantic movement. The liberal spirit of the Romantic movement reflected the liberal movement in politics, which, in turn, reflected economic facts. Feudal and bourgeois elements were in revolt against the regime in power. The opposition was a confused one, liberals and absolutists jostling each other. Accordingly, a peculiar feature of the time, noted by Balzac, was that most of the "liberals" were really reactionists, seeking to introduce things of the past. Hence Romanticism's apotheosis of the past. Victor Hugo fortunately broke the vicious circle of worship of the past, and developed as a consistent bourgeois liberal; the other Romantics were lost in the shuffle. And when France outgrew the peculiar conditions of 1830, Romanticism decayed; the regime of Napoleon

the Little crushed Romanticism completely. When social conditions take the bottom out of the movement, Futurism, as a *movement*, will doubtless disappear. For it is a wild, social passion of the moment, a storm worn out by its own fury.

But Futurism artistically will not die. International forces aided the distinctive Italian conditions to produce Futurism. Futurism would not possess the artistic maturity it has were it not for this interaction of local and international forces. This is why Futurism, expressing capitalism ascending, possesses many of the characteristics of capitalism dominant. Modified by local conditions, the New Art is yet one in its international expression of the capitalist *cultus*. Futurism and Cubism will develop, coalesce; and, even more than now, reflect an art typically capitalist.

For this New Art is not a bolt out of a clear sky, as superficial critics, helpless in the face of new phenomena, would have us believe. Literature has been trending in its direction. Zola, with his materialistic precision and application of "scientific principles" to the novel, drama, poetry, adumbrated the movement. In Kipling, the typical Kipling of "MacAndrew's Hymn", "The Ship That Found Herself", and ".007", machine-inspiration dominates. Machinery acts as the leitmotif, throbbing with life, as inexorable as the passions of man. Machinery urges the action and catastrophe. Kipling humanized machinery; the Cubist and Futurist machinize the human.

There is no inspiration in Futurism for the Socialist. It is remarkable that many American Socialists should hail the New Art as something marvellous, epoch-making. I suspect they are taken in by its grandiloquent phraseology. How can the Socialist find inspiration in an art thoroughly and superbly capitalist?—which, while it expresses the power of capitalism, likewise expresses all that is evil and degrading. Must we then admit that the Socialist is generally only an economic revolutionist, and finds inspiration in bourgeois "revolutionary" art?

Socialist art must not adopt the tools of the bourgeois. Socialist art must forge its own tools, evolve its own methods to express and interpret the new culture which the Socialist movement carries within its folds.

John Spargo's "Syndicalism"

By LOUIS LEVINE, Ph. D.

Author of "The Labor Movement in France"

It is not always wisdom on the part of the lecturer to publish his lectures in book form. The author can not enjoy the privileged position of the speaker who may add weight and meaning to his words by eloquence, forcefulness or charm. On the other hand, the lecture as a form of expression has defects which may pass unnoticed in the lecture room, but which are rather conspicuous in cold print. It requires a rare combination of good form, thorough information and sound reasoning to make a lecture worth while the printing.

John Spargo's recent book on Syndicalism* undoubtedly suffers from the fact that it is a mere reproduction of lectures delivered in Brooklyn. There are digressions in it which may be inevitable in lectures, but which are not pleasant in a book; it lacks proportion and abounds in words, which is quite comprehensible in view of both the limitations and the privileges of the lecture hall, but which does not enhance the value of a book; and it conveys the impression of a lightness of touch which is surely intended for the mental ease and comfort of an evening audience, but which is somewhat disappointing to a serious reader.

However, within the limits which he outlined for himself, Spargo has made a praiseworthy attempt to describe and explain syndicalism in an impartial manner. The attempt is the more praiseworthy, the more one realizes all the psychological difficulties involved. It meant that the author had to cultivate sympathy for the syndicalist movement and cleanse his mind of all bias towards his "Syndicalist brother." The process must have been particularly painful as it made it inevitable for the author to expose also the "brazen falsehoods" (see footnote, p. 36) of his erring brother. The strain must have been great, for the author broke down in his impartiality in many a place to the extent of falling into inaccuracies of fact and interpretation. This is rather unfortunate. Spargo should have been particularly on his guard against inaccuracies of statement in view of

* Syndicalism, Industrial Unionism, Socialism, by John Spargo. Published by B. W. Huebsch, New York, 1913. Price, \$1.25 net.

the large ambitions by which he was animated. He proclaimed them himself in quite assuring words in his Preface: "I trust," writes he, "that the statement of the Syndicalist position which I shall make will satisfy most thoroughly of all the thoughtful Syndicalist." To one who knows the hypercritical and sceptical character of the Syndicalist this sounds somewhat presumptuous. Still there is no objection to great plans in this world, if they are really carried out. But Spargo must have a poor opinion of "thoughtful Syndicalists" if he expects them to accept his "statement of the Syndicalist position."

The "thoughtful Syndicalist" cannot accept Spargo's statement as long as he continues to repeat the error which has been made by a number of writers on Syndicalism (such as McDonald, Graham Brooks, etc.) and which it is time to dispel once for all. Spargo assures us that the Syndicalists' ideal is a society in which the unions and not the community will own the means of production, and that in this respect Syndicalism is but a revival of Owenism (pp. 23, 24, 41, 182). Where Spargo obtained his information on this point no one can see. At least, he does not tell us. To prove his erroneous assertion he first quotes Tom Mann to the effect that Robert Owen had advocated long ago industrial organization; on the basis of this quotation he makes the unwarranted conclusion that the *aims* of Owen were "similar" to those of the Syndicalists; then he quotes Mr. and Mrs. Webb on Robert Owen's ideas of the Socialist society in which the unions will own the instruments of production. *Nowhere* does Spargo quote verbatim any Syndicalist writer who says that the unions and not the community should own the means of production. No wonder; he could not, if he wanted to. The "thoughtful Syndicalists" have never said any such thing. Spargo, who views Syndicalism as an amalgam of Anarchism and Socialism, should have known that the fundamental conception with which Syndicalism started out was the idea which is at the basis of both Socialism and Communist Anarchism—namely, that of the collective ownership of the means of production. The fact that Syndicalists claim Owen and Proudhon as their spiritual fathers has nothing to do with this fundamental idea. By following Spargo's method of reasoning one could prove that Marxian Socialism must reproduce all the erratic ideas of St. Simonism, because Engels regarded St. Simon as the forerunner of Marx.

It is time for all critics of Syndicalism—friendly and un-

friendly—to free their minds of this misconception. The Syndicalists speak only of the "control of industry" by the unions which means the determination of conditions under which work should be carried on (*i. e.*, hours, methods, division of labor, etc.). But they do not and cannot contemplate group ownership because they are generally Communists, and could not advocate a social system which would lead to group interests and to rental privileges and which would make distribution on Communist principles impossible.

Misunderstanding of the Syndicalist ideal is accompanied in Spargo's book by misinterpretation of the essentials of Syndicalist method. In this respect Spargo has shown himself absolutely incapable of sympathetic penetration into the psychology of the Syndicalist movement. To him Syndicalism is a "siren voice offering an *easy* way to the shores of the Promised Land."

A siren is supposed to care little for decorum and morality in her efforts to lure her victim. The Syndicalist—in Spargo's interpretation—is even worse, for he "boasts" of the fact that his "methods of fighting are such that their use involves deceit, treachery and cowardice and thus tend to impair the *morale* of the workers." The poor Syndicalist "does not realize that the social revolution if it is ever to succeed will require moral stamina" (p. 59).

If the Syndicalist had not realized that, there would probably never have been any Syndicalism in this world. One of the deepest sources of the Syndicalist movement was and still is the feeling that the transition to a new social order involves the psychological and moral transformation of the workers which can be brought about only by the methods of Direct Action. The books and pamphlets mentioned in the bibliography appended to Spargo's volume contain many interesting passages on this point. Had Spargo grasped their meaning, he would have understood that the Syndicalists do not claim to offer an "easy" way; that, on the contrary, they realize that there is no royal road to emancipation and that the one they point out is beset by the greatest difficulties. Had Spargo avoided this error of interpretation, many of his comments could have been spared. As it is, many passages in that part of his book which deals with methods are entirely irrelevant because they are based on a complete misunderstanding of Syndicalist ideas.

These are the two fundamental points in which Spargo fails

to present Syndicalism at its best so as to satisfy "thoughtful Syndicalists," and which vitiate the largest part of his book. There are a number of minor inaccuracies throughout the book, a few of which may be pointed out. For instance, on page 3 Spargo divides French unions into "yellow" or "conservative", and "red" or "revolutionary". This is quite erroneous because the "yellow" syndicates in France are regarded mainly as tools in the hands of the employers and as strikebreaking agencies. The unions which are bona fide organizations—though conservative in spirit—form a part of the General Confederation of Labor. On page 42, Spargo says that the term "Direct Action" has long been used by Anarchists to cover "the propaganda of the deed" and that the term "historically is identified with insurrection and with terrorism generally, including assassination." Both these statements are wrong. The term "direct action"—it is true—was used occasionally and in a very vague way by some of the Bakounist members of the International. But it did not come into use before the end of the 19th century when it was coined by Pelloutier to express the new spirit of the French Labor Movement. Pelloutier—though a philosophical anarchist—did not believe in assassination or terrorism. In fact "Direct Action" became popular largely because the terrorist activities of the Anarchists had proved a failure. On page 78 Spargo accuses the Syndicalist of regarding the Social Revolution "as an episode, a cataclysmic event." This is strange in view of the fact that Syndicalists have described the Social Revolution as a *process*—both destructive and reconstructive and requiring a long period of time. On page 49 Spargo says that "Sorel's works remain by far the best and strongest theoretical expositions of Syndicalism and are circulated by Syndicalists as such." The first part of this statement is a personal opinion which is not subject to criticism; but the latter part is erroneous. M. Sorel's works have never been much circulated among Syndicalists; but during the last few years they have been withdrawn entirely from circulation among workers, by the active men in the Syndicalist movement.

Besides minor inaccuracies, there is a fundamental error in Spargo's method which is in no way conducive to a true presentation of Syndicalism. Spargo does not seem to have made up his mind at the outset as to the real exponents and representatives of Syndicalism. At one time he deals with organizations, at another he quotes individuals who have noth-

ing to do with the representative organizations. Besides, he chooses the man to be quoted to suit his own purposes—and in many a place he could have reversed his statements if he had quoted Sorel instead of Foster and vice versa. This method of treatment is particularly queer on the part of a Socialist who knows that there are such things as platforms, programs, convention reports, etc. Why not use them?

However, regardless of its faults Spargo's book contains a considerable amount of interesting and exact information in its descriptive part; where it fails completely is in the explanation of the why and wherefore of the Syndicalist movement. This would seem to be the most interesting question to a Marxian Socialist and the one which he would be best fitted to handle. Equipped with his method, the Marxian Socialist would seem to be the social anatomist who could dissect the movement and lay bare the pleasant and unpleasant sights of its inner being. Spargo, though professing to treat Syndicalism from the point of view of Marxian Socialism, hardly touches upon the economic and psychological mainsprings of the movement. He tells us that it is the rebirth of an old movement, but why the old movement should be born from time to time we are not told. He intimates that Syndicalism appeals to certain elements in the Labor Movement, but what are those elements and why Syndicalism is so much to their liking is not disclosed. In fact, if it was not for the "illuminating observation" of the "veteran Socialist," Lucien Sanial, that Syndicalism prospers where "industries are still largely carried on in workshops"—we would remain wholly in the dark on these most perturbing questions. Of course, one cannot help feeling grateful to the veterans who continue to do yeoman service to Socialist theory and practice. But one is strongly tempted to remark that it would be better if the veterans were not so obliging and would give the others a chance to find the light for themselves. There would be more real Marxism in this world and less dependence on the light that fails.

Revolutionary Tendencies in the United Kingdom

By TOM QUELCH (London)

It is a really difficult problem to estimate all the forces making for the Social Revolution on this side of the Atlantic.

The giant economic mill is grinding slowly but surely, and as it grinds a clearer conception of its great historic mission is being forced upon the working class. The class struggle is becoming more clearly defined, more raw and bloody. Trustification proceeds apace, and as capitalism concentrates so it gets more entirely under its control the machinery of government. As a matter of fact the present Liberal government is nothing but the kept instrument of the trust magnates, who supply the party funds. Discontent is rife everywhere. The masters are becoming more arrogant—the workers more revolutionary.

The main cause of the prevailing discontent has been the increased cost of living. According to figures provided by the Board of Trade during the past ten years, the cost of living has risen from thirteen to fifteen per cent., while wages have only risen three per cent. Other causes have been industrial changes: the introduction of new methods of production and distribution, which have compelled workers either to re-learn their particular trade or calling or else find new situations in other departments of industry. Uncertainty of employment, casualization of labor, and the general feeling that no job is permanent have also been contributory factors.

Innumerable strikes have taken place, and from all quarters come rumors of more. We have been passing through a remarkable trade boom, and many of these strikes have been due mainly to the fact that there has been a pressure of work and the moment has been therefore considered the most opportune for a demand for increased wages and better working conditions. How far these strikes have had a revolutionary origin is open to question; but that they are making revolutionists there can be no question at all.

The most significant strike was that of the Dublin tramwaymen and transport workers, led by the redoubtable Jim Larkin. At the time of writing it is not yet settled. The outstanding features have been the murderous brutality of the police, and the food ship provided by English trade unionists to aid their starving Irish comrades.

All this industrial rebellion has caused many of the clearest-headed amongst the organized workers to consider the question of more effective methods of industrial organization. The amalgamation of the various craft unions into industrial unions; the closer national federation of the unions; and the more aggressive methods of trade union warfare have been prominently before the members of the unions. There has also been a stupendous increase in the membership of the trade unions.

Just as the workers are busy solidifying their organizations, so are the employers. The announcement has just been made that a great masters' association with a financial strength of £50,000,000 has been formed.

The battle lines are forming for the final struggle.

The strikes, after all, are only surface effects of the unhealthy state of capitalist society. Indications are not wanting, however, which point to the fact that the period of wonderful industrial activity is now nearing its close. We are undoubtedly on the eve of a great commercial crisis—a period of industrial stagnation. The strike policy may then have to be abandoned, but the discontent will remain and be greatly added to by the increase in unemployment. What will happen then will depend to a large extent upon the readiness of the Socialist movement to take advantage of the critical situation of capitalism.

* * *

Our great German comrade, Karl Kautsky, in his lecture on "The Social Revolution," points out clearly how the influence of Parliament must gradually decline. And that is what is happening here. Parliament is becoming less and less a factor in the eyes of the workers. And the actual power, owing to the government being owned by the trust magnates, is being gradually taken away from Parliament as such and vested more and more in the Cabinet and the Judiciary. Nevertheless the Socialist interest in Parliamentary action has grown considerably: every seat won being considered as additional vantage ground. But it is generally held that the Social Revolution will be brought about long before we attain a Parliamentary majority.

* * *

Beneath all the strife and turmoil one feels that there are immense forces at work. Everyone seems aware that things cannot go on as they are; and to realize the approach of the great change. Events move rapidly. The great work in front

of the Socialist movement of this country—the unification of our forces now seems at hand—is to prepare steadfastly for the coming crisis. Many are of the opinion that then the Social Revolution will be precipitated: that the necessary shock will be given the top-heavy capitalist house of cards. It is a supreme task and one which requires all the energy, enthusiasm and courage the British Socialist movement can command.

London, September 29, 1913.

New Zealand's Labor Movement

By P. H. HICKEY

Secretary-Treasurer of the New Zealand Federation of Labor.

It is now many years since New Zealand first attracted the attention of the social student and reformer through her experimental legislation. Time, the great teacher, has demonstrated that despite the expectations to the contrary, the condition of the New Zealand proletariat is not a whit better economically than that of the workers elsewhere.

The trust is everywhere; its tentacles grasp everything worth taking. Land monopoly flourishes, with its natural corollary of slum areas and all that that connotes. Unprejudiced observers must admit that so far as the New Zealand proletarian is concerned, he is confronted by the same forces as are in operation the world over. It may be that this fact has been responsible for his remarkable awakening. He has been fed on Arbitration Courts, which legalize scabbery; lulled to sleep by Land for Settlement Acts, which didn't settle the land; fascinated by pictures of Workmen's Dwelling Acts, which have not interfered in the slightest with the slum landlord or reduced rents one cent. In short, every conceivable variety of legislation likely to check temporarily the growing desire for the fullest economic freedom has been dazzlingly displayed, and still he is unsatisfied.

Of all the acts passed, probably the only ones granting any measure of relief to the working class are the Factory Acts, Mines Act, the Workers' Compensation Act, the Old Age Pension Act and the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Act. Although the amounts granted under the latter two Acts are ridiculously small, nevertheless, to some extent, they ameliorate those con-

ditions of abject poverty found in countries where no such provision is made.

Although the Liberal party has been responsible for this legislation, the workers, for a good many years past, have been inclining toward a break-away and the establishment of independent political parties of the workers. This feeling found expression in the launching of "Labor Parties" under various names and of a Socialist party. None of these parties, however, could claim to be at all representative, though they did wage unceasing war on each other, each claiming the right to represent Labor.

Out of all this internecine strife came a Unity Congress, remarkable alike for its size, the scope of its representation and its decisions. The Congress opened in Wellington, the capital city, on July 1 last. It was attended by no less than 380 delegates representing 60,000 of New Zealand's 70,000 organized workers. After ten days of debate there was inaugurated, industrially, a United Federation of Labor, the first of its objects being: "To organize systematically and scientifically upon an industrial union basis, in order to assist the overthrow of the capitalist system and thus bring about a co-operative commonwealth based upon industrial democracy." Politically there was established an organization to be called the Social Democratic Party. Its objective is: "The socialization of the means of production, distribution and exchange."

Despite the efforts of a small group of disrupters, backed by the combined voice of the kept press, both movements are being enthusiastically acclaimed by the workers and will be the means of establishing a united industrial and political movement superior to anything yet existing. New Zealand led the world in the realms of political reform. Let a strict watch be kept on these far away isles, fellow-toilers, for here surely will be born one of the very first children of the Social Revolution.

Story of the Putumayo Atrocities

By W. E. HARDENBURG

VI.

THE POSITION TO-DAY

The report of Consul Casement, made public in July, 1912, and immediately taken up by the English press, caused a tremor of horror throughout the civilized world. The tragedies of the Congo paled before the hideous details set forth in the Blue-Book. Public indignation was at last aroused.

One of the first results of the publication of the report was the decision by religious organizations, both Protestant and Catholic, to send missionaries to the Putumayo, the idea being that their presence might in some degree restrain the brutalities of Arana's gang. Furthermore, it was urged, they could from time to time report on the condition of the Indians, and thus keep the matter agitated. With this end in view, both sects appealed for funds. So generous was the response that, within a few months, two large expeditions were equipped and sent out, the Catholics entering by way of Iquitos and the Protestants skirting along the Colombian border to the North.

But the most important result was the appointment of a Select Committee of the House of Commons, for the purposes of ascertaining the degree of responsibility of the British directors of the Company and of determining the desirability of amending the Company Acts to prevent them from being used in connection with similar practices in other foreign countries. This Committee, after some thirty-six sittings extending over a period of several months, has recently delivered its report, a document of considerable interest, which will be reviewed in a succeeding article.

In Peru, also, the Blue-Book created a great sensation, which manifested itself in two ways: firstly, by the formation by a few humane and generous people of the *Association Pro-Indigena*, an organization modelled on the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines' Protection Society and designed to protect the Indians from the more brutal forms of oppression in all parts of Peru; and, secondly, by the "patriotic" articles of the subsidized press, which alleged that the atrocities had ceased years ago and were now put forward again to aid "the machinations

of Colombia." There were also numerous personal attacks on every one who had participated in the exposure, while Arana and his butchers were represented as self-sacrificing heroes, whose only aim had been to serve their country.

This attitude was also adopted by the government. Thus Pezet, the Peruvian Minister to this country, said in a statement to the New York press (July, 1912):

"The atrocities which Sir Roger Casement speaks of were committed years ago. They all occurred not later than 1907. Things are very different now, and the Peruvian government is in entire control of the Putumayo district."

Dr. Paredes, who himself uncovered numerous grave crimes committed in 1908 and 1910, also fled to the defence of the "good name of Peru," and strongly attacked Great Britain in the following terms:

"The responsibility for these crimes should not be made to rest solely with the nation in whose territory they have been committed, but should be shared with the concern which by its methods has obtained enormous profits which have gone into a foreign country and have not benefited in the least the Peruvian nation, her government, or her people."

As a matter of fact, Arana and his sinister relatives owned (and still own) fully 75 per cent. of the stock of the Peruvian Amazon Company, and the government collected more duty on the rubber from the Putumayo than from that of any other river. Further on Dr. Paredes says:

"In the course of my investigations, I was able to convince myself of the culpability of the greater part of the Barbadian negroes who had given evidence to the Casement commission. These British subjects, with the exception of one, had been allowed to leave the country before the arrival of the Peruvian judicial commission. As the Casement report is based principally on the evidence of these men, it is to be regretted that they were prevented from appearing before the Peruvian commission."

As though Paredes' commission, returning with nearly 3,000 pages of evidence, needed more evidence!

The Prefect of the Department of Loreto also performed his part. The following telegram, sent to the Minister of Foreign Affairs at Lima, closely approaches the "limit":

"The production of rubber on the Putumayo has increased remarkably, owing to the change from the old cruel methods to humane, affording the Indians, who no longer flee, proper treatment. *Those who formerly lived in retreat are voluntarily returning to work. The Indians now receive food and wages, and consequently work willingly, whereas formerly they avoided work and thought only of flight.*"

Early last February the United States Department of State received the report of Consul Fuller, who made a tour of the Putumayo district in the latter part of 1912 in company with the British Consul. This report throws a flood of light on the actual conditions in the Putumayo and incidentally reveals the untrustworthiness of the claims made by Peru and Arana that the "Devil's Paradise" no longer exists.

While Consul Fuller did not witness any actual crimes during his tour, this was apparently only because he was not allowed to do so. On the other hand, his report gives one every reason for believing that conditions still remain as before. Thus he says:

"It was quite evident throughout the trip that not only ourselves, but even our interpreters, were the subjects of a close espionage. It was not possible to go anywhere among the natives without being followed by employees of the Company. Whenever we tried to talk privately to the Indians, an employee of the Company familiar with the Huitoto language always approached, with the result that the Indians invariably ceased to be communicative."

Referring to the present conditions of the Indians, Consul Fuller describes them as so brutalized that

"I doubt whether they know the difference between proper treatment at the hands of the whites and maltreatment, for the simple reason that the first idea of the white man they had was bad usage. In case of any trouble they would not be likely to appeal to the authorities. They would not understand how."

As to the entire control exercised by the Peruvian government, according to Minister Pezet, the Consul remarks:

"As to the Peruvian government, it is plain that they apparently leave the whole zone to the Company to do as they please, the occurrences of the past notwithstanding. I saw nothing whatever to support their repeated protestations as to the measures they were taking to improve conditions.

"In fact, the total absence of any attempt at government up to the present time was freely admitted to both the British Consul and myself by Senor Rey de Castro. There was no other position he could take when once he was on the ground.

"The strength of the government's hand and the extent of their control is indicated by the fact that (Peruvian) Consul General Rey de Castro found it necessary, in order to secure information in regard to his mission, to rely entirely on the Company.

"Senor Rey de Castro stated to me that when the present commandant of the Putumayo region came there to take over command he found the troops working rubber for the Company, and was obliged on this account to alter the arrangements of the posts—an important comment on their value in protecting the Indians."

Consul Fuller holds out but little hope for the future. He describes the present employees as "very ordinary and, I believe, entirely capable of repeating the atrocities . . . if instructed to or offered inducements, such as commissions on rubber produced. In other words, the machinery is all there; and there is danger that the temptation to make a big showing preparatory to seeking new capital might bring about a return to old conditions. *The sole value of the property lies in the labor.* The product is inferior and, I believe, worked out to a considerable extent, and the only possible way to make a showing is to push the Indians. . . . Considering the inaccessibility of the region (with consequent high cost of transportation for supplies and product), the unproductive nature of the soil (making food extremely scarce) and the very inferior quality of the rubber produced, it is hard to see how the enterprise can be made to pay without hard treatment of the Indians, forced labor to say the least."

The British Consul, Mr. Mitchell, who accompanied Consul Fuller on his tour, corroborates all these statements. His report concludes with the following words:

"The Peruvian authorities and public feeling in Iquitos are far more anxious about the sovereignty of Peru in the Putumayo than about the condition of the Indians there. The system of peonage is too firmly rooted in the country to allow any sentiment of consideration for the natives, other than their use as servants, to lead to trouble or expense, much less real sacrifice,

in releasing them from a state of servitude. The only feeling in Iquitos is annoyance at the exposures which bring the good name of Peru into disrepute, and a keen apprehension that the agitation about the Putumayo may lead to their losing that country. Even those who admit the truth of the allegations of atrocities express no pity for the victims or a determination to prevent their ill-treatment in the future. Their only preoccupation is the political position of Peru in the matter."

This seems a fair statement of the Peruvian attitude. The Arana gang does not desire to release the Indians from their servitude, because the servitude of the Indians is profitable to them; the other members of the Peruvian ruling class do not wish to free the Putumayo Indians, because this would mean a blow at the peonage system, which is universal throughout Eastern Peru and which is the basis of their own fortunes; the government does not want to stop the crimes of the Putumayo, because that would mean the exodus of the Peruvians there, and probably the loss of the territory; the great mass of the people, the working class, are themselves so enslaved, exploited, robbed, by means of the system of peonage that they regard the slaughter of the far-away "*infeles*" with but little interest.

Such is their ignorance and mental subjection that not a few regard the Arana butchers as patriotic "empire-builders."

These workers have yet to learn the spirit of solidarity, the spirit of the class struggle. Like so many of our own workers, they realize dimly, vaguely, that they belong to one class, their masters to another. But of the vast significance of this fact they know nothing. Modern industry has not yet appeared to drill them, discipline them, fill them with the spirit of revolt. To-day they are dumb, driven beasts, incapable of thinking for themselves, incapable of expressing themselves. But as the wheel of evolution turns on in its ceaseless course, they, too, will learn the great lesson of revolt.

A BABY'S EPITAPH

By Harry Kemp

Taken away from all the woes of life,
 Saved from the disillusionment of years,
 The heart-break, the betrayals of false friends,
 The failures and rejections of the world—
 Nay! I had rather known these twenty fold
 Than to lie here not having lived at all.

Hopelessdale

By Morrison I. Swift

(Hopedale is a Massachusetts mill town wholly owned by the Draper dynasty. Many of the workers, with families to support, receive between 7 and 9 dollars a week. By the working people of Massachusetts this medieval principality is called Hopelessdale. Last summer, during a strike of the mill-workers, one of the strikers was killed. Of several who were arrested six were given prison sentences of nine months, and others are now on trial.)

Profits of fourteen millions in eight years
 Were from the Draper workmen shrewdly wrung,
 Whose pittance wages should have called forth tears
 From those who robbed them and Christ's praises sung.

The Christian Baron palaced at his ease
 Or skimming in his car the blooming earth,
 So rich that he can do whate'er may please,
 Passes his careless days in wooing mirth.

Oblivious is he of factory slaves
 Whose lives in ardent toil supply his wealth,
 Toil which the faculties of men depraves
 And robs the spirit of its manly health.

Rebellion rumbles, and the toilers strike:
 On them the purchased vultures of the Law
 Descend, to club and murder if they like,—
 For supreme law is the policeman's paw.

The bullet whistles and a striker falls,
 His back pierced through by a policeman's lead.
 No 'wakening voice for honest justice calls—
 'Tis but a mere Italian that is dead.

This was the land of Massachusetts once,
 Where human rights were sacred as the stars;
 The cry for justice now has no response
 And he who calls is rushed behind the bars.

The craven people to the rich man grovel;
 The courts, police, the governor, and all,
 Crush back the poor man to his cell and hovel,
 While Revolution weaves its sombre pall.

The Model

By ANDRE TRIDON

Ethics of the bar, young man! ahaha! save your client's life and let ethics go hang. I lost my first big case thirty years ago by sticking to the absolute truth and I made a fool of myself in the bargain.

I don't suppose you remember the Ivanofsky case; that was before your time. I had met Sergei Ivanofsky in St. Petersburg when he was an art student. A tall fellow, with slanting, laughing blue eyes, a pointed blond beard; apparently phlegmatic; only three interests in life, painting, women and vodka. Thank goodness, painting came first. Vodka was Ivanofsky's comforter when one of his love affairs took an unpleasant turn. And they almost always did. Otherwise a first rate chap, the big-hearted type. Well, at twenty-nine I married and went to practice law in Tambovnaia, in the Crimea. One morning I was called to the jail. A certain Ivanofsky had sent for me. I first heard the police side of the story. A horrible case. I didn't even ask for a description of the prisoner. They brought him in. It was the Ivanofsky of my student days, considerably changed, however. He did not give me time for any questions.

"Will you take my case?" he grunted.

His eyes were half closed, his breath was terrific.

"Yes," I answered, "I'll take your case, but tell me . . ."

"No, no. I must sleep. I'll tell you everything to-morrow."

And he insisted on being taken back to his cell.

The next day the laughing Ivanofsky, phlegmatic Ivanofsky, refreshed by a restful night, greeted me cheerily.

"Now isn't this an awful joke?"

His levity surprised me.

"Do get me out of this as soon as possible," he added with such an expression of unconcern that I felt then and there that he couldn't be guilty of the atrocious crime for which they had arrested him. This is the story as he related it to me:

"Last winter was rough on my lungs and I thought the southern climate would do me good. And then I was a little sick of the game; I owed small sums here and there. I took a train for Sebastopol. As we neared Tambovnaia I caught sight of a fine bit of landscape, the bend of the river, you know, with the poplars, and I got off the train. Here I am. I thought I'd

look you up, but somehow I kept putting it off. This Crimean sun gives you the working fever. Well, I hadn't been here two months when Doonia turned up at the studio. How she raised the car fare is more than I know. She used to be a magnificent model for the neck and shoulders. If she hadn't been so wild I suppose I would have ended by marrying her. We were together a year, you remember. She lived with almost every man who studied under Akonoff, but she always came back to me. She undoubtedly loved me, couldn't keep away from me long, but couldn't be faithful to me. May be if I had loved her. . . . But her third escapade cured me as far as the heart is concerned. Only she was a beauty and I always let her come back.

"Well, a year ago she finally landed in a hospital. When she came out she was a pitiful sight. I gave her a little money to go away to the country and recuperate. When she returned, Katia, you know, who sat for Arenof's 'Fate', was staying with me. Doonia kept away, but knocked at my door again when Katia and I had our big row. We had a painful explanation. The usual scene. She had never loved anyone else. She called herself fickle, disreputable, said she deserved a beating, but loved me more than ever; would kill herself if I turned against her. . . . Four times in one month we went through the same rigmarole. Every time I put on my hat and coat and went away, leaving her alone in the studio. She would grow so excited that I could not even think of attempting to turn her out. There would have been bloodshed. After I had gone she cooled off and finally left the place. Last Monday afternoon she came, about five. The usual scene . . . with a variation. 'Sergei, darling, let me at least be your model once in a while . . . Oh, I am so much better now. I am quite my old self.'

"Not waiting for an answer she proceeded to undress and climbed up on the revolving platform. Poor Doonia. I couldn't say any harsh things to her then, but she read the truth in my eyes.

"Instead of getting dressed and going home, she began to pour abuse upon me, gesticulating ridiculously from the platform, in her deplorable nakedness. Once more I left her to her fit of rage and went to Glazoonin's rooms. We dined together, then drifted into the winter garden and spent the night in various places, smoking and drinking.

"I went home about eight the next morning. On my sofa

there lay Doonia covered with black, dried blood, my Malayan dagger in her breast up to the hilt. She must have been dead for hours. As I looked at her I experienced a curious mixture of feelings: Grief and at the same time relief at the thought of being definitely done with her, but above all things a sort of appalled admiration, a terrified, esthetic joy. The extraordinary attitude of that lean, devastated body, one arm dropping stiffly, the hand all smeared with blood, the other hand clutching strands of her hair, one leg terribly contracted; and that head, eyes open, filmed over with white, the lower jaw hanging, the teeth bared as in a snarl of agony. Several times in my life I had tried to pose models for death scenes. Phew! I couldn't do it. Once I hired a moojick to pose for Prometheus Bound. I fettered him with real chains and then threatened him with a burning cigar pointed at his ribs to get on his face an expression of terror; he laughed. . . . Life simply will not mimic death. I had only one thought. I saw my chance at last. . . . Before calling for help, I would sketch that dead body in all its realistic horror. I grabbed my palette, squeezed a few tubes and, in spite of my headache, started to paint, as fast as I could. Such livid tones and the terrifying stiffness of those last definitive gestures I have never seen. With the grey plush of the worn-out couch as a back-ground, that plush stained here and there an ugly black brown, and the strange droop of her dark half-unbound hair, God, what a model! I felt obscurely that in the complex nervous state induced by a night of debauch, the shock of this event, and the incipient faintness due to lack of food, I would paint the canvas of my life, the work by which I would be remembered. There were several knocks at the door. I never answered. I worked and worked until I felt dizzy, stopped a while and noticed that the sun had gone down. It was six o'clock in the evening. I had been at it for ten hours.

"I went downstairs in a daze; I couldn't summon enough strength to tell the janitor. Better tell the police first, I thought. I entered a café and drank something. The warmth of the alcohol permeated my body. I took another drink. I felt perfectly normal and the situation took on a different aspect. Poor Doonia! After all she had spoken the truth when she said she loved me. I might have prevented this, perhaps, at the cost of my freedom, at the cost of my career. Had I but known! But at least I could believe now that she had loved me. Had any of the other women really cared for me? For

ten years . . . ah, well. . . . When I thought of all that past which her gesture had annihilated, of that long-drawn, touching and ludicrous story of her life, the final chapter of which was written so melodramatically in her own blood, I weakened and almost fainted. Tears surged to my eyes. I drank some more. Then I wished some one else could go to the police and tell the whole thing. I couldn't tell them, there was too much to tell; I felt they couldn't understand. I was the only one who understood. I told the waiter to bring me a whole bottle of vodka and I only remember that somehow, sometime, I reached Glazonin's apartment and told him that I had killed Doonia. Yesterday they came for me and brought me here. You know me. It will be an easy thing for you to explain to them the whole thing now that you know."

An easy thing! The date of the trial was set for July. The nearer the day came the less I saw how I could save Ivanofsky from Siberia. The papers of the little bourgeois city had made a wonderful mess of it: Ivanofsky driven out of Petersburg; an anarchist; loose-lived; scandals; had ruined Doonia; abandoned her; killed her; a ghoulish seeker for notoriety; had hidden himself in a strange house to escape the police, etc., etc.

The day before the trial I went to the prison and told him frankly that his only chance of escape was to confess and throw himself upon the indulgence of the jury. He laughed at me and threatened to call in another lawyer. . . .

The day came. I had made up my mind to disregard all his wishes in the matter and to present his case in a way which the twelve ordinary, conventional, commonplace, trashy minds of jurymen could understand. Before the last hearing began, I asked him once more in a whisper:

"Ivanofsky, what shall I tell them?"

"The truth."

The twelve little shopkeepers into whose dreary lives no romance had ever been smuggled and whose slow brains were made even more unreceptive by the summer heat, never understood.

The verdict was guilty. I lost my practice and had to move to Moscow.

To the Editor of the NEW REVIEW:

Through your kindness this office has been receiving the NEW REVIEW, and I have been reading with great interest all the articles which appear in each issue, especially "The Status of the Negro in the United States" in the September number.

Having lived many years in the North, several years in the West, and now living in the State of Mississippi (where the intolerance of the Negro is at its highest pitch) and being the State Secretary of the Socialist party gives me the opportunity to realize, and know from experience, the conditions which form the environment in which the Negro has to exist (cannot say live) in the Solid South.

Therefore, it is with a spirit of earnestness that I write you, hoping you will take timely warning, to be careful concerning the publishing of articles similar to the one above mentioned advocating the "meeting on equal terms of the white and the black race."

Do not misunderstand me as not endorsing every word, and more, of those sentiments as expressed so ably by Comrade Ovington, but to advocate at this present time that the colored race, as they are in the South, and the white race shall meet on equal terms and organize mixed locals, will do more to retard the efforts that are now being made quietly to educate both the whites and the blacks up to that point where there will be no opposition, than any other thing that can be done.

The people of the North cannot realize what the Negro question is here, in the South. Your Northern black man is composed mostly of the better class of colored people, who know their position and do not presume to step outside of that line, consequently they can bear treatment accorded to them without becoming arrogant in their actions.

The South has had a taste of what the Negroes would do if they were to be allowed full political rights accorded them by the Constitution, and can you blame them if they, remembering those awful days, should fear a repetition of the time when the Ku Klux Klan had to take matters in their own hands and save their women, their homes, and their country from the terrible outrages that were perpetrated by the Negroes as long as they were allowed the constitutional rights without limitation?

The Negro to-day in the South is just the same man as he was then, with the exception that some few have received an education, and at the present time are engaged, with the assistance given quietly by our most active Socialists, in trying to reach the masses and training them up to the standard where they may be organized into locals, with the intention of showing them wherein the Socialist party is the only party that will give them the proper assistance to obtain their political rights. The Negro of the South to-day is worse than the "Uncle Tom" of slavery days, for he, without education, is "robbing the white man by night while the white man is robbing him in the daytime"; the consequences are that they are always scheming whereby they may get the advantage of the white man, and should they be given the rights granted them by the Constitution and not be restricted by the state laws, and not be educated to the principles of Socialism, they, being in a vast majority in Mississippi, would begin a time the like of which has never been known outside of the Ku Klux Klan days of Negro supremacy.

Accordingly the proposition to place the Negroes so they may "meet on equal terms with the whites" here in the South at present will only do harm, until the education, both of the whites and the blacks, will reach the point where both classes will recognize the position each must occupy in the economic and social distribution of the classes.

We in Mississippi are organizing the Negroes into locals of their own, and hope to live to see the time when there will be as many Negro locals as there are white ones, and that there will be a time when the Socialist party will recognize them as they now do any locals of any other race. But any

agitation now on the part of the Socialist party, as a whole, will only retard the efforts that are being made to bring about this very condition.

We have already the "race discrimination," the "segregated class," "a class without the ballot," "a class without civil rights, poorly educated, and with the low standard of living" all here in the South.

We do not need to watch the efforts that are being made to place this discrimination upon the Negroes of the North, but to watch the effort that is being made publicly to place the Negro on equal terms with the whites, now! before there has been time allowed to educate the public mind for this transition, because it will prevent the consummation of just what they are trying to do, that is, to give each man the economic position he justly is entitled to without reservation, whether he be white or black.

Fraternally yours,

Jackson, Miss.

IDA M. RAYMOND,

State Secretary Socialist Party of Mississippi.

[We print this letter because of its frank and sincere statement of the views of certain Southern Socialists. It is highly important that the Socialists of America and of the world learn that the aim and ideal of these Southern Socialists is to bring about a condition "where both classes will recognize the position each must occupy in the economic and social distribution of the classes." We hereby invite our readers to discuss this momentous question. —Ed. N. R.]

Postscript to "The Elections"

At the time of going to press we learn from the **Party Builder**, the official bulletin of the national office of the Socialist party, of two disastrous defeats sustained in last month's elections. In Columbus, Ohio, the vote went down from 10,000 last year to 4,000 this year. In Allegheny County, of which Pittsburgh is a part, the vote for Debs last year was nearly 20,000. This year the election returns for Pittsburgh alone show that our vote was about 6,000. There are no figures at hand to compare last year's Pittsburgh vote with this year's, "but considering the vote in the county, the loss is evidently heavy." It is characteristic of our regular party press that it either did not report these heavy losses or glossed them over so they wouldn't be noticed.

The **Party Builder** ascribes these heavy losses to the following considerations: "The workers of these two cities have, to their evident hurt, flirted with syndicalism. Considerable portions of the party, leaving the time-proved tactics of our movement—political action along constructive lines—strayed off to 'direct action,' 'industrialism,' 'the one big union,' etc. Endless discussions and conflicts followed, bringing with them broken and disrupted locals and cessation of propaganda." In other words, the new invention of the Indianapolis convention was applied—Sec. 6, Art. II—, the party organizations were broken up, the confidence and the votes of the workers vanished, and now we can swear at the I. W. W. to our heart's content, precisely as in Massachusetts. H. S.

A NEW DEPARTMENT

With the next issue of the NEW REVIEW we shall begin the publication of a
MONTHLY REVIEW OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT
AND A
SOCIALIST LITERARY DIGEST.

The aim of the new department will be to convey reliable, unbiased information concerning the activities of the Socialist Parties, Labor Unions, Co-operatives, Labor Legislation, etc., the world over, and to present a succinct summary of the development of Socialist opinion in all its phases, including that of the critics and opponents of Socialism. The work will be done by William English Walling, Richard Perin, Louis C. Fraina, Grace Potter, and the editor. It is hoped that this new department will add greatly to the usefulness and popularity of the NEW REVIEW. In other respects the NEW REVIEW will continue to maintain the high standard which has made it the leading organ of Socialist thought in America.

ARTICLES IN EARLY ISSUES

Among the more important contributions to appear in early issues are the following:

Frank Bohn, Middle Class and Progressive Movement.
Theodore Rothstein (London), The British Labor Movement.
Robert Rives La Monte, The New Intellectuals.
Paul Louis (Paris), The Latest Phase of French Syndicalism.
William English Walling, French Syndicalism.
Albert Sonnichsen, Recent Growth of International Co-operation.
Charles Rappoport (Paris), The Intuitive Philosophy of M. Bergson.
Charles P. Mitchell, Bergsonism and Practical Idealism.
Michael Pavlovitch (Paris), Peace in the Balkans.
Herman Simpson, Phases of Socialist Evolution.
Harry Kemp, The Thresher's Wife, a narrative poem.

Other important contributions by American and European writers of note are in preparation.

A Socialist publication maintaining the high standards of the NEW REVIEW cannot be made self-sustaining in a short time. But if all friends of genuine Socialist education lend us a helping hand, to however small an extent, its existence can be assured until such time as it becomes self-supporting.

IT'S UP TO OUR READERS

to get to work now and place the NEW REVIEW on a sound basis. If every reader of the NEW REVIEW will do his or her share it would not take long to accomplish this. As we said last month, there are several ways in which you can help.

Show your copy of the Review to your friends and secure their subscriptions. Or better still, send us \$3.00 for four yearly, or eight half-yearly subscription cards. You can then sell these when occasion offers. We find from experience that it is much easier to sell a card than it is merely to ask one for a dollar bill for a subscription.

Order a bundle of the NEW REVIEW for distribution among your friends and comrades.

Get your Branch or Local to sell the NEW REVIEW at meetings and lectures. With a little effort on the part of the readers of the NEW REVIEW we shall be able to increase our circulation to the point where it will cover expenses.

Why not give a year's subscription to the NEW REVIEW as a Christmas Gift to your friends? Send us a dollar for each name and we will enter the subscription to begin with the January number, out December 25th. A letter will be sent from this office (arriving on Christmas), notifying them of your gift. We are sure that your friends will thank you—and so shall we.

The NEW REVIEW

NEW YORK, N. Y.

"Scholarly and stimulating" Survey

Immigration and Labor

The Economic Aspects of European
Immigration to the United States

By ISAAC A. HOURWICH, Ph. D.

8vo. With Numerous Diagrams

\$2.50 net; by mail \$2.70

THE NEW YORK SUN: "One of the most important contributions to the literature on the subject of immigration The volume contains a keen, analytical, comprehensive study of the much discussed and often misunderstood problem."

THE NEW YORK TIMES: "His volume is a censure of those who treat immigration in the impressionist manner instead of with the fullness of knowledge, such as is evidenced on every page of his studious book."

THE NEW YORK CALL: "The book of Dr. Hourwich comes as a godsend, with its mass of reliable statistics There is no question about the stand of the author. He writes from the standpoint of labor We say cheerfully and enthusiastically that we have an epoch-making book, a book that should be read by all students of social conditions. One cannot lay it down without feeling that he has learned a great deal, has gained a new point of view."

NEW YORK G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS LONDON

ANARCHISTS?

O Dear, No!

LAW-AND-ORDER is our Middle Name

The MASSES

Should be on every library table. It will entertain the babies, upset Ma, and give Pa a jolt regularly once a month.

WE GUARANTEE TO ANNOY!

HAVE YOU A LITTLE DYNAMITE IN YOUR HOME?

Send for a copy and you will subscribe

Ten Cents a Copy

One Dollar a Year

The Masses Publishing Company

91 GREENWICH AVENUE

NEW YORK CITY

Kindly Mention the NEW REVIEW When Writing to Advertisers.

If you become a Partner in our Socialist Co-operative Publishing House, you can buy a

Nine
Cloth-bound
Volumes,
worth
\$10.00

FULL SET OF **MARX**

For only
\$2.50

We Pay the
Expressage

To get the special rate you must pay at the same time \$1.00 on a share of stock, and must promise to pay \$9.00 more in monthly instalments of \$1.00 each. Or if you send \$12.00 in advance you will get the books and a fully-paid stock certificate.

The set of Marx's works consists of the following volumes:

Capital, Vol. I. The Process of Capitalist Production	\$ 2.00
Capital, Vol. II. The Process of Circulation of Capital	2.00
Capital, Vol. III. Capitalist Production as a Whole	2.00
Critique of Political Economy	1.00
The Poverty of Philosophy, a Reply to Proudhon	1.00
Value, Price and Profit, Addressed to Workingmen50
Revolution and Counter-Revolution, or Germany in 184850
The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte50
The Communist Manifesto with Liebknecht's "No Compromise"50
	<hr/>
	\$10.00

Any other books published by us may be substituted for all or part of the books named above; in other words for \$3.50 cash and \$9.00 in monthly instalments of \$1.00 each, or for \$12.00 cash with order, we will send \$10.00 worth of books published by us, and a certificate for a \$10.00 share of stock in our publishing house.

This certificate means that the holder is part owner of the publishing house, with a vote in the election of directors. Our authorized capital is \$50,000, divided into 5,000 shares of \$10.00 each. Only 1,300 of these are still for sale, and this exceptional offer should close them all out in a very few weeks.

Only \$10.00 worth of books and no more can be bought by any one person on this special offer, but after buying a share you have the same privilege as other stockholders of buying our books at 40% discount in small lots, and 50% when at least \$10.00 is remitted at one time for books to go in one package. We pay expressage.

A complete book list and a booklet explaining in detail how the publishing house is organized will be mailed free on request. Fill out the blank below.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
118 West Kinzie Street, Chicago:

I enclose \$3.50 and agree to remit \$1.00 a month for nine months, in return for which please send at once by express prepaid a set of "Marx" in nine cloth-bound volumes as advertised, and issue to me a share of stock as soon as my payments are completed.

Name..... Address

Postoffice..... State.....

Kindly Mention the NEW REVIEW When Writing to Advertisers.