

GENERAL LIBRARY
MAR 28 1920
UNIV. OF MICH.

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

ALLIED PLOTS IN RUSSIA

SINN FEIN AND LABOR

SYLVIA PANKHURST

SOCIALIST PARTY TACTICS

A SYMPOSIUM

THE ALBANY TRIAL

POLITICS FOR WORKERS

RUSSIAN DOCUMENTS

Contents

<p>ALLIED PLOTS IN RUSSIAPage 257.</p> <p>MARCHAND'S LETTER TO POINCAREPage 258</p> <p>LABOR AND SINN FEIN Sylvia PankhurstPage 263</p> <p>THE "FREE SPEECH" FALLACY S. E.Page 269</p> <p>WEST TWENTY-THIRD STREET Babette DeutschPage 274</p> <p>ALIEN AND SEDITION LAWS OF THE PAST Harry Elmer Barnes.....Page 275</p> <p>POLITICS FOR WORKERS Duncan McDonald.....Page 281</p> <p>THE CLASS WAR IN RUSSIAN NEWS Evans ClarkPage 284</p> <p>THE SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF COOPERATION Albert SonnichsenPage 290</p>	<p>SOCIALIST PARTY TACTICS A SymposiumPage 298</p> <p>THE ALBANY TRIAL—A DIGESTPage 304</p> <p>SOCIALIST REVIEW CAL- ENDARPage 308</p> <p>RUSSIAN DOCUMENTSPage 312</p> <p>BOOK REVIEWS "The Opium Monopoly." Ellen N. La Motte.....Page 315 "The Sangreal." Irwin St. John TuckerPage 316 "Man or the State." Waldo R. BrownePage 317 "Bolshevism." John Spargo. Page 318 "Horace Traubel." David KarsnerPage 319</p> <p>COLLEGE NOTES Jessica Smith.....Page 320</p>
---	--

Our Contributors

- HARRY ELMER BARNES, PH.D.** Professor of History of the New School of Social Research.
- EVANS CLARK.** Former instructor of government in Princeton, and director of the Information Department of the Russian Soviet Bureau.
- BABETTE DEUTSCH.** Author of "Banners."
- S. E.** Professor in an American college.
- DUNCAN McDONALD.** President (1919) of the Illinois Federation of Labor; organizer of the American Labor Party; for years a prominent officer of the cooperative movement and of the United Mine Workers of Illinois.
- SYLVIA PANKHURST.** One of the founders of the militant women's suffrage movement in Britain. Now editor of *The Dreadnought* (London).
- VIDA D. SCUDDER.** Professor of English Literature, Wellesley College, and author of "Socialism and Character," etc.
- ALBERT SONNICHSEN.** Author of "Consumer's Coöperation," Secretary of the Coöperative League of America.
- ORDWAY TEAD.** Author of "Instincts in Industry," etc., and a director of the Bureau of Industrial Research.
- ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG.** Director of the Labor Research Department, Rand School, editor of "The American Labor Year Book."
- CLEMENT WOOD.** Educator, poet. Author of "The Earth Turns South" and "Glad of Earth."

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. VIII.

APRIL 1920

No. 5

Allied Plots in Russia

[This month THE SOCIALIST REVIEW is in a position to lay before its readers one of the most damaging pieces of evidence in the whole history of the anti-Soviet campaign conducted by the Allied governments during the past two years. The document which follows, hitherto unpublished in the United States, save for brief excerpts made by Foreign Minister Chicherin in a Soviet wireless, is a letter from one René Marchand to Raymond Poincaré, then President of the French Republic. M. René Marchand was in Moscow during the summer of 1918 as special correspondent for the Paris Figaro and Matin, and was acting as special attaché of the French Embassy. President Poincaré had requested him, as a personal friend, to report privately and directly to him regarding the trend of events in Russia. This letter was written at the end of August, 1918, pursuant to the President's request, but it is impossible to state whether it ever reached M. Poincaré, for it was seized by the Bolsheviki when they took possession of the papers in the French Embassy, after discovery of the Allied plots. M. Marchand, along with several other Frenchmen who refused to take part in the conspiracy, is still in Moscow, and at liberty.]

The young college man who brought this letter from Moscow writes: "I cut the letter up into six pieces, and deposited them in various books of mine. I fear that when the Whites penned us up incommunicado in Archangel (ostensibly under quarantine until our boat sailed), their "fumigators" succeeded in finding several sheets of this unhealthy letter. Fortunately, the missing pages are all from the very first part of the letter, and the

real kernel of the letter is contained in the sheets that got through."

The letter as we have it commences in the midst of a protest against the diversion of French activity from attacking their German enemies to attempting to overthrow the Soviet Government, with which they were still nominally allied. M. Marchand declares that even the head of the Russian Church, the Patriarch Tychon, definitely opposed all Allied intervention that would in any way add to the great sufferings of his people (by famine) or would menace the unity of the Russian state.

The "Overshadowing Crime"

Marchand then passes directly to the most sensational portion of his letter, which is a direct accusation that Allied agents were plotting (in 1918) the bribery of railroad employes, and the actual destruction of railroad bridges in order to bring utter starvation to the city of Petrograd. Here, then, we have an unequivocal statement by the responsible informant of the French President that the Allies as far back as 1918 were plotting within a presumably ally nation to overthrow its government by force and violence—an ironic comment upon the present-day press allegation against L. C. A. K. Martens of the Russian Soviet Bureau!

Marchand proceeds to deny the alleged guilty alliance between Imperial Germany and Soviet Russia, declaring that it is improbable that the Soviet Government should "at any time whatsoever" call the German Government to its aid, and that "if Germany leaves the Bolsheviki in power it is not vol-

untarily," inasmuch as the Imperial German Staff "is unable to count on certain military units, which . . . have permitted themselves to be permeated with Bolshevik propaganda." How true this forecast was can be seen by the exposures (of last year) of the German levies for the Russian White army under Von der Goltz, and at this moment by the plea of "Chancellor" Kapp and General Von Luettwitz that the German counter-revolution was necessary "to stay the advance of Bolshevism" in Germany! (N. Y. Sun, March 15, 1920.)

Marchand concludes by stating that the Allied policy in Russia was itself responsible

for the strengthening of the Soviet Government and adds: "The Bolsheviki in every place where they have been thrown out of power have later been restored again by popular insurrection."

By the mouth of their own representative the policy of the Allied Governments is thus shown to have "squandered in civil war [in Russia] all that amount of energy which, in other conditions, would have been turned effectively against a Germany enfeebled and growing weaker still" in those critical days before the final collapse of the German Imperial Government in November, 1918.—[The Editors.]

Marchand's Letter to Poincaré

". . . This very regrettable diversion of our activity (from attacking our German enemies to attempting the overthrow of the Soviet Government, with whom we are nominally allied), which has led us, little by little, in rather an insensate fashion, to leave the road of national defense and to pass on to the sterile and, in any case, secondary ground of interior Russian politics, is manifested still more sharply at the beginning of the month of July, after the painful events at Yaroslav, where the struggle of the White Guards of Savinkov against the Soviet Government ended finally in the death of several thousand Russians, the destruction of numerous churches and a large number of art treasures, the sacking of an ancient city, the discouragement of those whom we are pretending to reinforce, the growing hatred of the Bolsheviki, and the ever stronger defiance of the bourgeoisie.

"I know the particularly painful impression which these sad events have produced upon the venerable

head of the Orthodox Church, the Patriarch Tychon. In this regard, I must insist on the fact that, during all the interviews which I have had the honor to obtain with this distinguished and venerable gentleman, whenever I have broached the question of his moral support in case of a possible intervention by the Allies, he has invariably repeated, avoiding a direct response, that the primary condition of any moral support whatsoever from the Church would be a solemn engagement by the Entente Powers to undertake nothing which could menace the unity of the Russian State, to act energetically against the German enemy, and to take measures to prevent an increase in the sufferings of the Russian people, in particular from famine, which has been already provoked in central Russia by the acts of the Germans in the Ukraine. Engagements of this kind have been furnished more than once to the representatives of the most diverse political parties of Russia. I remember, with respect to this subject, the precision

with which our consul-general on several occasions explained to me the motives for the delay of our intervention,—a delay growing out of the fear that our military operations would not concur with the economic measures, which it was even proposed to place as the primary project, and to this end considerable reserves of provisions and manufactured articles had been prepared for Russia.

“You will thus understand, Monsieur le Président, that under these circumstances such a complete and rapid diversion of our purposes could only profoundly astonish me. However, I had hoped with the most absolute certitude that we should end up by returning to our original point of view. Recent events have unhappily convinced me of the vanity of these hopes.

Allied Sabotage in Russia

“I have recently had occasion to participate in an official conference which laid bare to me in the most unexpected manner a work enormous, secret, and, to my point of view, extremely dangerous, contrary in any case to all that I had considered as my obligations up to this day. I speak of a conference behind closed doors which took place in the Consulate General of the United States, the 23d or the 24th of August, without error. The consul-general of the United States, Monsieur Poole, and our consul-general, were present. There were also several Allied agents whose names I have forgotten¹, one among others whom I had never happened to meet up to this time. It is well understood—I em-

¹Lieutenant Vertamond and Lieutenant Rallay were among those present at this conference, the former being an expert in destructive engineering.

phasize this particularly—neither the American consul-general nor the French consul-general made in his own name the least allusion whatsoever to any secret plans of destruction, but *accidentally* I became acquainted with this design through the statements of the agents present.

“It was thus that I learned that an English agent was preparing the destruction of the railroad bridge on the river Volkhov near Zvanka. It is only necessary to glance at the map to be convinced that the destruction of this bridge would be equivalent to giving Petrograd over to complete famine. In this case the city would in fact be cut off from all communication with the east, whence comes the grain which already does not suffice for its existence. Moreover, the author of the project himself showed all the gravity of the possible consequences of this act, while doubting the possibility of putting it into execution.

Starving a People

“In this connection, one of the French agents added that he had already made preliminary arrangements for the destruction of the Cherepovetz bridge, which would have had consequences as fatal for the provisioning of Petrograd as the blowing up of the Zvanka bridge. Cherepovetz is situated on the line which connects Petrograd with the eastern regions. Then it was a question of the destruction of rails on different lines. An agent even remarked that he had assured himself of the aid of employes, which was a valuable factor, but that, on the other hand, this prevented the use of certain methods of destruction, the bribed railway employes consenting to destroy only ammunition trains.

I do not wish to continue further, thinking that I have said quite enough to explain by undeniable facts the fears that I have formulated above. I am profoundly convinced that it is not a matter of the isolated activities of these various agents. And, moreover, even private activities of this character can only have one fatal result—to precipitate Russia into interminable and still bloodier political struggles, and cause it to suffer superhuman agonies of hunger. It is further necessary to add that these privations would invariably and almost exclusively fall upon the poor and middle classes, which is to say, that part of the population which suffers *the most cruelly and most innocently* from the present crisis,—the small bourgeoisie, the clerks, the laborers; while the great bourgeoisie, the rich, will still find means of departing to the Ukraine or to foreign countries (moreover, such departure has long since commenced, and continues on a large scale) and, on the other hand, the popular elements who are in the service of the Soviet Government are in a certain measure insured against excessive privations, which work little by little to the detriment of other sections of the population.

“I do not wish to lay further stress on the fact that during the entire conversation I did not hear *a word* about the struggle against Germany.

“Obviously, I have no desire to draw from this fact arguments to prove that these attempts have for a determined purpose the striking of a blow at Russia herself, at her toiling and defenseless population, but this, unhappily, is nevertheless a reality. I understand perfectly that these actions can, I do not say be justified,

but be understood when they are based, as on an established fact, on the principle that the Soviet Government is working in concert with Germany. Moreover, I know that such is the opinion spread abroad at the present time, and that certain agents of the Entente seek to acquire (I call attention to it between parentheses: in creating a dangerous and disquieting moral atmosphere) some ‘material proofs’ of this ‘alliance.’

No Prussian-Soviet Alliance

“It has happened to me personally several times, thanks to the concurrence of circumstances and from exterior indications, to suspect certain Bolshevik leaders of having an understanding with Germany: about the time of the arrival of Lenin in Russia; at the period of the July insurrection in Petrograd, terminated by a crisis; and, finally, at the beginning of the pourparlers of Brest, when the process of the dissolution of the army was at its height. The Allied governments and their authorized representatives thought it possible to determine their position and to make decisions in guiding themselves by impressions that no positive data have subsequently confirmed, if one leave aside the furious polemics of the newspapers. Since this epoch the international situation has become strongly modified in many respects, and it is now impossible seriously to be assured that the Soviet Government would have decided to bind its fate to that of the central empires when the victory, or simply even the integrity of these empires, far from signifying advantages for it, would, on the contrary, give the signal for the strangulation of the Russian revolution, and

consequently for the collapse of the government. That is why, whatever may be the final outcome of military events, I believe it is improbable that the Soviet Government should resolve at any time whatsoever to call the Germans to its aid. This would be a combination too *risky*, which would also *compromise it* in the eyes of international socialism and, what it must above all else avoid, *in the eyes of the masses of the Russian people, by whom it is supported*; for the Germans have definitely succeeded in provoking in the people, in general so little given to hatred, a sentiment of most profound and most serious hostility.

“One of the principal arguments that is continually cited to support this thesis of a secret ‘alliance’ between the Soviet Government and Germany is the evidence of the complete inactivity of the latter on the Eastern Front, at a moment when it was particularly important for the Soviet Government to feel its hands free in military affairs and outside of all danger with respect to Germany. This argument can not be taken into consideration. The very first observer, however inattentive and inexperienced he may be, can see now that if Germany leaves the Bolsheviks in power, it is not *voluntarily*, since she has reason to fear the provocation of troublesome interior complications from this source,—but *by necessity*, since it is physically impossible for her to do otherwise. Under the influence of our remarkable victories in the West, which have had everywhere *the strongest repercussion*, the anti-German sentiment of the masses of the Russian people grows apace.

Bolshevism in Prussian Army

“In order to combat this phenomenon, Germany finds herself compelled either to extend her occupation to new regions, or to increase her forces in the regions already occupied. She is not able to consider this in the face of the events which are occurring in the West; she is all the less capable of it *because she is unable to count on certain military units, which little by little have permitted themselves to be permeated with Bolshevik propaganda*. This is why, far from being in a condition to strengthen her activity in Russia, she will be forced,—I am entirely convinced,—to evacuate a considerable part of the occupied regions. Without doubt she will be able for several months yet to come to maintain false appearances, undertake *pourparlers*, and carry on *bargainings*. But any attentive observer can see without any doubt that her days in the Ukraine—the most important of the regions which she occupies—*are numbered*. And in this connection, every observer can aver that at the present time it is the Bolsheviks who are carrying to the Ukrainians an ever-increasing active assistance in the shape of a popular uprising,—an uprising of workingmen and peasants; and that these Bolsheviks are sending to the insurgents both money and munitions. This fact, which I have had the occasion to verify from several different anti-Bolshevist sources, appears to me incompatible with a Bolshevism which would be the *artificial government of a distant city, (Petrograd, Moscow), created incidentally by means of an insurrection, and destined to disappear under the pressure of another insurrection*. We

have here a government which is sustained, it is true, only by one part of the population against another part; but this first part does not sustain itself at some fixed and isolated central point, but throughout the entire territory of the country. It is, moreover, a government which, up to now, has resisted the assaults which have come solely from the Right, and not from the Left,—that which may come to pass any day,—and it is exactly for this reason that it has become in the eyes of the elements which it has succeeded in uniting, the synonym and the symbol of the ‘revolution.’ For my part, these two facts explain this circumstance, that in spite of all the hatreds which they have provoked among those whom they are pursuing, the Bolsheviki, in every place where they have been thrown out of power, have later been restored again by popular insurrection.

*Allied Policy Strengthened
Bolsheviki*

“It is this fact which explains why every attempt to overthrow Bolshevism by means of an uprising in any place or center whatever is reflected in the entire country,—and this phenomenon up to the present time has been invariably repeated,—in the sense of a growth of existing anarchy, of general disaster, and of extreme confusion; which have all aided the artificial growth—and without profit to anyone whomsoever—of the sufferings of the unhappy Russian people, and the squandering in a civil war, disorganized and without end, of all that amount of energy which, in other conditions, would have been turned effectively against a Germany enfeebled and growing still weaker;—

yet, on the other hand and by recoil from these calamities, the Soviet Government is consolidated temporarily by express reason of the pressure directed against it, for it sees itself forced by the very course of events to increase tenfold its energies in order to gain the upper hand so as to cut short the dangers, and, *at the same time, the anarchy* which has been gradually and imperceptibly encircling it:—in other words, we are raising it *to the rank of a revolutionary government*,—incontestably revolutionary in the strongest political sense of this word.

“Excuse me, Monsieur le Président, for having abused at such length your valuable attention, engrossed in numerous and important labors. Deprived of all possibility of direct relations with our ambassador, and also reminding myself of the high favor that you have had the kindness to accord me, I decided, after long and repeated hesitations, to address myself to you, esteeming it my duty, in the presence of events which are taking place before my eyes, to offer for your examination the facts and the situations that I have indicated, for the welfare of our dearly beloved France.

“Be so kind, Monsieur le Président, as to accept the expression of my profound respect and my absolute devotion.
René Marchand.”

[All changes of address for the May issue of THE SOCIALIST REVIEW must reach the office, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., not later than the fifteenth of April, 1920. The editors cannot be responsible for the non-delivery of copies unless this request is complied with.]

Labor and Sinn Fein

Sylvia Pankhurst

TRAVELLING westward through Ireland, we pass stark ruined buildings—factories or monasteries. The tiny hovels of the workers, their walls of rough boulders from the mountain side, and roofs of turf, seem to be cowering in the crevices as though in fear of this bleak isolation. Many of these too are lying in ruins; the reduction of the population means that they are not needed now. Agricultural production, the chief means of livelihood here, is at the minimum. Tiny pieces of earth are cultivated after a fashion; amongst the scant crops bright flowers and weeds run riot, great rocks poke through the thin soil, small springs well up and spread in boggy patches. Everywhere is the grey-brown peat, miles upon miles of it.

The West Country

In the wonderful west country the soft rain is often falling, the black cattle roam over the fine pale sand of the seashore, and the waves leave behind them countless bright little lemon yellow shells. The mountains are blue in the distance, red flowers glow in the fuschia hedges. The children, fine featured, and olive skinned like Spaniards, run bare-legged, swarming about the tiny hovels. Donkeys bray, poultry clucks, half-wild dogs dash out, growling and showing their teeth at any stranger, and followed by tall black-bearded men, barefooted, bare-chested, their old clothes only just able to hang upon them. Girls with large sun-filled eyes and flower-like faces tread lightly with naked feet along the roadside. Irish women pass swiftly from lovely girlhood to a gnarled old age. Majestic in their dignity, tall, finely shaped, deep eyed, great hearted, they are the finest things in Ireland. They, too, are shoeless, and their short homespun skirts are dyed by themselves with a terra-cotta dye they make from the seaweed.

Rack rents are extorted from the small strips of poor land and hovels built by the

tenants, the walls of roughly piled stones they collect, the roofs made of turf they have cut from the patch, the floor just the earth trodden over, that was left when the turf for the roof had been cut away.

In the winter, men and women wade into the sea, up to their necks in the cold, cruel water, to win the seaweed, "kelp" as they call it. To render the seaweed marketable it must be burnt on the beach, and they must pay the landlord for allowing them to set light to little heaps of it on the lonely waste of pebbles. The miserable kelp industry is said to have improved during the great war, but government blue books state that in 1916, in the best districts, an entire family could make no more than twenty pounds sterling out of it in an entire season. Years before when the cost of existence was lower, double that sum could be made.

In order that families may be able to pay the charges with which the exploiters load them, the Congested Districts Board, a so-called Charity, under the auspices of the British Government, finds home work for the women, crochet or lace making at 85 cents to \$1.75 a week, sock knitting at 21 cents a dozen pairs. The total earnings in the lace making trade thus fostered were \$144,297 in one year, 1912-13. By 1914-15, they had fallen for the year to \$56,848. In 1914 Ireland lay at the depths of her most helpless misery.

To relieve this bleak poverty, and to subsidize also the rapacious landlords, came the earnings of far away sons and daughters. American dollars were as commonly changed as British money in West of Ireland village stores. Amongst the shawled, short-skirted girls and women, sometimes was seen one wearing a hat and city clothes—a daughter home from America, who had brought a parcel of white-handled knives and forks, and had announced that father must build a new room to the house.

Transport Workers' Strike

Unhappy Dublin. You seemed like a lovely woman stricken with melancholia. Your gracious buildings, wrought with fine taste and skilful craftsmanship, were fast decaying. Your stately mansions were now overcrowded tenements. Your workers were degraded to the most appalling poverty, ground down alike by British and Irish employers. Then came the terrible lockout which lasted from August, 1913, to February, 1914, and in which 404 Dublin employers tried to enforce upon the workers a written pledge against trade unionism. The transport workers were first affected, but 20,000 men and women joined in the struggle under the leadership of Connolly and Larkin. Irish labor then called to British labor to refrain from playing the part of blackleg by sending goods to the employers, called to British labor to blockade Ireland as a pariah country which degraded its workers far below British standards. The appeal was in vain; British trade union leaders, as usual, failed to rise to the call of working-class solidarity. With a gesture of patronage they gave, instead of comradeship, inadequate gifts of food, mere charity, accepted of necessity and with bitterness, as is always the case with charity.

At last the Irish workers were defeated by hunger and violence, the police in attacking them even entered their homes, and struck with their bâtons children and bedridden people. The strikers returned to work without a concession from the employers.

The Nationalist Movement

Irish labor had reason indeed to be disillusioned with its nationalism, but internationalism, too, had failed it. Had British labor responded to its appeal, a knowledge of labor's class solidarity and common mission throughout the world would have awakened in that period of intense struggle. Even as it was, the Irish labor movement received a new and permanent impulse toward class consciousness at that time.

Nevertheless, the Irish Transport Workers' Federation was broken, and had to be built

up anew from the very foundation, and the revolting spirit in Ireland turned very largely into nationalist channels. The passage and subsequent holding up of the Home Rule Act by the creation of the Ulster volunteers and Ulster's threat to fight, brought the political question of Ireland's independence into prominence. The Irish volunteer force also came into being. It was composed of Fenians, Sinn Feiners (who then were only a very small party), Parliamentary Irish Nationalists, workingmen and youths of the middle class who belonged to no party at all but were eager to fight for Irish freedom. Ready to muster with the rest were labor's volunteers, the Citizen Army, as they were called, originally formed during the great lockout to protect the workers from attack by the police and soldiers.

The next significant landmark was the attempt of the British military to stop Nationalist gun-running at Howth (though Ulstermen had done the same thing with impunity), and the firing upon the people at Bachelor's Walk, Dublin, by the soldiers returning from the encounter, because people jeered and children threw banana peels.

The pale daughter of one of the victims shook her fist at the passing soldiers, crying: "You killed my father." The parents were weeping for dead and wounded children. Then suddenly the war came. The shooting had occurred on July 26th; on August 4th, the day Potsdam declared war, was held the inquest on the victims. A resolution stood in the name of the Lord Mayor of Dublin, to be moved at the City Council on August 5th calling for the dismissal of the permanent officials of Dublin Castle. A motion by other members demanded the recall of Lord Aberdeen, the Viceroy, and Augustine Birrell, the Chief Secretary. But the war had come, and had changed men's opinions. The Councilors stood outside the Chamber, and did not go in to form a quorum: the roll was called eight minutes before the time: there was no quorum, the council had to adjourn. The affair of the shooting was officially buried for-

ever, as far as the Dublin City Council was concerned.

That night the first batch of Reservists left Ireland for England and the war, singing, fighting, and very drunk. The women clung to them crying. The Dublin quays were thronged with cheering crowds. Ireland seemed to have buried the hatchet: British statesmen referred to her as the "one bright spot."

The Sinn Fein Rebellion

Labor and the Fenians were now fast drawing together. It was they who created the Easter Week Rebellion of 1916. Sinn Fein is the name that is now connected with the rebellion, but, as a matter of fact, the Sinn Fein organization did not make the rebellion, and of the seven men who signed the Republican proclamation only Sean MacDiarmada called himself a Sinn Feiner. Arthur Griffith, the leader of Sinn Fein, took no part in the rebellion and remained indoors when the insurrection began. Some report that he said he must stay at home to mind the children, others that he was a pacifist, and others again that he was too valuable a thinker for his life to be jeopardized. In the great labor struggle of 1918 Griffith had strongly opposed the workers, dubbing their fight against the oppression of Irish capitalists "injurious" to Ireland.

James Connolly

James Connolly, the acknowledged leader of labor and socialism in Ireland, was by far the most important figure in the rebellion. British socialists, who had often heard him insist that capitalism was the chief enemy of the workers in all countries and in Ireland like the rest, wondered that he had given his life in a nationalist struggle. But the struggle was by no means wholly nationalist, and his part in it was not inconsistent with his earlier policy. In 1896 he had founded the Irish Socialist Republican Party, which established a paper called *The Workers' Republic* under his editorship. In 1897 this party organized an anti-Jubilee demonstration against Queen Victoria. In 1898 it was

prominent in commemorating the Republican Insurrection of the United Irishmen. In 1899-1900 the party agitated against the Boer War, and joined the Republicans in establishing the Irish Transvaal committee, which organized an Irish Brigade to fight with the Boers against the British. Connolly was in America from 1902 to 1910. In 1910 he returned to Ireland and became organizer both for the Socialist Party and the Irish Transport Workers' Union, which had been founded in Dublin by Jim Larkin in 1909.

Connolly's work for socialism had therefore always been closely associated with the idea of an Irish republic and with the idea of a nationalist insurrection. In many ways his policy, and the evolution of the Irish working class movement as a whole, followed along the self-same lines which have developed in Britain. First isolated unions were formed in various trades: then a trade union congress was formed in 1894, a mere loose federation and purely industrial. The Socialist Party, formed two years later, had at first no connection with the trade union movement. Larkin, by his activities in both bodies beginning in 1907, and Connolly, becoming both a socialist and a trade union organizer in 1910, helped, no doubt, to hasten their inevitable union. So long ago as 1899 local labor organizations had run candidates for local elections, but their nominees had been absorbed into the capitalist parties. In 1911 a number of Irish Trades Councils secured seats for labor candidates on municipal councils, and at the Trades Union Congress in Galway a motion to establish a Parliamentary Labor Party was defeated by a narrow majority. In 1912 the same motion, moved by Connolly, who appeared in the congress for the first time, was carried by two to one. The Irish labor movement had become political and it had adopted parliamentarianism, because the political development of its socialist leaders had as yet reached no further. The socialists had captured the leadership, though not always the complete control, of the trade union movement by the time the transport workers, led by Larkin and Con-

nolly, entered the trade union in 1910. The story of Connolly, the Irish Socialist Party, and the Irish Trade Union Congress is largely a repetition of the story of Keir Hardie, the I. L. P., and the British Trade Union Congress.

But it was the expectation of a Home Rule Parliament in Dublin which had provided the main impetus towards parliamentarianism in Ireland; and with the shelving of the Home Rule Act and the outbreak of war Connolly, and with him Irish labor, were driven back to rebellion. It is significant that in 1915 Connolly was publishing a paper called the *Irish Republic*. So it was that the Irish rebellion was the first revolution produced by the war—and to Connolly it was largely an economic rebellion, whatever it may have been to his colleagues.

Ireland was at first very far from unanimous in supporting the rebellion. Some of those who fought in it have told me that if, after the British government had shelled Dublin, it had simply turned the rebels adrift in O'Connell Street, they would have been stoned for having caused the ruin of the city and the loss of many lives. But by the execution of sixteen leaders the rebellion and those who had made it were sanctified for the mass of the Irish people, and above all James Connolly and his writings gained a wide and far-reaching influence.

Sinn Fein and Socialism

Nevertheless, it must not be thought that the nationalist movement has become socialist. Sinn Fein, which took small part in the rebellion, the Sinn Fein leaders who held aloof from it but afterwards became popular because the government deported them, have inherited the great nationalist rebel movement that arose from the blood of the martyrs. In the parliamentary election at which candidates were pledged not to go to Westminster, but to join in setting up an Irish Parliament (*Dial Eireann*), the Labor Party was told to stand aside lest it should split the vote, and it did so. *Dial Eireann* represents no new tendencies in social evolution. Arthur Grif-

fith, who mainly controls it, is a narrow doctrinaire. His chief panacea for Irish troubles is the tariff wall. Ignoring the world development of capitalism, he argues that the British government is solely actuated by the desire to exterminate the Irish people.

Constance de Markievicz is the only member of the Cabinet of the *Dial*, and of the Sinn Fein Executive, who has been prominently associated with the labor movement. She joined the Liberty Hall workers in the 1918 lockout, and toiled early and late in the feeding center. She also joined the Citizen Army and organized boy scouts to fight for Ireland. As every one knows, she was condemned to death for her part in the rebellion. She is a woman in middle life, rather worn in appearance now, but as active as a girl, and exuberant in her enthusiasms. During her long imprisonment in England she was able to think and study. She came back to freedom, like many other prisoners, with a broadened outlook. She takes a keen interest in Russian communism and reads all she can about it. She refuses, as yet, to recognize the deep cleavage which exists, and must widen, between official Sinn Fein and the communist movement, but when the inevitable struggle between communism and capitalism comes, I think she will choose the side of communism.

Darral Figgis, another member of the *Dial*, has also communist tendencies, indeed theoretically I think he calls himself a supporter of the Bolshevist policy, but I think also that he is unlikely to take an active part in achieving the social revolution. The Sinn Fein attempt to achieve freedom for Ireland at the Peace Conference was in my opinion harmful, except from the superficial point of view of keeping the subject alive with fresh stunts. Nothing could be hoped for from the capitalist politicians who had engaged in the great struggle. It was bad tactics to lead the Irish people after a will-o'-the-wisp, and to divert their attention from what they could do for themselves at home.

Labor is the strongest, indeed the only powerful force behind the movement for

Irish independence. This was demonstrated when the threat of conscription came, and the one-day protest strike stopped the wheels of business and productive life in Ireland.

At Limerick

Again when Limerick was proclaimed a military area, and no one was allowed to enter the town without a permit, labor alone could cope with the situation. The military had drawn a circle round the town, and had drawn it so that all that part of the town which lay across the river was considered outside the town. Therefore workers living without the circle had to get permits to come in to work: workers living within the circle and going outside it to work, needed permits to come home. Therefore the workers downed tools and for two weeks all activities were suspended. The strike committee was called the Soviet. Shops were opened only for a short time each day and prices were lowered, at its bidding. Vehicles only drove through the streets by its permission, carrying a large notice to say so; newspapers were only allowed to appear on two days and only then if they printed a prominent notice that they were authorized by the committee. The cross-channel flyers and the trans-Atlantic flyers had to come up the little dark stairs of the strike committee's office for permission to bring gasoline into the town. In the end the permits were withdrawn on the pretence of a concession to the American visitors, and though Limerick was still called a military area, the restrictions were not enforced.

But actually the strike had collapsed without achieving a decisive victory. It collapsed for lack of financial support. Official Sinn Fein gave no assistance. It was "considering" the question. The Irish Transport Workers' Union gave \$5,000. The Irish Labor Party gave \$2,500. The Irish Clerks' Union gave \$500. Branches of various unions gave small donations. In all less than \$15,000 was received, and upwards of 80,000 people whose wages had stopped were to be fed! A limited amount of food was given by Sinn Fein farmers and Sinn Fein clubs

in the country around the city, but this the strike committee was afraid to distribute without charge lest the shopkeepers should be offended and unite against the strike. The food was therefore sold at various centers, the proceeds being used for strike pay, but amounting to very little. Having no money to spend, masses of people could not buy food at any price.

The strike committee decided to print its own money; indeed the money was actually printed. A committee of influential persons agreed to interview the shopkeepers with an appeal to honor the strike committee's money. But when the influential persons heard there was less than \$1,500 in the bank, they refused to start out on the canvas. At the same time it was said that the priests were about to issue a manifesto against the strike—and the priests have great influence in Ireland. It was rumored that trade was leaving the city and being diverted to other parts never to return. The strike committee in panic suddenly called off the strike. Many rebel spirits tore down the committee's proclamations, but the return to work had begun and the strike could not stand.

During the strike a deputation from the Labor Party, including Tom L. Johnson, had visited Limerick to discuss the prospects. A general strike of all Ireland was considered, but the project fell through, because the Labor Party representatives insisted that such a strike could only be a demonstration lasting one or two days, and the Limerick strike committee would not pledge itself to carry on their strike after the general body of Irish labor had returned to work. Tom L. Johnson suggested that the city should be gradually evacuated by its inhabitants, being temporarily housed by comrades in the country. The Limerick Committee replied that this was impossible, as the military would sack the deserted town. There was much recrimination by those who knew little of the facts, as a result of the collapse of the strike. Many blamed the Limerick Committee. Many blamed the Labor Party. Sinn Fein with its big bourgeois membership had greater oppor-

tunities of raising money than had the labor movement; for the labor movement, reduced to bankruptcy in 1913 and again in 1916, has not been able to accumulate large reserves. But Sinn Fein does not seem to have been blamed for failing to support the Limerick protest, although the protest was a purely national one.

Though it failed to achieve a complete success, the Limerick strike was a wonderful demonstration of solidarity: nothing like it has been accomplished in Britain. Those who hoped that it might portend an important proletarian awakening feared to build too much on it, because, as the protest was a nationalist one, the bourgeoisie of Limerick had largely acquiesced in it.

But on the following May Day we saw that Irish labor, without any support from Sinn Fein, could organize a national demonstration strike which was practically complete throughout Ireland, and in which the manual workers were solid, and even clerks and civil servants joined. The red flag was declared illegal on that day, but everywhere it was flown.

Three Schools of Thought

In the Irish labor movement, as in that of other countries, three distinct schools of thought are beginning to make themselves felt, though they are less clearly defined, as yet, than we find them in Britain.

These are: (1) The old-fashioned non-socialist reformists, determined to adhere to what the capitalists tell them is constitutional and anxious to avoid industrial action. (2) The mildly militant parliamentarians, who want reforms, even socialism, if they can get it without too much effort, who rely mainly on legislation but would use industrial action as a threat and a spur. (3) The industrial revolutionary socialists.

From my observation of Irish affairs I should say that many people active in the movement are not quite sure to which of these categories they belong: not having cleared their own ideas they float mentally hither and thither, supporting sometimes one policy,

sometimes another. There are many people like that in Britain also.

The official policy of Irish labor is a little mixed. It is far in advance of, and much more militant than, the policy of official British labor. But that is at present inevitable, since on the railway bridge facing Liberty Hall (the labor headquarters) are stationed always those sinister block-houses with armed gunmen ready for action!

The Executive of the Irish Labor Party some time ago stated its position in regard to the Russian Soviet Republic in these terms:

"Irish labor utters its vehement protest against the capitalist outlawry of the Soviet Republic of Russia, and calls upon the workers under the governments sharing in this crime to compel the evacuation of the occupied territories of the Republic at the same time as it renews its welcome and congratulation to its Russian comrades, who for twelve months have exercised that political, social, and economic freedom towards which Irish workers, in common with their fellows in other lands, still strive and aspire."

Nevertheless the Irish Labor Party, though it held meetings, did not join the demonstration strike proposed by the Italian workers for July 20th and 21st, 1919, in support of the Soviet Republics. Was Irish labor officially approached, or was it left to take its invitation through England?

Coöperation

There are also hopeful constructive tendencies in Ireland. A flourishing coöperative farm-produce store was left behind when the Limerick strike ended, and butter, potatoes, buttermilk, firewood, and other commodities continued coming into the city from the country on a permanent basis, and were sold below the usual price. Demands for increased wages and sectional strikes followed in trade after trade, and substantial increases were secured throughout the district.

In Dublin, the hotel and restaurant workers' strike, which went on for many weeks, resulted in the opening of a café close to Liberty Hall, staffed by the employees of one of the first hotels. Some sort of coöpera-

tive industry seems now to arise from the ashes of every Irish strike.

George Russell, who has been preaching coöperation for many years, begins now to see a substantial beginning made in the reali-

zation of his long-cherished idea. Communism will not come in dribblets without an upheaval, but these constructive efforts by the workers indicate a development in their power and solidarity.

The "Free Speech" Fallacy

S. E.

THE keystone of the liberalist edifice¹ is the liberal's faith in "freedom of discussion." I fancy this faith has been rather severely shaken the past five years and in many cases destroyed altogether; but it is a faith that dies hard and we may expect it to survive for a long time to come to confuse and unsettle political discussion. Liberals would admit that political discussion has been seriously restricted during the war period, but they might claim, with some plausibility, that such restriction is only temporary and proves nothing as to the possibility and value of unrestricted discussion as a normal political policy.

Is the liberal's faith in freedom of discussion altogether unfounded? If not, what basis in human nature and political experience has it? In what sense may political discussion be free as a matter of fact? What specific function and value has this freedom of discussion in the sense it is found to obtain?

The qualifying adjective "free," or "freedom of," may be taken in two important senses. First, a legal or formal freedom, connoting an absence of legal restriction on political discussion; second, freedom in the positive sense of *means or opportunity* of discussion.

Futility of Merely Legal Freedom

The first sense of the term must not be exclusively identified with constitutional or statutory guarantees, but broadened to cover popular toleration of unwelcome ideas. There may be an entire absence of constitutional

or statutory limitations on political discussion, and freedom of discussion in the legal sense still be wanting. The sentiment of a community may be and often is such that discussion is more effectually restrained than it could be by constitutional or statutory prohibitions. Freedom of discussion in the legal sense is analagous to the individual laborer's freedom of contract as defined in constitution and statute and in the common law (the latter corresponding, perhaps, to popular toleration of unwelcome ideas). Freedom of discussion so regarded, like its analogue, the laborer's freedom of contract similarly regarded, *implies nothing as to the use which can be made of the freedom*. It merely means that an individual or a group may speak and print whenever they desire to do so, *provided* they can secure the requisite facilities. It is, so to speak, freedom of discussion *in vacuo*.

Freedom of discussion in the positive sense, in the sense of opportunity or means of discussion, begins where freedom in the other sense leaves off. It depends, of course, on legal freedom, but legal freedom will not guarantee this positive sort of freedom, no more than the laborer's freedom of contract secures to the laborer a positive, that is a real, freedom. For freedom of discussion to be of value it must be a freedom in both senses of the term. Freedom of discussion without facilities for discussion obviously cannot amount to much.

Positive Freedom

But, it will be said, opportunity of discussion is open to every one who wants to discuss anything. Granted: we can always find an audience when we have something to say;

¹ See the February and March issues of this journal for an examination of other phases of liberalist philosophy.

each of us has at least a few friends who are good enough to listen to us, and who are more or less influenced by what we say. *But the character and size of our audience will depend on the kinds and amounts of the facilities for discussion at our disposal. Now, this command of facilities will not itself depend, as a rule, on the value of the ideas to be expressed or the knowledge and understanding with which they are urged.* These will have some effect; but, assuming these and other things, such as histrionic and literary ability, to be equal, the size of our audience will be determined mainly by our *class* connections. One identified with or friendly to the class in power will, other things being equal, have an incomparably larger audience than one identified with or friendly to an opposing class. This claim will be supported further on in the discussion. We are only anticipating here the objection of those who will say that freedom of discussion in the legal sense guarantees freedom in the positive sense. While they are right in saying that legal freedom carries with it *some* positive freedom, they will be wrong if they say that this "some" is enough to constitute positive freedom properly understood. It is the *kinds and amounts of positive freedom* that make the vital difference. For there to be a really positive freedom of discussion *equally large and constant* audiences must be available to rival ideas and programs, for otherwise one set of them will or may have so great an advantage over the other set that the latter has not a fighting chance of victory.

It may be objected at this point that the more valuable idea or program will win out in the long run even though it cannot be pressed on the attention of people as often as a rival idea or program which by hypothesis is less valuable. Every idea or program for which a real case can be made out is eventually brought to the notice of the entire citizen population, it will be urged, and the majority of people may be depended on to consider each idea or proposal on its merits, so that the superior idea or proposal will in the end win the victory over the inferior. Such a

claim rests on assumptions already criticized.² Many people can and do consider ideas on their merits, and many are drawn to the superior ideas for other reasons, but under present educational conditions and even under the most favorable conditions for which there is any prospect, the great majority of people will accept the ideas and proposals which have the largest volume of reiteration and mass suggestion behind them.

Class Restriction of Free Speech

And where an idea or movement is so appealing as to have a chance of victory despite the limited (positive) freedom of discussion which handicaps it, the class in power will, when such idea or movement seems to menace its position, take vigorous steps to compass its defeat. In such case, the advocates of the change will, as a rule, respond by other than measures of persuasion which have thus been rendered nugatory. The struggle between the two parties will thus have been taken out of the intellectual realm, where discussion is the method of adjustment, and carried over into the realm of physical force where the issue can be settled only by military or economic warfare.

This is, in fact, the course which the struggle between two classes for power usually takes, when the opposition between them is vital and irreconcilable. We may go even further and lay it down as a broad historical generalization that the final act in the struggle between two hostile classes (with their opposing ideas and programs) is accomplished by means of economic or military warfare, understanding by the "final act" the overthrow of the class in power or the decisive defeat of the class opposed to it. Discussion has, as regards issues between opposing classes, two functions: (1) It serves to initiate "reforms" in the existing system (reforms which may be in the interest of either party to the struggle) without fundamentally modifying the system; (2) it is instrumental to the better organization of antagonistic

² See this journal, March, 1920, pages 209-212.

classes and hence preparatory to their final struggle for power.

Having defined the two senses in which the term "freedom of discussion" may be taken, and sketched in general terms their respective functions, let us examine the liberalist position in regard to the principle. In which of the senses distinguished does the liberal take the term freedom of discussion? To what extent is freedom in that sense possible? What value has political discussion of the scope thus delimited as a method of settling political issues, especially where vital class interests are involved?

The term is generally taken to mean, and liberals take it to mean, the absence of constitutional, statutory, and popular restrictions on liberty of discussion. It is true that some liberals dream of a positive freedom of discussion, but whenever they purport to deal with political realities, the term is taken in its legal or formal sense. With two important qualifications to be stated presently, such freedom does obtain at normal times in so-called democratic countries.

The Power of Intolerance

Freedom in this sense is restricted by (1) popular (as distinguished from legislative) intolerance of ideas which represent too sharp a break with the existing order, and (2) constitutional or statutory restrictions on the more obnoxious ideas of the same class. Examples of (1) are to be found in the virtual exclusion from our educational institutions, our pulpits, and, to a lesser extent, from the theatre, the press, and the platforms, of all shades of revolutionists, particularly the more radical sorts. We ought to distinguish here between such exclusion as dictated by the class in power, and the same sort of exclusion as reflecting the general sentiment of the community. Only the latter would come under our first category of restrictions. When the class in power dictates such exclusion, it would either come under the second category or be referred to a third category, that of *direct action* by a class. Examples of (2) are seen in the arrest and prosecution of

radical propagandists and other spokesmen of the subordinate class. This is done by bringing the activities to be suppressed under such legal categories as contempt of court, incitation to unlawful acts, disorderly conduct, sedition, and the like. This second sort of restrictions is not, in countries like the United States, specially important in normal times, but it may become exceedingly important in war time. For it is during war time that radical propagandists are most active and most likely to meet with success and when unrestricted discussion would serve their cause most. Moreover, war is made to order when a radical group or class pushes its claims too far, and typical war-time restrictions on discussion and action are rigorously carried out.

What value has legal freedom of discussion as thus qualified and restricted? It has value for "reforms" in the existing order, but it has no revolutionary value except, as before pointed out, in the preparatory work of recruiting and disciplining a radical class, and then only to the extent that the legal freedom is complemented by a positive freedom. This inapplicability of the discussion method to more radical undertakings doubtless explains in part the great value imputed to it by the liberal party. The method is serviceable for the reforms in which liberals are interested, but its serviceability for the more radical changes to which they are opposed is quite limited. Besides, as pointed out in the March issue, legal freedom of discussion is an express recognition of the intellectual interests which liberals are so prone to magnify. Despite these counts in its favor, many liberals would be opposed to the legal and positive freedom which we have, did they recognize the value, however limited, which it does have for radical movements. Many former liberals are, as a matter of fact, opposed to it at the present time and favor, like good reactionaries, the rough and ready methods, recently perfected, of dealing with the communists, the I. W. W.'s, and others of that stripe.

We have anticipated somewhat our discus-

sion of the question to what extent positive freedom of discussion does or might obtain. The restrictions on legal freedom of discussion, some of them normally present, others not so, will of course limit positive freedom. When popular intolerance of outspoken radicals debars them from functioning through churches, colleges, and universities, then positive freedom is to that extent limited. Positive freedom is also limited by the extraordinary legal restrictions of war time, whether or no the given war was manufactured for the purpose of charming or forcing a subordinate class into a more docile attitude toward their superiors.

Avenues of Expression

Despite these restrictions, there are a number of avenues along which a considerable measure of positive freedom might be had. In the first place, the subordinate class can set up opposition organs in the form of labor churches, workmen's educational associations, and the like. This they are beginning to do. How much positive freedom can be achieved along these lines? Not enough, it must be confessed, to match the freedom of the ruling class in the same field. It requires a lot of money to establish and operate colleges and churches, and a propertyless class cannot compete with a propertied class in the provision of money for such purposes. The capitalist class can have, as long as it remains in power, more attractive and hence better attended churches and colleges than any of the laboring class can establish and maintain. Add to this the fact that those who by reason of their class connections might be converted to a radical position are usually unable to avail themselves of such educational opportunities as may be offered, and we shall realize how handicapped the subordinate class will be in competing along these lines with the class in power.

The same analysis applies to educational institutions supported by the state, except that the control of the class in power is there less direct. That it is not less effective any one will admit who understands how thor-

oughly state legislatures, city councils, and boards of education are dominated by business interests or business points of view. A powerful ally of the ruling class in this work is the daily press. It fosters the sentiment, the good will, which assures to the ruling class an uninterrupted control. The press has of course a far greater significance than that, for as a medium of communication it has no rival. What measure of positive freedom can a subordinate class achieve through the press?

The press is different from the churches, schools, and higher institutions of learning in that at normal times there are fewer and less serious legal (popular) restrictions on the radical press than on radical activities through agencies of the other classes. We do not need to inquire at length why this is so. Suffice it to say that more attention has been given to, and greater success attained in, the establishment of a radical press than in the establishment of radical churches and schools. It has been possible because of this for the radicals and conservatives to quarantine themselves from each other in the matter of press propaganda, and this has made possible a greater latitude to the radical press than to radical propagandists working through other agencies of opinion. The conservative can tolerate the radical when he is, like the skunk, a great distance away. But he will not tolerate him at close quarters. If the radical functions at all through schools and churches, it must, under present conditions, be through the *same* particular institutions as his antagonist, the conservative, and this is not to be tolerated.

Because of this greater latitude allowed the radical press, it has been the principal avenue along which radicals and spokesmen for the subordinate class generally have sought a positive freedom of discussion. What has been achieved, and what further is possible, along this line?

The Press Itself "Big Business"

Our analysis here approaches quite closely our previous analysis of radical churches and

schools. The newspaper business is today predominantly a "big business." It depends for success on large capital and on voluminous advertising, which latter is itself dependent on capitalistic support. The truth of this contention, if any are inclined to doubt it, is attested by the consolidation of newspapers, the commercialization of the periodicals, and the passing of formerly "independent" newspapers and magazines under the control of powerful financial interests. It cannot be denied that the financing of large-scale newspaper and magazine enterprises depends, with but few exceptions, on the goodwill of the business community. And this goodwill cannot be had without serving the interests of the business community.

Radical organs appeal, on the other hand, to an entirely different group, and this group has but little money available for the support of these publications. The result is that we have on the one side a great number of well-equipped newspapers and periodicals with large circulations, and on the other side a small number of poorly equipped publications with small circulations. Better equipment, and hence greater attractiveness, multiplied by large circulation gives an invincible combination compared with inferior equipment multiplied by small circulation. You consequently have a radical press occupying a position analagous to radical churches and schools. The conservative press can, like the established churches and schools, make an enormously more impressive, and hence a more powerful, appeal than can the radical press. I am of course referring to appeals directed to neutrals who theoretically might be attracted to either camp.

Who can doubt what the outcome will be? The conservative press gets itself accepted as the voice of the people and therefore carries the people before it, saving only the remnant whose attitudes are not determined by the mere volume of suggestion and reiteration playing upon them. This outcome is the more inevitable in that the deliberate policy of the conservative press, and, it must be admitted, the radical press as well (though perhaps to

a less extent), is to suppress, emphasize, and color facts in such a way as to favor the policies or interests which they severally represent. So few people are really equipped for newspaper reading that the mass of conservatives and radicals, too, think in the medium of alleged facts created by the dominant press. The dominant press is able to determine the medium for radicals as well as conservatives because it has far better machinery for collecting the news than has the radical press; and the radicals are dependent, or think they are, on these better equipped news-collecting agencies.

Since the political attitudes of a great majority of the unthinking, and hence a great majority of *all* the people, will be determined mainly by the conservative press, what chance of success has the press which speaks for a subordinate class? Compare the volume of printed matter put out by the press upholding the *status quo* with the volume put out by the radical press in opposition to the *status quo*. For every line put out by the radical press there are ten or a hundred lines put out by the conservative press. If, as we have insisted, the great majority of people are swayed in their political opinions by mass suggestion rather than by real evidence, what will the positive freedom attainable through a radical press amount to?

The People's Conservatism

Obviously, such freedom considered in itself alone offers no hope of salvation. The radical press will of course have a powerful ally in the conditions of life which press so hard on the subordinate class, and will be able with the aid of this ally to convert many of the class to a radical position. But even here there are powerful cross-currents which make anything like complete success impossible. The suggestibility of many of the class, a trait shared of course with others who have not had the advantage of a scientific training, and the opposition of all classes, including the subordinate class, to change as such, are examples of what is meant. The net result is that the radical press, with radical churches

and schools added, cannot hope to convert more than a proportion of the class in whose behalf it labors, together with a small number of people outside the class whose sympathies are broad enough to override their class interests or preconceptions.

Whether a greater and more serviceable freedom along these lines is possible is doubtful. Legal restrictions will automatically come into play as the facilities for radical communication and propaganda are multiplied. That is in part the significance of the general campaign of suppression at the present time.

We cannot afford, however, to be dogmatic about the possibility of a greater positive freedom for radical propaganda. It is too early to say whether we shall repeat the Russian experience, with violent revolution as the culmination, or whether we can follow what is supposed to be a British method of compromise, with the more violent type of revolution avoided. Certainly if present repressionist tactics are persisted in, as seems not unlikely, then direct action rather than the indirect methods of discussion will be resorted to.

If the foregoing analysis be correct, then liberalist claims for freedom of discussion

must be very seriously modified. That degree of legal and positive freedom which is attainable is of course to be valued, since, as we have admitted, it will be serviceable for certain purposes. But a radical policy cannot be based upon it, although freedom of discussion may be availed of up to a certain point in the promotion of radical movements. The machinery of communication, like all the accredited institutions of a given society, is too much under the control of the class in power for any decisive use to be made of it by a subordinate class. Vital class issues are not as yet to be settled through discussion and compromise, and we shall do well not to base our programs on the assumption that they may be.

Such a conclusion is not necessarily pessimistic. We must, if we are to be effective, deal with political realities. But the nature of political reality may and does change. It is worth while to strive for a fuller measure of freedom. Issues not now adjudicable by parliamentary methods may some day be brought within the domain of constitutional politics. But the time is not yet, and the issues of today cannot wait for it to come, if indeed we may hope for its coming at all.

West Twenty-Third Street

Babette Deutsch

**Over the dingy street, mean mingled lights
Flare in a huddle of flamboyant gold.
The cobbles crack where stumbling drays are rolled.
A frozen scent of long November nights
Is in the wind, that wavers as it smites.
And like a genie through the shadowy cold
The movie palace, magical and bold,
Shines on dark desolate blocks and shuttered fights.**

**A far train wails. The street is stiller then.
A black enormous giant, shaped like doom,
The elevated lurches overhead.
What fire consumes these drabs and sullen men
That flickers here out of the jaws of gloom?
They freeze, and hope; they starve, and mourn their dead.**

Alien and Sedition Laws of the Past

Harry Elmer Barnes

In the midst of the present hysteria it may be helpful to consider the nature and results of earlier attempts in our national history to regulate and restrict freedom of speech and press. Such a historical survey is likely to be interesting, not merely because it illustrates the dangerous consequences of repressive legislation, but also because it clearly shows that those who are now greatly revered by the conservatives were themselves in their own day held up to public view as dangerous and licentious radicals.

The "Fathers" of the Constitution were two-fold revolutionaries. Men like Hamilton, John Adams, and John Hancock destroyed one form of government in this country through what Benjamin Franklin designated as the deplorable act of "breaking that beautiful vase, the British Empire." They also "brought contempt" upon the government which operated under the Articles of Confederation, overthrew this government, and established new governmental machinery through a bloodless but nevertheless a truly revolutionary action.

So much for the more notable Federalist leaders. The radicals, led by Jefferson and his fellow "parlor Bolsheviki," were regarded even by the "revolutionary" Federalists in a manner similar to that now shown by William D. Guthrie and his sympathizers toward the suspended socialist legislators in Albany. These lineal party ancestors of Attorney General Palmer, whose traditions the attorney general piously imagines himself to be carrying out, were regarded as dangerous and foul-mouthed incendiaries, a menace to the safety of this country and its institutions, agitators whose suppression or imprisonment seemed to be dictated by every consideration of moral principle and political expediency.

Finally, those revolutionary refugees from France, whose destruction of the Bastille on the 14th of July is now commemorated by the most conservative Americans, were viewed

by all the "respectable" classes in this country in 1798 in a light wholly comparable with that in which the members of the Communist Party and the sympathizers with the Soviet Government in Russia are at present regarded by the editorial writers of the *New York Sun* and the *New York Times*.

The Foreign "Reds"

The historic setting of the Alien and Sedition Laws enactment was not widely different from that which now exists in the United States and which furnishes the impulse for the present restrictive legislation. The United States had been an asylum for radicals driven from Europe. These refugees had long been repressed in Europe, and under the more liberal institutions of America had sought psychic release for their pent-up feelings. The result was wordy attacks against those who in America represented the political powers and authority which the refugees had come to hate so thoroughly in Europe. Worst of all, from the Federalist point of view, the virulence of these newcomers was being exploited by Jefferson and his supporters in their efforts to organize a new party of opposition to the Federalists. Professor Channing has well summarized the situation which had come to exist by June, 1798:

"Many of these newcomers were extreme radicals and expressed their opinions by speech or pen with a venomous facility that has few counterparts in these milder times. In their old homes, they had detested kings and governors, but had been compelled to keep their thoughts more or less to themselves. In America, they contemned whatever magistrate they found in power without fear of guillotine, axe, Bastille or Tower. . . . It was inevitable that in 1798, some one should ask by what right a lot of foreigners came over here and malignantly reproached those whom the voters had placed in high station? If these foreigners did not like the men and things that appealed to the majority of American voters, let them keep away, or if they had come over, let them get out." The Federalists were greatly concerned over the success which seemed to be attending

Jefferson's effort to organize the radical elements into a strong and stable party, but it is doubtful if all the sagacity of Jefferson, the logic of Madison, or the shrewdness of Burr could have accomplished as much in aiding their cause and turning public sentiment against their opponents, as did the Federalists themselves by their indiscretion in the moment of victory. The Federalists, stirred by the X. Y. Z. trouble and the virulence of the Republican press, and recognizing that public opinion had turned in their favor, "signed their own death-warrant." On June 21, 1798, the House passed a bill received from the Senate, which was entitled "An Act Concerning Aliens," and provided for the deportation of obnoxious aliens.¹ The bill enabled the President to order such aliens as he deemed dangerous out of the country; and, upon the failure of said alien to comply with the President's order, he might be imprisoned for three years and forfeit all possibility of becoming an American citizen. If an alien should return to the country after having been once sent out, he was to be imprisoned as long as the President believed it to be necessary in the interest of the public safety.²

On July 3rd another Act entitled "An Act Respecting Alien Enemies" was passed by the Senate, to which it had been sent by the House, and approved by the President on July 6th. This provided that, in case of war between the United States and any other country, all citizens of that country should be liable to be seized and held as alien enemies. The President was to determine the conditions under which these aliens were to be restrained and under which they were to be permitted to remain in the United States, and was empowered to provide for the removal of those who were not permitted to remain.³

¹Macdonald, *Select Documents Illustrative of the History of the United States, 1776-1861*, p. 141.

²*Ibid.*, pp. 141-143.

³*Ibid.*, pp. 144-146.

Finally, on July 10th, the House passed the most obnoxious of this triad of repressive measures, the famous "Sedition Act,"⁴ which was approved by the President on the 14th. The first section provided that all persons or combinations of persons to oppose the passage of measures, to impede the operation of the laws of the United States, to intimidate a public official or prevent him from doing his duty, or who should attempt to incite an insurrection or riot, should be fined not more than \$5,000 and be imprisoned from six months to five years. The second and most odious section contained the following provisions:

"And be it enacted that if any person shall write, print, utter or publish, or shall cause or procure to be written, printed, uttered or published, or shall knowingly and wittingly assist or aid in writing, printing, uttering or publishing any false, scandalous, and malicious writing or writings against the Government of the United States, or either house of the Congress of the United States, or the President of the United States, with intent to defame the said government, or either house of the said Congress, or the said President, or to bring them, or either of them, into contempt or disrepute; or to excite against them, or either or any of them, the hatred of the good people of the United States, or to stir up sedition within the United States, or to excite any unlawful combinations therein, for opposing or resisting any law of the United States, or any act of the President of the United States, done in pursuance of any such law, or of the powers in him vested by the Constitution of the United States, or to resist, oppose, or defeat any such law or act, or to aid, encourage, or abet, any hostile designs of any foreign nation against the United States, their people or government, then such person, being thereof duly convicted before any court or tribunal of the United States having jurisdiction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars, and by imprisonment not exceeding two years."⁵

In addition to their general content there are two matters especially worthy of mention in respect to this legislation. In the first place, these oppressive laws were not the product of the greatest minds among even the conservatives of the time. Hamilton and

⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 146-148.

⁵*Ibid.*

Marshall vigorously denounced them as unwise, untimely, and ill-considered, while Adams was scarcely lukewarm in their support. They were the product of the activity of petty politicians and irritated mediocrities in Congress and of insignificant functionaries in the administration, whose inflated pride was hurt by the criticism of themselves or the government, or who resented the support which the foreign radicals gave to the Jeffersonian group. In the second place, violation of these acts was attended with much milder punishment than that imposed for violation of the espionage laws passed in this country during the World War or by the sedition bills which are now being proposed in Congress.

Thomas Jefferson Leads the Attack

It is easy to surmise what effect such measures as these, without justification in constitutional law, would have on Jefferson and his party. Here was something which monarchical England would not tolerate,⁶ and compared with which the measures of Hamilton were mild indeed. Still, however shocked Jefferson may have been, his conduct stands in remarkably favorable contrast to the precipitate and ill-considered action of the Federalists. The wily leader of the American radicals of 1798 realized that, as soon as the real import of these acts was fully grasped by the country at large, and as soon as some had actually felt the impact of their tyranny, there would be a tremendous revulsion of public opinion from the Federalists to his party. He was careful to see to it that, while legal protests might be made against the laws and popular sentiment aroused against them, no act of violence should be perpetrated against the federal

⁶Gardiner, *Students' History of England*, p. 830; and Cross, *History of England and Greater Britain*, pp. 834-835. Pitt and the Tories, frightened by the French Revolution, had passed the Treason and Sedition Acts of 1795, but public sentiment was so strong against them that they were never put into operation. The similarity of the American measures to these seemed to substantiate the Republican charge of servile imitation of England.

government which should, like the Whiskey Insurrection, the Genet trouble, or the X. Y. Z. affair, cause the people to forget their wrongs and grievances and again rally to the support of the government.

In June, 1798, he wrote to Madison: "They have brought into the lower house a sedition bill, which among other enormities, undertakes to make printing certain matter criminal, though one of the amendments to the Constitution has so expressly taken religion, printing presses, etc., out of their coercion. Indeed this bill and the alien bill both are so palpably in the teeth of the constitution as to show they mean to pay no respect to it." To Steven T. Mason he wrote on October 11th his most vigorous criticism of these measures:

"The X. Y. Z. fever has considerably abated through the country, as I am informed, and the alien and sedition laws are working hard. I fancy that some of the State legislatures will take strong ground on this occasion." For my own part, I consider these laws are merely an experiment on the American mind, to see how far it will bear an avowed violation of the Constitution. If this goes down we shall immediately see attempted another act of Congress, declaring that the President shall continue in office during life, reserving to another occasion the transfer of the succession to his heirs, and the establishment of the Senate for life. At least, this may be the aim of the Oliverians (Adams and his followers), while Monk (Hamilton) and the Cavaliers, who are perhaps the strongest, may be playing their game for the restoration of his most gracious majesty, George the Third. That these things are in contemplation, I have no doubt; nor can I be confident of their failure, after the dupery of which our countrymen have shown themselves susceptible."

Caution Against Violence

On February 18, 1799, Jefferson wrote to Archibald Stuart telling him of the change of public opinion and expressing the hope that

⁷*Jefferson's Works* (Ford edition), VII, pp. 266-267.

⁸Jefferson was probably at this very time writing the Kentucky Resolutions.

⁹*Jefferson's Works*, VII, p. 288. Jefferson misrepresented Hamilton as being in favor of these laws.

an insurrection might not break out and injure the radical cause:

"The public are getting back to the point where they were when the X. Y. Z. story was played off on them. A wonderful and rapid change is taking place in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. Congress is daily plied with petitions against the Alien and Sedition laws and standing armies. Several parts of this state (Pennsylvania) are so violent that we fear an insurrection. This will be brought about by some (Federalists) if they can. It is the only thing we have to fear. The appearance of an attack of force against the government would check the present current of the middle states, and rally them around the government; whereas, if suffered to go on, it will pass on to a reformation of abuses. The materials now bearing on the public mind will infallibly restore it to its republican soundness in the course of the present summer, if the knowledge of the facts can only be disseminated among the people."¹⁰

To Edmund Pendleton he wrote a letter the next day expressing the same general attitude:

"The violations of the constitution, propensities to war, to expense, and to a particular foreign connection, which we have lately seen, are becoming evident to the people, and are dispelling that mist which X. Y. Z. had spread before their eyes. This State (Pennsylvania) is coming forward with a boldness not yet seen. New York and New Jersey are also getting into great agitation. In this State, we fear that the ill-designing may produce insurrection. Nothing could be so fatal. Anything like force would check the progress of public opinion and rally them around the government. This is not the kind of opposition the American people will permit. But keep away all show of force, and they will bear down the evil propensities of the government by the constitutional means of election and petition. If we can be quiet, therefore, the tide now turning will take a steady and proper direction. Even in New Hampshire there are strong symptoms of a rising inquietude."¹¹

Protest from the Press

The popular feeling against the laws was exactly what Jefferson had predicted. A storm of protest immediately went up from the Republican press. The earlier attack on the Democratic societies had been resented as an infringement of the right of freedom

of speech and of the press, but that was in no way comparable to this sweepingly tyrannical measure. "What," asked *Greenleaf's Daily Advertiser*, "is a libel? A libel is whatever a Federalist President, Marshal, Judge, and Grand Jury choose to make it. The President orders the prosecution. The process goes on in his name. He appoints the Marshal. The Marshal summons the grand and petit jurors, and, in a large city, Federal Tories for this duty may be had in plenty. Nor is this all. The Federal Judges are likewise named by the President, who, if they behave well, may make them Envoys Extraordinary, as he did of John Jay."¹² "Does any man hope for an impartial trial before such a tribunal as this?" inquired *Cary's United States Recorder*. "The thing is an infamous mockery of justice. The moment the law takes effect the Democrat who squints at the President through a pair of spectacles will be guilty of sedition. To look at him through an opera-glass will subject the man to misprison of treason."¹³ "To laugh at the cut of a Congressman's coat, to give a dinner to a Frenchman, or to let him sleep in your bed will be treason," said the *Independent Chronicle*. "When election time comes round," continued this paper, "it will no longer be safe to speak of a member's doings in the House lest it 'bring him into contempt and disrepute.' Do the Tories really think their gag-law will be obeyed? If one knows a member to be actuated by bad and wicked motives, shall he not say so? Can any man read the amendments of the Constitution and say such freedom of speech can be abridged? Certainly not. The independent citizens of America will never be deterred from a manly censure on their servants. May the hand grow palsied and the voice grow dumb that shrinks from such a task, let the threats of the servants of the people be ever so loud. As for the creature who proposed this gag, let him have that kind of immortality which has fallen to the

¹⁰McMaster, *History of the People of the United States*, Vol. II, pp. 397-398.

¹¹*Ibid*, p. 398.

¹²*Ibid*, VII, pp. 354, 356.

ruffian who burned down the Temple of Diana. Give the name of this Vandal, this Goth, this Ostrogoth, this Hun, to be a by-word among the nations! Hold him up while living to the execration of mankind. Consign him when dead to the abhorrence of posterity."¹³

The "Witch Hunt" Begins

If the Federalists were imprudent in their method of attempting to restrain the abusive criticism of the press, they were no less so in their selection of the first person upon whom to experiment in the enforcement of the Sedition act. This individual was Congressman Matthew Lyon, known in Federalist circles as "the Beast from Vermont."¹⁴ Two months before Lyon had gained considerable notoriety by spitting in the face of Congressman Griswold of Connecticut, whereupon several days later Griswold proceeded to cane Lyon in a manner which served admirably as a sort of preliminary bout to the disgraceful Sumner-Brooks affair, half a century later.¹⁵ This attack upon Lyon and the bitter articles which appeared in the Federalist papers that poured out their scurrility upon him, had tended to make him a martyr in the eyes of the Republicans. It was natural, then, that when he was arrested the Republicans, knowing that he was bitterly hated by the Federalists, immediately attacked his detention as a purely partisan and personal act of revenge. Doubtless this was true in a measure, and it appeared all the more evident when it was seen that Lyon's offense was a trivial one, far less serious than those of which even Hamilton and Jefferson had been guilty.¹⁶ After a trial which furnished the Republicans with evidence that Lyon had been unfairly treated, he was fined one thousand dollars and sentenced to jail for four months.¹⁷

¹³*Ibid.*

¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 399; Schouler, *History of the United States*, Vol. I, p. 432.

¹⁵McMaster, *op. cit.*, pp. 363-368.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 364-5; 399-400; Schouler, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 432. He had charged Adams with "unbounded thirst for ridiculous pomp, foolish adulation, and selfish avarice."

¹⁷McMaster, *op. cit.*, p. 400.

Lyon's son placed his father's cause before the public in a little paper called *The Scourge of Aristocracy and Repository of Important Political Truths*. His friends petitioned the President to release him, but when Adams heard that Lyon would not humble himself enough to sign the petition, he refused their request. To pay his fine a lottery was started in which his property was made a prize, and a stirring call was issued urging the people "to be prompt in saving from poverty the first sacrifice on the altar of Sedition." Steven T. Mason of Virginia, Jefferson's old friend, started a subscription to pay his fine. Lyon was reelected to Congress by his constituency, and friends girdled the apple trees of those who had testified against him. His release was celebrated as an escape from the "Federal Bastille."¹⁸

Not only were the Federalists unfortunate in their attempt to enforce the Sedition law in the Lyon conviction, but also in the cases of Callender and Cooper. Much of the odium which was bestowed upon them in these instances was due to the shameful conduct of Judge Chase, who presided at both of these trials. McMaster brands him "as violent and intemperate a partisan, and, therefore, as unjust a judge, as ever disgraced the bench of the Circuit Court of the United States."¹⁹ In the Cooper case, before pronouncing the sentence, Judge Chase asked whether Cooper or the Republican Party was to pay the fine, as he would go to the limit if it was the latter. His colleague, Judge Peters, however, preserved sufficient self-respect and legal spirit to declare that the matter of party was not involved. Cooper's conviction was particularly unpopular because his offense was a very mild criticism of the acts of the President, a very slight misdeed compared with that of which two of the leading men in the Federalist party were guilty.²⁰ This case, together with the fact that the ten or more editors who were punished under

¹⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 400-401.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 466. See also Schouler, *op. cit.*, pp. 460-462.

²⁰McMaster, *op. cit.*, pp. 466-467.

the Sedition law were all Republicans, stigmatized the law as a strictly party measure, as it doubtless was.²¹ In the Callender trial Chase throttled the attorneys for the defense.²² This conduct brought upon Chase the bitter attacks of the Republicans, who gave his name to dogs and maligned him in the press. It no doubt served to stimulate the subsequent Republican attack on the Judiciary.²³

Downfall of Federalists

As has been almost uniformly the case in similar instances in modern history, this attempt to repress and submerge a liberal party through over-severe limitations on the freedom of their expression of opinion resulted in consequences quite different from those which the authors of the law had anticipated. The anti-sedition legislation utterly failed to put an end to the current criticism of the government. There were relatively few convictions for seditious utterances, whereas there was actually a very marked increase in the volume of abuse and the violence of vituperation directed against the administration and the Federalist party.²⁴ The Jeffersonian radicals profited by the persecution which the Federalists directed against them, and as they were able to avoid violence, they soon secured the sympathy of many who had not hitherto been their supporters. Therefore, the general political result of the Alien and Sedition laws was to increase the numbers of the Republicans and to strengthen and solidify their organization, while the Federalists were at the same time dealt a severe blow which marked the beginning of the disintegration of the party. McMaster has admirably summarized this matter of the general significance of the repressive legislation:

"For passing the sedition act there was unquestionably great provocation. No man who has not waded through the political literature of the

²¹*Ibid.*, pp. 467 ff.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 471.

²³*Ibid.*, pp. 497-8.

²⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 397-403; 417-419; Schouler, *op. cit.*, pp. 413-14; 481 ff.

closing years of the last century can form any conception of the depths of falsehood, of knavery, of calumny, of shameful abuse to which it is possible for writers of pamphlets and newspapers to descend. Yet the Sedition Law was most untimely and unwise. *Had the Federalist Congressmen assembled in caucus and debated by what means they could make themselves more hated than they had ever been before, by what means they could destroy their present power, by what means they could turn thousands of 'black cockaders' into bitter and inveterate foes, they could not by any possibility have found a means so efficient as the law against libellous and seditious writing.* Hamilton saw this plainly, and begged them not to set up tyranny. Energy, he reminded them, was one thing; violence was another. But they would not listen to him. Their faces were set toward destruction. And, from the day the bill became a law, the Federal party went steadily down to ruin."²⁵ [Italics the writer's.]

Sedition Act and Nullification

Beyond their effect upon the Federalists there was another very important result of the Alien and Sedition Laws, namely, the doctrine of nullification which appeared in the famous Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions drafted by Jefferson and Madison. Beyond party organization, these Republican leaders attempted to secure legislative opposition to the Alien and Sedition Laws in the southern states. The Kentucky Resolutions were drawn up by Jefferson and were introduced in the Kentucky legislature on November 10, 1798. A year later they were strengthened by the addition of the doctrine that every state in the Union possessed the right to nullify laws passed by the federal government which exceeded the powers delegated to it by the Constitution.²⁶ Though Jefferson was unable at the time to get any significant following for this doctrine, it furnished a precedent for the Hartford Convention and for the later theory of Calhoun. The Virginia Resolutions were drafted by Madison and were introduced in the Virginia legislature on December 27, 1798. While agreeing in general with the doctrines expressed in the

²⁵McMaster, *op. cit.*, p. 397. See also Schouler, *op. cit.*, pp. 404 ff.

²⁶MacDonald, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-155; 158-60.

Kentucky Resolutions, they did not declare as clearly for nullification, but rather called upon the other states to join in a "condemnation" of the hated legislation."

Conclusion

Judging from the history of the past, then, the attitude of the American people towards any permanent attempt to restrict the freedom to criticize political theories and govern-

¹⁷*Ibid*, p. 155.

mental policies and officials seems likely to continue to be of the sort which inspired the following doggerel verse, contributed at the time of the height of the excitement over the Alien and Sedition Laws:

"The Freedom of Speech, to discuss and debate,
Of the deeds of our servants who govern the state,
We'll never resign to the sticklers for power,
Though courtiers and sycophants frown and look sour."¹⁸

¹⁸McMaster, *op. cit.*, p. 401, note.

Politics for Workers

Duncan McDonald

‘**N**O politics in the union” was the slogan in the American labor movement for many years, particularly in the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Any effort on the part of a member of a trade union to inject a political proposition into a trade union meeting was, in consequence, immediately frowned upon. In fact, no politics in the union was the unwritten law of most organizations, and in some of them, it was a declared, definite, fixed policy.

Some eighteen months ago, as a result of restraining orders that had been issued repeatedly by men clothed with judicial authority, the minds of a majority of the trade unionists connected with the Chicago Federation of Labor seemed to undergo a change, and this federation decided to form a Labor Party with a platform almost identical with that of the Socialist Party. With the word "Socialist" left out, many who had formerly opposed political action subscribed to this new doctrine of injecting politics into the union.

Birth of the Labor Party

Later, their program was taken to the convention of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, and accepted by a practically unanimous vote, the incoming officers of the Federation being instructed to help organize the new Labor Party and set it going.

About the same time the New York unions took up the cry, and the movement spread to many States in the union. The question of no politics in the union is no longer raised except in the A. F. of L., and, judging from expressions used by those in close contact with this movement, some of the extreme conservatives there are now beginning to change their attitude toward political action.

The Attitude of the A. F. of L.

At the Atlantic City convention of the A. F. of L., the convention adopted a report of the Executive Council recognizing the right of workers to organize politically in city, or even in State labor parties, but opposing any effort to organize labor on a national scale. What prompted this first step in a changed policy of the A. F. of L. can only be conjectured, but few trade unionists today, who are actually employed in their regular vocations, will subscribe to the doctrine that they must longer remain out of politics. They have discovered that the bosses are in politics and that it is just as essential for "Big Business" to control a political situation as it is to control an industry. Another thing that has prompted the workers to modify their former program is the constantly recurring issuance of injunctions in labor disputes. These injunctions have been growing ever more sweeping in their character. The climax was reached in the decision of Judge Anderson

in the coal miners' strike, which nullified the efforts of trade unions to improve their conditions. When men are denied the right to strike, then their organization is of little avail. When they are denied the right to use their own funds during a strike to support the members for whom the fund was raised, we have strayed quite a long way from the path of democracy and freedom, but when a Federal Court lends its support to the efforts of employers to compel men to return to work, or denies them the right to strike, we have about reached the pinnacle of judicial tyranny, that condition described by the workers as government by injunction.

The Workers Fooled

In the past there has been no such thing as a trade union or working class vote so far as the nation was concerned. The A. F. of L. constantly flirted with the Democratic Party, and used the Federation to direct the votes of trade unionists to the Democratic camp. Others in the labor movement used their influence to fool the workers into voting for a "full dinner pail," "sound money," "protective tariff," or some other similar humbug in which the workers had no particular interest. We found men in local, district, State, or International positions sending out letters endorsing this or that candidate as a "friend to labor," and denouncing the other as an "enemy of the worker." Such endorser would generally be rewarded by a "soft job" or a monetary reward.

The Socialist Party

The Socialist Party, though succeeding in some few instances in electing a handful of men to the city councils, State legislatures, and Congress (the one Socialist congressman elected lately has been denied a seat), had never reached a point where its influence as an organized group had been felt to any material extent. In addition to the two dominant parties who had their following in the trade union movement and the Socialist Party, other workers followed the lead of the Socialist Labor Party and more recently of the Communist Labor Party. The activities of

the latter groups, however, have been somewhat curtailed by some politicians who seem to fear the loss of their control if the workers are permitted freely to organize.

Other movements on foot are the Committee of Forty-eight and the Nonpartisan League organized by the farmers in the Northwest. All of these activities indicate a very sincere desire for a change, and most of them direct their efforts toward a common goal. One member of the Committee of Forty-eight recently expressed himself to me in the following manner: "After all, McDonald, we are striving for the same ends as is the Socialist Party and yet many of us haven't courage enough to admit we are socialists."

At the present time there is an apparent desire on the part of many of the members of the Committee of Forty-eight, as well as on the part of some men prominently connected with the new Labor Party, to form a coalition. The same idea has been expressed by members of the Nonpartisan League, and the question very naturally arises, "Is it possible to effect an affiliation or coalition of the progressive forces in America with a definite, complete program upon which they can agree? If so, how can this be brought about?"

It is suggested that the Labor Party hold a convention in Chicago in June of this year, and the Committee of Forty-eight has expressed itself as favorable to holding their convention at the same time and place. It is hoped that the farmers may agree to a similar program and that these bodies can cooperate in some sort of a triple alliance that will have strength and power enough to be a factor in the next presidential campaign.

Old Parties Identical

There is no good reason now why the Republican and Democratic Parties should stand aloof from each other, as there is no fundamental difference between them. The League of Nations does not even offer an issue. No tariff is involved, no question of North and South, while the "16 to 1" issue has long been in the discard. I have per-

sonally talked with many workers who were formerly Republicans or Democrats, who would have nothing to do with the program of the Socialist Party and yet who now declare they will never again vote for either of the two old parties dominated by the Big Business interests of the country.

The great stumbling block in the way of the union of these forces is the fear that each group may become contaminated by the doctrine of the other. "No compromise" has been the slogan of most organizations who decide to unite politically. This danger of compromise has been emphasized by the experience of the Populist party in fusing with the Democrats. Yet when we examine the declarations of these various newly formed organizations, we find that they agree on fundamentals. They favor public ownership of public utilities; they oppose land monopoly; they stand for the restoration of free speech, free press, and peaceful assembly, and for the right of labor to share in the management of industry and to bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing.

The Farmer

Thus the middle ground is already formed. It is said that the farmers will in no wise injure their own chances by joining forces with the industrial workers of the city, and yet no more progressive program has ever been carried through in any State in the Union than that which was enacted into law by the farmers' Nonpartisan League in the State of North Dakota at the last session of legislature, a program which granted labor every law it requested. No other State legislature can point to the enactment in an agricultural State of such a complete labor program. This in itself demonstrates that there is a working ground upon which the farmer who is exploited and the city worker who is exploited can get together.¹

¹ The following are bills adopted by the last session of the North Dakota General Assembly: The workers' compensation law. Mine inspection law. Eight-hour day for women. Union labels on State printing. Minimum wage for women. Full-train crew. Anti-injunction law.

If such a State as Illinois were to enact at a session of the General Assembly even one bill beneficial to the workers, the political party in control would use that fact for propaganda purposes for the next twenty years.

The Committee of Forty-eight

The Committee of Forty-eight adopted a very brief program as follows; their idea being to confine it to postal card size:

(1) Public ownership of transportation, including stockyards, large abattoirs, grain elevators, terminal warehouses, pipe lines and tanks. Public ownership of other utilities and of the principal natural resources, such as coal, oil, natural gas, mineral deposits, large water powers, and large commercial lumber tracts.

(2) No land (including natural resources), and no patents to be held out of use for speculation to aid monopoly. We favor taxes to force idle land into use.

(3) Equal economic, political, and legal rights for all, irrespective of speech or color. The immediate and absolute restoration of free speech, free press, peaceable assembly, and all civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution. We demand the abolition of injunctions in labor cases. We endorse the effort of labor to share in the management of industry and labor's right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing.

Labor

The Labor Party in their national convention in Chicago, November last, set forth their aims, of which the most fundamental were:

(1) The formation of a League of Workers of all nations, with the abolition of all secret treaties, military conscription or training.

(2) Repeal of the Espionage Laws and complete amnesty for political and industrial prisoners; restoration of free speech, assembly, and press.

(3) National ownership and democratic management of all public utilities and natural resources, along with all industries that require large-scale production: Plumb Plan for railroads and banking exclusively in the hands of the Federal government.

(4) Democratized and free education from kindergarten to university.

(5) Nationalization of all unused land, lease of same to citizens who agree to cultivate it for production, but title still to remain public.

(6) Limitation of Supreme Court power of veto, popular election of federal judges for four-year

terms, and abolition of the United States Senate and of government by injunction.

(7) Development of the coöperative movement.

When we compare these programs there is no fundamental difference, but if all of these separate units are to hold themselves aloof from each other, which is apparently the hope of the reactionaries, they can accomplish nothing.

In the State of Washington has been formed what is known as the Triple Alliance. I am advised that the farmers, the railroad brotherhoods, and the industrial workers who form this three-cornered organization will sweep that State, wrest the powers of government from plutocracy, and use their power in behalf of the twin victims of exploitation, the farmer and the industrial worker.

The Class War in Russian News¹

Evans Clark

THE blockade of Russia by the Allied and Associated Powers has been characterized by one of America's leading journals as "the most inexcusable and barbarous atrocity of the world war." The next place in the order of atrocities may well be assigned to the efforts of the powerful newspapers and magazines in the Allied countries to overthrow the government of Russia by converting their news columns from sources of accurate information into vehicles of propaganda designed to bring about a violent revolution and an armed intervention against the constituted authorities of the Soviet state.

Injury to Allies

Both of these atrocities have worked more ill upon their perpetrators than upon the victims. The blockade has prevented foodstuffs from reaching the famished inhabitants of Moscow and Petrograd, but it has also prevented information from reaching the people of London and New York. The policy of the powerful press has been to distort what little information has run the blockade into the most absurd canards against the Russian masses and the government they have set up. The one reacted upon and strengthened the other in a vicious circle. The continuance of the blockade was made possible only because neither statesmen, nor the people they are supposed to serve, knew the truth about Rus-

sia. The results of this policy of isolation and suppression and distortion of facts have already been written in three years' history of complete Allied disaster in Russia—military, diplomatic, and commercial. On the one hand, the unprecedented policy of armed force and blockade, used in furtherance of the openly admitted object of overthrowing a foreign government with whom the Allies were at peace, has undoubtedly united all Russian factions in the support of the Soviet Government and contributed vastly to its invincible strength in the military and political fields. On the other hand, the same policy has cost the Allies millions of dollars, thousands of lives, and an almost incalculable volume of trade in manufactured goods and raw materials for the reconstruction of their industries.

The Russian Revolution has disclosed the bankruptcy of the conservative press, government officials, leading business men, and publicists as sources of reliable information. Almost every prominent man in the Allied nations has, during the last three years, made public confession of an ignorance about Russia that—were the same ignorance displayed in any other subject—would have destroyed his reputation for stability and sound judgment. The same is true of practically every conservative newspaper in Europe and America.

The illustrations are so numerous and all of them so apt that it is difficult to pick out the best.

¹This article is taken in an abridged form from a pamphlet entitled "Facts and Fabrications: Soviet Russia in the American Press," to be published by The Rand School.

Revolution Declared Impossible

The National City Bank is recognized as one of the leading authorities in the United States on financial and business affairs. In January, 1917, two months before the March revolution and only nine months before the proletarian revolution that swept away the entire structure of private property in Russia, the Executive Manager of this bank, Mr. Samuel McRoberts, delivered an address which was published as a pamphlet by the bank and sent to its clients as a guide for business men and investors. The subject of his address, and the title of the pamphlet, was "Russia." Mr. McRoberts described with a considerable wealth of statistical material what he considered the condition of Russia from the point of view of the American investor. Toward the end of his address he gave his opinion on the future of the country. He is recorded, on page 15 of the pamphlet, as asserting:

"In criticizing and forecasting the political future of Russia great emphasis has been laid upon the spirit of unrest and the agitation of the Nihilist, the Democrat, or the Conservative-Progressive. It has been overlooked that the great mass of the Russian people remain loyal to the hereditary ruler and the discontent is not with the crowned head, but with what may be assumed to be the miscarriage of his intentions. Furthermore, the Russian people are a peculiarly religious people, with an unparalleled unity in religious belief and practice. These elements in the situation render it impossible for any revolution to make progress unless its aims are conservative and it contains a religious element. . . . No apprehension may be felt for the stability of the personal or property rights of the foreign investor."

"Insane and Unstable"

The myth which the rulers of the Allied countries have built up about Russia rests upon the assumption, first, that the Soviet régime is unstable—"tottering" is the thumb-marked word in this connection; and, second, that it is insane. From these roots the rest of the myth has grown, blossomed, and borne fruit. Nothing but the delusion of instability in Soviet Russia could have explained and excused an attempt to crush by force of arms

the political structure set up by some 200,000,000 people inhabiting an area of one-fifth of the entire surface of the globe. Had the public mind not been inflamed with the idea that Bolshevism was actually a disease of the mind that spread like smallpox, the *cordon sanitaire* could not even have been conceived.

It has taken an army of 2,000,000 determined and disciplined men, and two and a half years of increasing civil and political power in Soviet Russia; it has taken the collapse of Allied strategy and diplomacy; and it has taken thousands of human lives and suffering beyond measure to undermine the Soviet myth. Insanity and instability do not produce order, discipline, military strength, and victory on more than a dozen fronts against the combined force and intrigue of the entire world. For the mass of people in America the myth still exists, but each week's batch of news dispatches makes its life more hazardous.

Attitude of Government Officials

Even the United States Government has been engaged in the universal campaign against the Soviet Government. The newspapers have continually printed dispatches from Washington and Paris giving an official interpretation of Russian events. The character and purpose of these inspired stories is obvious from a mere quotation of two typical examples:

"Washington, D. C., Sunday. Reports coming to Washington from various official sources forecast the collapse of the Bolshevik state very soon, possibly within the next fortnight. Outwardly the Soviet government continues to operate. Trotsky talks glibly about raising a red army of enormous proportions and manifestos and decrees are issued without interruption. But, according to information that sifts across the frontiers of the Bolshevik dominion, the organization is tottering. . . . Bolshevik Russia, the reports all indicate, is like a leaking ship. At a distance it looks formidable. Actually its radical crew is demoralized. The whole fabric of authority is waterlogged and at any moment it may go down like a plummet."—(N. Y. *Herald*, June 2, 1919.)

"Paris, April 30. Bolshevism is fading out in eastern Europe. President Wilson's experts on the Slavic, Polish, and Magyar situations have

sound information to this effect. The British and French governments have received like news, and the opening of summer . . . finds the Bolshevik movement decidedly on the wane. Except for the points where Bolshevik troops are in contact with invading troops of foreign nations . . . there is little vigor remaining in the Bolshevik movement in Russia."—(Special article by William G. Shepherd, Foreign Correspondent of the *N. Y. Evening Post*, printed on June 8, 1919.)¹

The highest government officials have uttered the same absurdities. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy, was quoted in the *Herald* of May 19, 1919, as follows: "If Bolshevism continues its murderous work much longer the reaction will be intensified everywhere. But Bolshevism is on the wane. Russia will adjust herself before long."

Nor have these official absurdities been confined to prophecy. Secretary of Labor Wilson said, according to the *Washington Star* of May 4, 1919, that "Bolshevism is precisely as democratic as was the absolutism of Czar Nicholas, Kaiser Wilhelm, and Emperor Carl, no more and no less."

Attorney General Palmer

Attorney General Palmer, in a letter dated January 27, 1920, and addressed to editors of magazines and newspapers with the evident intention of influencing their editorial opinion, has expressed this version of the "truth" about Russia over his own signature:

" . . . It is the contention of the Department of Justice . . .

"(1) That the present aim of the Russian government and its officers is to foment and incite discontent, aiming toward a revolution in this country.

"(2) That the entire movement is a dishonest and criminal one, in other words, an organized campaign to acquire the wealth and power of all countries for the few agitators and their criminal associates.

"(3) The Red Movement does not mean an attitude of protest against alleged defects in our present political and economic organization of society. It does not represent the radicalism of progress. It is not a movement of liberty-loving persons. Lenin himself made the statement at the Third Soviet Conference, 'Among one hundred

so-called Bolsheviks there is one real Bolshevik, thirty-nine criminals, and sixty fools.' It advocates the destruction of all ownership in property, the destruction of all religion and belief in God. It is a movement organized against democracy, and in favor of the power of the few built by force. Bolshevism, syndicalism, the Soviet government, sabotage, etc., are only names for old theories of violence and criminality.

"Having lived at the expense of the Russian people for two years, these speculators in human lives and other people's earnings are trying to move to new fields to the East and to the West, hoping to take advantage of the economic distress and confusion of mind in which humanity finds itself after the terrific strain of five years of war.

"Its sympathizers in this country are composed chiefly of criminals, mistaken idealists, social bigots, and many unfortunate men and women suffering with various forms of hyperesthesia. . . ."

President Wilson himself has given utterance to the same misstatements about Soviet Russia. In a speech at Des Moines, Iowa, on September 6 last, he said:

"The men who are measurably in control of Russia represent nobody but themselves. . . . They have no mandate from anybody. There are only thirty-four of them, I am told, and there were more than thirty-four men who used to control the destinies of Europe from Wilhelmstrasse. There is a closer monopoly of power in Moscow and Petrograd than there ever was in Berlin, and the thing that is intolerable is not that the Russian people are having their way, but that another group of men more cruel than the Czar himself is controlling the destinies of that great people."—(*N. Y. Times*, September 7, 1919.)

American Publicists

The opinions of other prominent men on Russia, provided they corresponded to this point of view, have been given the widest publicity in the American press. Some typical illustrations are as follows:

Major Montgomery Schuyler, former United States diplomatic representative and Chief of the Intelligence Service of the A. E. F. in Siberia:

"Bolshevism is radical and rotten and it cannot survive. . . . Russia is too big, too vital and too sensible to stay long under the yoke of the irresponsible despotism of a minority led by criminals and renegade Russians helped by German money and German brains."—(Quoted in *N. Y. Herald*, Jan. 25, 1920.)

¹ See also *N. Y. American*, May 13, 1919.

Frank H. Simonds, the New York *Tribune's* expert on contemporary history:

"Russian Bolshevism is again isolated and is manifestly on its last legs. During the recent weeks we have had in Paris a frank effort on the part of well-intentioned Americans and British humanitarians, possible victims of less well-intentioned intrigue, to carry food to Russia. So far this effort has failed. If failure remains constant it is possible to hope that Russian Bolshevism will fall of its own weight solely due to starvation which it has produced and become the victim of the sin which it engendered."—(N. Y. *Tribune*, May 9, 1919.)

Samuel Gompers, President, American Federation of Labor, is on record about Russia to this effect:

"No more monstrous or degrading movement was ever set up anywhere in the world. Its entire existence has been one of terrorism, tyranny, and brutal slaying of those who are seeking for a just government, for the Bolsheviks have proved more tyrannous than ever were the Czar and his brutal officials. They have brutalized Russia and used every means to throttle freedom by joining Germany in its efforts to enslave the world."—(*Ibid.*)

Statements of a somewhat similar nature may be cited from the lips of Elihu Root, Jacob H. Schiff, John Spargo, and numerous others. (See N. Y. *World*, November 28, 1919.)

Myth of Nationalized Women

The newspapers have exceeded government officials and prominent men in their fabrication and abuse. For weeks the papers were full of the stories of the nationalization of women: the text of decrees were printed purporting to prove that women were public property in Soviet Russia. The Associated Press, in a dispatch from London dated April 15, 1919, went so far as to transmit a long dispatch commenting on the administration of this decree. "The law providing for the nationalization of women in Northeast Russia," it states, "has been suspended in one province as the result of popular outcry"—and so on for three quarters of a column. This whole story of the nationalization of women was so obviously absurd that some of its chief disseminators finally retracted it. The *New Europe*, the English periodical in which the so-

called decrees were originally published, admitted its mistake in its issue of March 18, 1919, and made public apology. Even the United States Department of State took pains to deny the tale. In the official press release of February 28, 1919, the Department stated: "The rumor as to the nationalization of women is not true." It is safe to say, however, that out of one hundred people who read the original stories not more than one or two ever saw the denials.

"St. Bartholomew's Night"

For several weeks prior to November 10, 1918, the press carried scare-head stories of "a general massacre of all the upper classes" that was planned by the Soviet authorities as "another St. Bartholomew's night." The details were published in almost every paper in the United States and aroused editorial condemnation from coast to coast. The so-called "Russian Ambassador" at Washington, Mr. Bakhmeteff, even went so far as to propose to the State Department that "the Bolsheviks and German agents be held personally responsible for the massacre before an international court." On November 11, the day after the "massacre" was scheduled to occur, an obscure note appeared in the New York *World* announcing in its headline that "the threat of massacre seems to have been a fake." No other New York paper carried even that denial. The only incident of the day, according to the *World* dispatch, was the granting of amnesty by the Soviet government to political prisoners!

The distortion of military and political news from Soviet Russia has now become so well known as to need little comment. As examples may be mentioned the oft-repeated announcement of the fall of Petrograd. Never at any time were the enemies of Soviet Russia within its gates. A writer in a recent issue of *The Nation* has summed up the fabrications about Petrograd in a sentence. Petrograd has "thus far fallen six times, been burned to the ground twice, been in absolute panic twice, has starved to death constantly, and has revolted against the Bolsheviks on

no less than six different occasions—all in the columns of the *Times*." Katherine Breshkovsky's death at the hands of the Bolsheviki was announced several times before her safe arrival in the United States in the spring of 1919.

Newspaper Abuse

In their editorials the American press has exceeded every other source in the quantity and quality of abusive fabrications about Russia. While extreme examples are literally without number, the following may be quoted as typical examples:

Washington *Post*, May 28, 1919:

"Gradually the sane element in Russia is gaining the upper hand over the assassins and madmen calling themselves Bolsheviki. From Siberia a great broom is sweeping the human scum westward against the wall, while from both north and south other Russian forces are closing in on the Bolsheviki. Petrograd is about to fall to still another force and immediately upon the fall of the city Herbert Hoover will start in motion the machinery of feeding the starving people."

New York *Tribune*, December 31, 1919 (under the title, "Recognizing a Cancer"):

"Lenin is well known to the world. He was first generally heard of when the German government forwarded him on a special train to Russia. Arrived in Petrograd he spent German money to induce Russia to betray loyal allies and to scuttle from the defense of civilization. He preached mutiny, an opening of the German lines. Next, setting himself up as a new czar, he dispersed with machine guns an assembly the Russian people had freely elected to write a constitution. Then he signed a treaty with Germany which betrayed Poles, Letts, Lithuanians, Finns, and Ukrainians to Germany. When Central Russia objected to starvation he launched an atrocity campaign that shamed even the Germans and made the tyranny of Ivan the Terrible seem benevolent."

New York *Sun*, January 6, 1920:

"The noose yearns for the crime-mad leaders of Red Bolshevism for more reasons than one. . . . In the hands of the plundering, butchering state it [Bolshevism] served to rob both the rich and the poor. It killed the last vestige of organized civilization."

New York *Herald*, May 19, 1919:

"Bolshevism, drunk from its saturnalia of crime in Russia, has staggered into America to loose its base passions upon a progressive civilization and destroy it. The beast has entered the gate. . . .

When it is said there are comparatively few Bolshevists in the United States it must be remembered that there are very few, comparatively, in Russia also. But they are wielding the club of murder and robbery over an intimidated people who failed to suppress them when they had the opportunity."

Even the briefest account such as this of American slander and abuse of the Russian people is not complete without an attempt to apportion the responsibility. Perhaps the simplest method is to compare the degree of fabrications with the character of their source.

The Attack of Conservatives

Any tabulation which gives on one side of the column the fabrications in a descending scale of viciousness and absurdity and on the other the sources, with their economic, social, and political connections, will disclose a well-defined sociological law. Stated in its simplest terms it is this. The more conservative the source, the more absurd is the fabrication. Those newspapers and the prominent men who are well known for their conservative position on public questions have been the worst offenders against truth and decency in regard to Russia. Taking the New York papers as an illustration, the New York *Sun*, the New York *Times*, and the New York *Herald* rank at the head of the list among the New York journals for the quality and quantity of their reaction, and also for their perversion of the truth about Russia. The *Evening Post* and the *Evening Globe*, however, have been far less guilty as well as considerably less reactionary.

Underlying all the fabrications about Russia, all the intrigue; back of the laws of behavior by which they may be classified, is the basic fact of human society constantly pointed out by socialist thinkers. The modern world is being driven by the forces inherent in its present organization into two increasingly distinct groups: capital and labor. Those who own for a living and those who work for it stand apart and opposed to each other. Between them a bitter war is being waged for the possession and control of the wealth of the world.

March and November Revolutions

The situation in its broad outlines is very simple. The March revolution in Russia established the supremacy of the business and trading interests at the expense of the feudal nobility. It was hailed throughout the Allied nations with a pæan of praise from the press and from prominent men. The November revolution established the supremacy of the working people and the poorer peasants at the expense of the business and trading interests. Property and trade were nationalized, the business man and trader were ousted from the pursuit of their activities for private gain and compelled to perform the same function for the benefit of the masses as a whole. The working people throughout the world responded with quickening interest. The supremacy of the business and trading class in every nation was threatened. The new revolution was heaped with abuse and vilification by the press and by prominent men in all the nations.

Class War and War Morale

Tales of disorder, starvation, anarchy, dispatches predicting early military and civil collapse—the whole machinery for maintaining a favorable public psychology in war time—was turned from the German Kaiser and the German people to the revolutionary working masses of Russia.

The fact that this same policy was not confined to the unofficial property-owning class, but was pursued with even greater vigor by the governments of the Allied nations is merely proof of what socialist thinkers have been saying for fifty years: governments are at bottom part of the machinery by which the dominant class in any nation maintains its supremacy. When the governments of the United States, England, France, Italy, and Japan threw their troops into Russia they were furnishing the socialist with an object lesson of his favorite propaganda theme. When the authorities at Washington refused to issue licenses for the export of food and medicines to the suffering Rus-

sian masses, and the Allied battleships and troops stopped shipments into Soviet territory it gave color to the belief that these governments were responsive to the interests of the property-owning class and intent on preventing working-class supremacy.

There has been much surprise in some quarters that the Allied governments have not declared war on Soviet Russia. To the socialist there is no surprise in this, but merely additional evidence to support his analysis of society. The Allies have as a matter of fact not been at war with Russia as a whole. They have been on the most friendly terms with the property-owning and business classes even in Soviet Russia. The Allies have been opposed only to the revolutionary working class and poorer peasantry of Russia. It has always been the policy of the ruling class—for it has been to its interest—never to admit the fact of a struggle between it and a subject class. But the very refusal of the Allied governments to declare war upon Russia has been tantamount to an admission—even a declaration and demonstration—of the actuality and reality of war between the classes.

**THE SOCIALIST REVIEW***Published Monthly by the***INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY**Room 914, Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue,
New York, N. Y.*Editor, HARRY W. LADLER, Wesleyan.**Managing Editor, W. HARRIS CROOK, Oxford.**Editorial Board*

JAMES W. ALEXANDER.....	Princeton
EMERY G. BALCH.....	Bryn Mawr
EVANS CLARK	Amherst
H. W. L. DANA.....	Harvard
FELIX GRENDEL	Columbia
JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN.....	Barnard
WINTHROP D. LANE.....	Michigan
F. F. ROCKWELL.....	Wesleyan
ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG	Trinity

Contributing Editors

Louis B. Boudin, Stuart Chase, Arthur Gleason, Freda Kirchwey, John Haynes Holmes, Florence Kelley, Bruno Lasker, Caro Lloyd, James H. Maurer, Wm. P. Montague, S. Nuorteva, James O Neal, Harry A. Overstreet, Vida D. Scudder, Charles P. Steinmetz, Norman M. Thomas, Louis Untermeyer, and Sidney Zimand.

The Social Significance of Coöperation

Albert Sonnichsen

Consumers' coöperation demands, rather than attracts, the attention of people otherwise interested in social phenomena. All that has ever been written on the subject might almost be concentrated within half a dozen volumes. The novels of Shaw, H. G. Wells, Galsworthy, and practically all modern English writers are permeated with socialism, but never is there the remotest reference to coöperation, though that word represents an organization with which one-fourth of the British population is affiliated. For the first time in its history the movement is now receiving front-page newspaper mention—and that because of the action of three of the most reactionary statesmen in Europe.

Why this reluctance to discuss in print a movement which has behind it the support of some thirty millions of heads of families—more than a hundred million individuals? There was a time when I ascribed this boycott of silence (and I still do, in my less tolerant moments) to the fact that coöperation is so essentially a working-class movement that even a radical, or a liberal, intellectual is prejudiced against it, as well as to the fact that coöperative enterprise does not support the periodical press with advertising.

But here is the real underlying cause. The first physical manifestation of the movement is a coöperative store, small, often dingy and tucked away in a side street. Furthermore, in the early phases the supporting membership is not conscious of any other purpose than a sordid desire to cheapen the cost of living. Behind this humble little institution no social idea is apparent, and we who worry over the social welfare consider ideas first of all. Robert Owen scorned the "cheese-paring storekeepers" as unworthy of the name which he had given to all classes

of social endeavor, and in this attitude he was imitated by the early socialists.

There was some justice in this attitude. Coöperation did not spring from any preconceived theory of social reconstruction. Unlike all other revolutionary movements, the fact preceded the theory; the latter was developed from the former. In the days of Lassalle it was not apparent to anybody that the coöperative stores could hope to accomplish anything more than slightly cheapen the cost of living, and he denied them even so much merit, on account of his "iron law of wages."

It was when the little stores federated and, still based on the democracy of the local coöperative societies, created great "wholesale societies," thus entering into the field of productive enterprise, that the basis for a complete social philosophy appeared. Later still these federations acquired land for the production of raw materials, and then coöperation, in fact and theory, reached that point from which all other theories begin: Mother Earth.

Recent Victories

It was not until then that consumers' coöperation began to manifest that tremendous growth which finally culminated in the abnormal expansion that it experienced during the war. From a few thousand local societies and half a dozen sectional federations, such as we have in this country today, the Russian coöperative movement developed such progress that at the present moment it includes over seventy per cent. of the population, and is practically universal as a system of production and distribution in the Slavic portions of the former Empire. In Great Britain, during the same period, the membership swelled from three to four millions, and in France from six hundred thousand to thirteen hundred thousand, more

than doubling. There were about ten million members all over Europe in 1914; now there are about thirty million, if we include the fifteen million in Russia.

Whatever these influences were, which reacted so favorably upon the development of consumers' coöperation, they did not take effect in this country until toward the close of the war. Two years ago there was no cohesive, self-conscious coöperative movement in the United States. It was not really until after the First National Coöperative Convention, called together in Springfield, Illinois, eighteen months ago, by the Coöperative League of America, that a national organization assumed shape. At that time the League had six hundred local societies listed, and most of them were of questionable quality, so far as fundamental principles were concerned.

Trade Union Support

At present there are about three thousand local societies, many of which are federated through five sectional "wholesale societies," the majority of which show signs of stability, prosperity, and further growth. But, more significant still, the whole American labor movement has placed itself squarely behind the idea. The American Federation of Labor has not only indorsed it, but is establishing a propaganda bureau, for the purpose of stimulating the organization of local societies among labor men. The Railroad Brotherhoods and the United Mine Workers have more recently thrown themselves behind a plan for the formation of a coöperative banking institution, involving over fifty millions of dollars. Another railroad labor organization, with headquarters in Toronto and Detroit, with a membership of nearly a quarter of a million, has just purchased three factories in which to manufacture clothing for its membership, and while this latter enterprise is not truly coöperative, it has nevertheless been inspired by the idea. Aside from these big-scale projects, which are dangers rather than promises for the future, practically every state federation of

labor throughout the country is backing local coöperative enterprises.

The exponent of the coöperative philosophy must assume somewhat more responsibility than would the exponent of socialist doctrine, for there are few authorities from whom to quote. The really intelligent writers on coöperation can be numbered on the fingers of one hand, and two of them are not coöperators at all, but Fabian socialists. But to those familiar with controversy within the movement, to one who has followed its history and studied its journalism closely, there can be no doubt that not only the leaders, but the majority of the rank and file, have a very clear idea of what they are striving to attain, and how they hope to attain it. Above all, we have the practical illustration of how it has worked out in Russia, where the movement is now large enough to define itself as a social system.

Like all schools of socialism, consumers' coöperation is based on a democratic collectivism. In its revolutionary character it takes second place to no other radical movement. But unlike Robert Owen, and unlike all other revolutionary movements, except pure state socialism, it does not base its democracy on labor, though it is more essentially a labor movement than is political socialism, judging by the character of the membership.

Coöperative vs. Syndicalist Ideals

The basis of coöperation is use, not labor. It was because he began his social experiments from the point of production that Robert Owen failed. The Christian Socialists in Britain, and the followers of Buchez in France, attempted to modify Owen's theories in the self-governing, or co-partnership, workshops. They, too, failed. Yet on them is based modern syndicalism, developed to the broader scope which proposes an industrial democracy based on national industries, rather than on individual manufacturing plants.

Coöperation, by act rather than by word, contends that industry is too uneven a basis

on which to rest a universal, all-inclusive democracy. Democracy can find a solid foundation only on an interest which is common to all members of society. Even after the institution of private profit, interest on capital and rent has been abolished, and all individuals are presumably workers, it would be impossible to find a common interest between all individuals as workers. The question of remuneration in the different trades and industries alone would be a continuous cause for friction, and in any artificial adjustment which might be contrived the weaker trades and industries would inevitably suffer.

Coöperation would base its social structure on the needs of every member of society as a consumer. To this all-inclusive collectivism—society as one solid body—labor would be subservient. Class would defer to mass. Why should the coal workers control the coal mines? Why should the railroad workers control transportation?

The Coöperator and the State

This is painting a picture in rather extreme colors, I know; I am well aware that comparatively few syndicalists advocate syndicalism in such pure quality, as I am also aware that few socialists stand for state socialism, pure and simple. The thoughtful socialist finds his solution in a modification of the two theories, in the direction of each other. And here, perhaps, is the point where coöperator and socialist come closest to each other. For, still basing theory on actual fact, looking for a rudiment of future institutions in the coöperative industrial organization of today, as it manifests itself in the Joint Board, which settles disputes between the organized coöperative employes and the directors who represent the consumers in the direction of those enterprises, we discover the ground for a compromise. Through the Joint Board the workers in each factory, or in each trade, have a voice in controlling the conditions under which they must work.

But the coöperator would not utilize the state as a body through which to represent the consumer. Some coöperators there are, indeed, who see, or hope for, an atrophied government, at present necessary to regulate disputes between nations and, above all, conflicting private interests in private industry, but which will gradually disappear as the causes for this friction disappear.

The coöperator would build up a collectivist society on voluntary, local groups of organized consumers, because his methods are evolutionary, rather than revolutionary. He would not force a strong minority to adopt his program unwillingly. But what is more to the point at the present time, he does not want to wait until he has convinced even a working majority of his way of thinking. So he begins construction with a very small minority, hoping to swell his following through an appeal to reason, rather than by legislative decree.

Coöperation Through Competition

Coöperation abhors the idea of any kind of monopoly. Its method is competition. It must develop to universal dimensions by the force of its own inherent superiority, and after it has practically displaced all opposition it would still allow private enterprise, or any other system of industry, to continue in potential opposition to it, if for no other reason than as a measure of its own continued efficiency. Its attitude would be that if a private person were able to enter into competition with its bread bakeries, there would be grounds for an inquiry into the management of the coöperative bakeries.

One of the highest officials of the Russian coöperative organizations, a member of the committee now conferring with the Supreme Council of the Allies, asserts that in a conference with Lenin, the latter proposed a compromise whereby the Soviet Government should adopt coöperation as its economic program, which, of course, would involve putting it into complete practice by decree. The coöperators refused to consider the proposal. Nor could they have done so without a re-

nunciation of their most fundamental principle—the free will of their membership. Coöperation is essentially opposed to conscription. Coöperation aims to make every member of society a worker, through the elimination of profit and interest on invested capital, but it has no desire to accomplish that through arbitrary force. Hence its opposition to any “dictatorship of the proletariat.”

On the other hand, there is no reason why coöperation should not participate in politics, as it now does in Belgium and England

and, indirectly, in other countries. It must do this for defensive purposes, if for no other. But aside from clearing the field of such legislative rubbish as may hinder its legitimate progress, it asks no special favor. It will fight the capitalist at his own game, in his own field, dollar for dollar.

Coöperation is the economic phase of socialism—in the broadest sense of that term—as contrasted with the political action of the political parties and the industrial action of the militant labor organizations

Socialist Party Tactics

A SYMPOSIUM

SHOULD the Socialist Party adopt new tactics? During the last few months both socialists and non-socialists have been busy discussing what attitude socialists should assume towards certain party and governmental policies. To discover the more general feeling among many of the active members of the Socialist Party *The Socialist Review* sent a questionnaire to a number of well-known socialists in the United States. The answers of those who replied follow in alphabetical order. The questionnaire letter contained the following five points of inquiry:

(1) What measure of control should socialist locals exert over elected officials? Should that control be greater or less than at present?

(2) What voice should minors and those who have not as yet become citizens have in the affairs of the party? Should they have a voice in (a) educational and propaganda work in the party; (b) purely political matters; or (c) both?

(3) Should some plan of coöperation be worked out during campaigns between the Socialist Party, the Labor Party, the Non-partisan League, etc.? If not, why not? If so, what should be the nature of the coöperation?

(4) Should the Socialist Party continue to forbid socialist legislators from voting for military appropriations?

(5) What should be the attitude of the Socialist Party to such left wing organizations as the Communist and Communist Labor Parties?

Joseph E. Cohen

(Of Philadelphia. Author of “Socialism for Students”)

There is a feeling among the membership of the party that it must make an aggressive campaign to become a political power in this country in order to assert a more substantial influence toward securing the release of working class and war-offense prisoners, in order to put through worthwhile constructive measures in the interest of the working class here and in order to bring moral pressure upon our government to extend friendly relations to the working class governments elsewhere. I am heartily in agreement with every change which, therefore, will tend to make the Socialist Party in America a greater power along practical lines, not only for our own but for the international good.

It is with this purpose in mind that I answer your direct questions.

(1) There is greater need for a clarification of ideas with regard to the program of the Socialist Party. That being done, those who accept nomination for public office from the party should consider themselves bound to abide by its decisions. The record of those who have ignored the party, after they were elected, reflects much less credit upon the individual officeholder than it does upon the party.

(2) Minors might very well belong to a young people's socialist organization until they attain voting age. Aliens who expect to return to their native countries should refrain from participating in any settlement of American tactical questions. Aliens who expect to be citizens might refrain from mixing in purely political matters, but should be accorded every other right.

(3) The question of coöperation by the Socialist Party with the Labor Party, Nonpartisan League, etc., on specific matters between political campaigns, must depend entirely upon the nature of the proposed coöperation and the character of the other organization. The Socialist Party has always coöperated in every immediate movement of a worthy public or particular working class character.

(4) The question of military appropriations is one wherein tactics shade into principle. It is too big a question to settle offhand. I think, however, that the weightier reasons are in the direction of adhering to our past action, and that the war and more recent experiences are in the direction of stressing the party's opposition to militarism and navalism.

(5) The Socialist Party should most emphatically insist upon the right of free speech for every other organization, such as the Communist and Communist Labor Parties. The Socialist Party attitude toward them should be that which it has always maintained toward the Socialist Labor Party; i. e., that it is too busy with its own work to fight other organizations striving to help labor. It must be clearly understood, however, that we differ in tactics from those who, while politically inclined, ignore the working program, and that we differ in principle from those who do not approve of participation in parliamentary activity.

I think your effort to secure an exchange of opinions upon pressing socialist problems is a highly commendable one, and I hope you will make the idea part of an established plan.

Walter M. Cook

(Secretary Socialist Party, New York)

(1) Socialist locals should maintain their present control over their elected officials. Some minor provisions, not legally binding, could possibly be eliminated to advantage. Fundamentally, however, the principles of control embodied in our by-laws are quite sound. Wherever the issue has been raised and the party position maintained, we have won the increasing confidence of the working class.

(2) I know of no good reason why a young man or woman of the age of eighteen years or upwards should not join the Socialist Party and enjoy full rights therein. I myself joined the party at that age and consider the three years preceding my attaining legal manhood as being the most fruitful of my experience thus far.

Individuals from other lands should be admitted to the party, but should pledge themselves, and be required, to attain citizenship at the earliest date legally and physically possible. Pending such

time I think it but sound tactics to permit them to exercise the full rights of party membership.

(3) The Socialist Party must maintain the integrity of its organization despite all temptations to fuse or compromise with any group which consciously, or unconsciously, acts in a way to prolong the capitalist profit system. To date neither the Nonpartisan League or the Labor Party on the one hand, nor the Communist parties on the other, have set forth a sound platform for the guidance of the working class in America in its struggles with the capitalist class. Nor do they show a true understanding of the prevailing economic conditions or of the problems with which the American working class is confronted. For the present the Socialist Party can take no position towards these organizations other than that already expressed through its various committees and conventions. We can surely recognize them as indications of development on the part of the American workers, but not as sufficient to meet their needs. I hold no antagonism towards any of these groups other than that I consider them, for one reason or another, unsound and thereby incapable of carrying on the proper struggle for economic emancipation.

(4) Socialist legislators must certainly be prohibited from voting military appropriations.

You will thus see that I am in agreement with the present position of the Socialist Party on the above questions, and see no good reason for any fundamental or immediate changes.

In addition to its splendid manifesto, its courageous declarations, etc., the last Chicago Convention of the Socialist Party also made some fundamental changes and improvements in its organization. It adopted the Agenda System, decided upon having annual conventions; it authorized the establishment of a press bureau, of a bureau for the teaching of industrial unionism, and made many minor improvements. When the party is able fully to overcome the destruction wrought by the left wingers last year, and these changes are actually made and developed as they will undoubtedly be, the Socialist Party will begin to take on new life and vigor.

J. Louis Engdahl

(Secretary Socialist Party, Cook County, Ill.)

(1) There should be a much greater control by the party, not only locally but in state and nation as well, over its elected officials. This will develop inevitably as the party gains strength.

(2) If young men and women are good enough to join the party at the age of 18 years, then they are good enough to participate in all party activities. The same holds true for those who have not yet become citizens.

(3) There can be no possible basis of coöperation between the Socialist Party on the one hand and the so-called Labor Party, the Nonpartisan League, the Committee of 48 and similar organizations. This is so for the simple reason that none of these other organizations are either socialist or working class.

(4) Yes, decidedly yes, the Socialist Party should continue to forbid socialist legislators from voting for military appropriations.

(5) The attitude of the Socialist Party toward the Communist and Communist Labor Parties should be the same as our attitude toward the Socialist Labor Party. We recognize them as working class political organizations, differing with them as to tactics.

There is a tremendous drift toward socialism everywhere. Let us not get off the main track by the specter of mushroom organizations springing up on every side.

William M. Feigenbaum

(Director Publicity Dept. Socialist Party)

(1) Elected officials should be controlled by the Socialist Party organization. That control should be greater than it is at present in all general respects, while in some regards it should be less than at present. The difficulty that we have in American politics today is this—that political organizations as a general rule (outside of the Socialist Party of course) are thoroughly corrupt. When the average American thinks of control of an elected official by a political party, his mind inevitably reverts to crooked Tammany control; he thinks of a small gang of political high-binders meeting in secret in Delmonico's and issuing orders to governors, to be obeyed on pain of impeachment. Or he thinks of corporation control over "respectable" officials, holding out to such "honest" men the hope of political advancement.

From such control it is inevitable that the American people should revolt and demand independence of their elected officials.

The Socialist Party, however, is of such a different character that to demand "independence" of socialist elected officials is utterly ridiculous. The socialist assemblyman or mayor does not enter public life to endow the people with the beauty of his own character. The socialist has no business in public life unless he wants to impress the socialist point of view upon the people. No individual is a fit judge of a point of view; it must of necessity be the result of a consensus of opinion of all elements. There have been times when an individual socialist mayor or sheriff got the idea that the socialist movement could not get along without some brand new idea of which he personally was sponsor. It is his privilege to think

so, but the place for him to urge that point of view is in the local of which he is a member. If he can convert his comrades there, well and good. If he cannot, if he is a good socialist, he will abide by the will of the majority openly discussed and democratically arrived at.

At the same time, the Socialist Party should modify its control to the extent that in the actual administration of an office, in the carrying out of the general principles laid down by the party membership, the elected official should have as free a hand as possible because the party membership, while competent to lay down general principles, is not in a position to lay down rules for the conduct of an office.

(2) The party rule should stand. The number of minors in the Socialist Party is negligible, and they cannot ever exercise a decisive influence in party affairs. The party provides for the membership of minors to permit enthusiastic youngsters, such as I was when I was under 21, to function in some way. As for aliens, I believe that they are exactly in the same position as were women prior to the granting of suffrage. The party constitution demands that all party members who are not yet citizens should immediately begin proceedings to acquire citizenship. All new party members who are not citizens are obliged under the constitution just adopted by referendum vote to begin within three months to secure citizenship. This element has never been, and can never be, a decisive element in our party. They are permitted in the party for the same reasons that minors are, to give those who are anxious to participate in Socialist Party work an opportunity to do what they desire.

(3) I can answer this question in the following way: In Chicago the Socialist Party was strong in a number of wards. In two of them the party had built up a tremendous strength, in every case among the working class. In one ward particularly the Socialist Party had an alderman who was a working man of the very highest type, active in the labor movement, intelligent, uncompromising, and aggressive. Openly avowing a feeling of the warmest friendship for the Socialist Party, the Labor Party nominated candidates in these wards, in several cases nominating lawyers and other professional men against workingmen on the socialist ticket, and in two cases being solely responsible for the defeat of the socialist candidate. This refers to the election of 1919; on the day on which I write, the election of 1920 is going on, and I do not yet know what the results will be.

Frankly, my mind is open on the question, but in the matter of the Labor party, with the Socialist Party already here, with decades of hard, thankless work in plowing up the field for the inde-

pendent political action for the working class, if the managers of the Labor Party movement want cooperation with the Socialist Party it is their duty to come to the Socialist Party and make the proposal. Where they fight the Socialist Party as they have done in Chicago and other places, they have forfeited all right to consideration.

(4) Emphatically, yes. The last war was to be the "last war." It was to make wars forever impossible. When we socialists pointed out the criminality of gigantic armaments, we were told that the only way to prevent the evil from continuing was to defeat Germany. Germany is defeated, and we are now preparing more feverishly than ever before. The continued preparations are not only a crime against humanity, but also the most ghastly conspiracy on the part of the capitalist class in recent history. It is so utterly transparent that I cannot see how anybody can be taken in by it. By all means, the Socialist Party should continue to forbid legislators voting for "the next war."

(5) The Socialist Party should (and does) welcome every individual member of the so-called Communist and the so-called Communist Labor Parties back into the Socialist Party. For its individual members the Socialist Party had (and does have) the warmest personal feeling. But for the party organization there should be nothing but condemnation. The brave "left wingers" who deliberately paralyzed the socialist movement with malice aforethought, and who built up the so-called communist movement, committed two separate and distinct crimes. They betrayed several hundred well-meaning working people into accepting a program that can mean anything or nothing, and that is interpreted by the enemy in the worst way. The result is that hundreds have been arrested, jailed, clubbed, and deported. In the second place, these same leaders paralyzed the work of the socialist movement for several months, leaving behind them much wreckage, bitter feelings, and smashed organizations all over the country. And, finally, to show their bravery many of them have run away and are now in Mexico living as political refugees, callously indifferent to the harm they have done to the movement that they pretend to serve. With these organizers and leaders we have nothing to do. With their misled and disorganized followers, I would have everything to do.

Alexander Fichandler

(of Brooklyn)

Without minimizing the importance of many other problems which confront the socialist move-

ment in America, I wish to present two matters which, in my judgment, demand thoughtful consideration and effective action on the part of those who are interested in the success of socialism in our country. One deals with propaganda, the other with action.

(1) It is very unpleasant and nevertheless true, that the socialist movement in America reaches but a very small portion of the population. There are many reasons for this, such as an inadequate socialist press, prejudices created and intensified by the capitalist class through the press, schools, colleges, and church, etc. But undoubtedly, equally important is the failure of the socialist movement to understand the psychology of the American people, and to employ appropriate and effective phraseology in its propaganda.

For example, the word *revolution* seems to be indissolubly connected in the American mind with the idea of force and violence. Possibly because it is associated with the stirring events of 1775. Possibly because the capitalist-controlled agencies of education advisedly use the word in this sense. But whatever the case may be, the fact remains that the great mass of Americans has this particular notion. It is useless to inform the people that according to the dictionary *revolution* means *fundamental change*, and that the socialists wish to effect a fundamental change in the social and economic structure of society by peaceful methods.

The American people declare that while they approve and sympathize with the use of constitutional, legislative, and peaceful methods of changing our institutions, they bitterly oppose methods that involve the use of force or violence.

The remedy for this unfortunate situation is obvious. If the American people do not understand certain words as we mean them, we must not waste time and energy in teaching their correct significance. We must, however, use words to express our thought such as *cannot be misunderstood*.

Similarly with such venerable formulæ as *seizing the state and abolishing it*. The word *seize* implies to the American mind the use of force. But the socialists in America use the word in a highly metaphoric sense. They aim merely at electing socialists to the various legislative, executive, and judiciary positions of our government. Let us therefore say so, with the emphatic assertion that when the socialists constitute a majority, they will utilize their power to bring about the changes they advocate.

Here it may be contended by advocates of industrial and direct action that the foregoing is a stupid dream, because the capitalist class will

never surrender its power without a physical struggle. Perhaps so. But the fact remains that such is the aim of the Socialist Party of America. Whether its methods will be successful or not, remains to be seen. But whatever they are, they should be explained to the American people in simple, unambiguous language. We must revise our propaganda literature, and *translate it into the language of the American people.*

(2) In the sphere of action, perhaps the most important problem is that of coöperation with other radical movements and organizations.

Of course, we must remember the fate of previous similar excursions and be on our guard. But we must also be realists. The Russians are furnishing an excellent example of what should be done. They do not hesitate to shelve some of the dogma which but a short time ago they proclaimed sacrosanct and inviolate.

The grim fact is that the champions of the *status quo* are united. They present a solid, invulnerable front to the divided radicals. A union of the latter is essential. But the nature of such a union offers a serious problem. Under no circumstances may the socialists weaken their organization, or surrender any of their aims. They must insist that the profit system must go, and in its place must be substituted industrial democracy. Not a jot or tittle of this can be yielded.

But the programs of the Nonpartisan League, the Committee of 48, and the American Labor Party contain elements common to all of them as well as to the socialist program. All demand the restoration of Civil Liberties in our country. All demand the abolition of land speculation. All demand the nationalization of railroads, coal mines, etc., with the participation of the workers in their management and control.

It seems, therefore, that without surrendering the integrity and purpose of the Socialist Party, and after making all possible and necessary provisions for cancelling the alliance when it becomes evident that any of the other groups is untrue to its program and is betraying the cause of the working class, it should be possible to coöperate with the other radical and liberal groups on the political field.

The recent consolidation of the radical elements in Great Britain, and the experiences of the French and German socialists, can furnish a great deal in the way of suggestion for action—what to do and what to avoid. The experiment is worth trying in America. If it fail, we shall know what to do in the future. If it succeed, we shall have done our part to hasten the coming of universal brotherhood.

Benjamin Glassberg

(Of the Rand School)

The most pressing duty of the Socialist Party at the present time is to give definite and vital expression to the position and convictions of the membership and to cease evading the fact that the Socialist Party is a revolutionary party pledged to the overthrow of capitalism and the erecting of a socialist republic in its place.

The one thing from which the Socialist Party has suffered in the last few years has been the failure of the party leaders properly to interpret the attitude of the membership. In every referendum and resolution adopted by a vote of the membership the party has been definitely Left—never Right or even Center. The party in America has taken officially the same position that the Italian party has taken on every international question. The party leadership has, however, consistently failed to interpret the party position with vigor and without equivocation.

For the second time an overwhelming vote of the membership has voted in favor of affiliation with the Third International, in spite of the open as well as tacit opposition of the leaders. There must be an open and wholehearted acceptance of this verdict, which should be indicated by a change in tactics which will harmonize with the *spirit* of the Third International.

The Socialist Party should maintain a friendly attitude towards the two communist organizations and make it possible for all those who want to further the work of revolutionary socialist propaganda to reënter the ranks of the Socialist Party. In Germany, where carrying a red card in the Communist Party was outlawed, the communists entered the Independent Socialist Party. The party should make it possible for a similar development to take place in America.

With the Nonpartisan League, an organization of landowners, the Socialist Party can have nothing in common. Neither can there be any sort of affiliation with the Labor Party, although the socialists will welcome the growth of the Labor Party, for it will help to impress upon the trade union movement the necessity of solidarity and class consciousness and the impossibility of affecting any fundamental change except through the complete overthrow of the capitalist system. The party should perfect its control over elected officials.

(1) It should insist upon all elected officials using their position mainly for the purpose of propaganda and not for the purpose of introducing the reform measures.

(2) It should expel any elected official who votes for war appropriations under any guise.

(3) Elected officials should be entirely subject to instructions from the socialist locals in their legislative capacities.

(4) Every member of the party, including aliens, should share in determining all the policies of the party; for all workers, whether native, alien, or naturalized, are equally affected by the same capitalist system and should have an equal voice in determining party policy.

In line with the Chicago resolution on industrial unionism, the party should begin immediately an aggressive agitation in favor of revolutionary industrial unionism. It should at once prepare literature of industrial unionism and devise machinery for proper distribution and route properly qualified speakers throughout the country.

Geo. H. Goebel

(Former Member Executive Committee, Socialist Party)

(1) Our undated resignations, and other red tape formulæ of the past, have *not* restrained elected officials, but they *have* disrupted locals, and even states. A little more care in selecting candidates and less hell after they happen to be elected. That's my prescription. The average American, true to historical development, is a born individualist. "Verboten!" does not sit well on his stomach. Any method of organization or control, to be effective must be such as works in harmony with this individualistic trend of mind, while at the same time gradually making for growing appreciation of the collective will and wisdom.

(2) Capitalist law will undoubtedly, and rightly, permit only citizens to be given a voice in political parties and their management. Meant to harm us, it will but help, inasmuch as it will force unity for things that come surely within the domain and possibilities of political action. On the other hand, the great bulk of the non-citizens have economic interests clearly in common, and in order to function would be forced into the organization of their industry, instead of taking refuge in the party, and from there making attacks on the economic organization they make no effort to join or understand. This would automatically eliminate the larger part of the sectarian divisions and factional battles that ever so often divide and redivide the political and economic organizations of the workers, and would not preclude some method by which citizens and non-citizens may unitedly carry on an educational and propaganda work for socialism in its wider aspects.

(3) Previous to the war I should have answered this question negatively. Such coöperation, previous to the war, occurred more or less frequently in Europe, the desire for freedom of expression by the separate groups being the medium by which they were forced into alliances and

combinations. In the United States this excuse or reason did not exist, freedom of expression for all being (comparatively) a fact. But today all forward-looking groups—Socialists, Committee of 48, American Labor Party, Nonpartisan League—all alike find themselves with a gag between their teeth. Even though they differ on principles, they have today a common and dominant interest in reëstablishing freedom of speech, freedom of press and freedom of Assembly. It would be criminal were not some method found for united action by these groups and many unaffiliated persons. The possible method of united action that I might suggest is as follows:

(a) Each group, as far as possible, to maintain its separate identity.

(b) Each group to construct its own program of principles.

(c) All groups to unite on the same candidates for President, Vice-President, Congress, Legislature, and perhaps other officials.

(d) All groups to accept and add to their declaration of principles a very short, concise declaration of immediate purpose, this last-mentioned declaration being the only expression absolutely binding upon the candidates agreed on. This common declaration should stand for complete freedom of expression, written and verbal, and freedom of assemblage, together with repeal of all Espionage and Sedition laws, and amnesty for political prisoners. It is more than possible also that common consent could be obtained for a declaration in favor of a large measure of public ownership and democratic administration—if in no other way than in the form expressed in the Plumb plan. The simpler this declaration the larger the measure of coöperation that could be obtained. The declaration formulated by the Committee of 48 would not be a bad basis upon which to build—except that it is perhaps too lengthy.

This method of united action would involve no sacrifice of principle by the different groups, but by emphasis upon the common declaration would unite millions for a direct smashing blow against reaction, and afford a chance for orderly discussion of the great problems before the public of this nation and the entire world.

(5) Largely answered by replies to questions two and three. Remembering our painful experiences of past years, and particularly the year 1919, I am not enthusiastic over the possibilities of coöperation with these two groups, nor sure of the desirability of such coöperation, except in a common drive for the right of free expression. There should be, however, determination on our part not to be drawn into a quarrel with members of these two groups.

R. H. Howe

(Committee, Cook County, Ill., Socialist Party)

(1) The only control which socialist locals should exert over elected officials is the understanding that if officials violated any of the principles or tenets of the Socialist Party, they would not be re-nominated for any position to which they had previously been elected. Any other control, such as a promise exacted before election would, in this state—Illinois—prevent them taking their seat.

(2) All members of the party should have an equal voice in the educational and political matters of interest to them, but a campaign of education should be carried on inside of the party so as to instruct the new members upon the philosophy and tactics of the party.

(3) There should be some coöperation between the Socialist Party and other organizations which have separated themselves politically from the old capitalist parties. While a real working coalition would not be advisable, in my judgment, at the present time, the future may develop events which will force us all to act as a unit. The coöperation at present should be in the nature of a discussion as to remedies that are proposed by these other elements and by that means clarify the issues and lay the groundwork for beneficial constructive legislation.

(4) It should not be necessary for the Socialist Party to forbid socialist legislators voting for military appropriations. If they understand the position of the Socialist Party, they ought to know that that is their duty without any further instructions or threats from the party.

(5) The attitude of the Socialist Party to left wing organizations, such as the Communist and Communist Labor Parties, should at present be one of neutrality. Their program is at present very nebulous; ours is clear-cut and definite, and our propaganda should be carried along the same line until such a time in the future as events may make it possible to take a clear position as regards the other radical organizations.

Jessie W. Hughan

(Author, "American Socialism of the Present Day")

(1) Socialist locals should control elected officials in all matters that clearly involve the party program and declarations upon which the officials were elected. In matters on which the party had made no declaration at the time of election, I believe the official should be independent.

(2) Minors should have a full voice in the party councils, as the age of 18 has been adopted ad-

visedly as a minimum. Aliens eligible for naturalization who have not availed themselves of the right should be allowed a voice in (a) only, not in (b).

(3) I would welcome any preliminary discussions with a view to coöperation with the bodies mentioned. Such coöperation, however, should, in my opinion, be limited. It would be a distinct advantage to form legislative blocs, and to work practically with these parties for many immediate demands. I would welcome the endorsements of our candidates by them, and even the formation of a permanent Labor Party in which the Socialist Party should keep its integrity. I should oppose, however, any arrangement by which the Socialist Party should endorse candidates outside of its own membership or encourage its members to do so.

(4) Yes.

(5) The attitude should be friendly and, where possible, helpful. While we should not hesitate to make clear our difference from these parties in policy, yet as fellow-socialists we should avoid all quarrel or unnecessary controversy.

Two other suggestions:

(1) Referenda should be submitted to all party members, using the mails if necessary, irrespective of presence at meetings.

Reason: Much of the "ring" rule of last year arose from the concentration of power in the hands of persons whose narrowness of interest allowed their invariable presence at local meetings.

(2) The formation of non-territorial branches should be allowed.

Reason: This practice would roughly permit proportional representation within the party. Future right or left wing members would no longer be disfranchised by happening to stand in a small minority in their particular districts, but could by banding together exercise due influence within the organization.

William F. Kruse

(Asst. Sec. Local Cook County, Ill., Socialist Party; Former National Secretary of the Young People's Socialist League)

Before answering *The Socialist Review's* questions categorically, we should make clear just what we conceive to be the real function of the Socialist Party. It will be found that, practically, all divergence of opinion on the controversial questions submitted is based upon disagreement on this fundamental point. Practically all answers will fall into one or the other of two groups, according to the viewpoint held on these fundamentals.

The one group holds that the Socialist Party should serve as an educational and propaganda or-

ganization, whose chief aim is to educate the masses of the American people to a knowledge of and a desire for socialism—realizing that if the masses once want this new order of society they will find some way of attaining their desires.

The other group feels that it is the function of the party to be an organization devoted to "practical politics," engaging in political campaigns for the purpose of winning as many votes as possible and of electing as many representatives as possible to do things for the people that will bring them closer to the new social order. "Practical politics" is its slogan, political expediency its creed. Momentarily unpopular principles may be soft-pedalled, popular prejudices are unduly considered, the ward-heeling tactics of the old parties may be winked at—all in the name of that fetish of practical politics: success at the polls.

The first group by no means frowns on participation in political campaigns, nor even on the popularization of our message by concrete application to local issues uppermost in the minds of the electorate. But it insists that both the campaigns themselves and the activity of officials incidentally elected thereby are but additional means for the spreading of our message and the furtherance of our cause. The campaign and the office is but a means in the estimation of this group, whereas to the other it rapidly becomes an end in itself, particularly when the smell of office once reaches their nostrils. Personally, I feel that the first group represents the true socialist attitude, and my answers to the questions propounded by *The Socialist Review* are naturally colored by that viewpoint.

(1) The only control that locals can exert over members elected to office is on the point of their membership, not on that of their office. It is asinine to require candidates to submit resignations legally not worth the paper on which they are written. Any elected representative taking an anti-socialist stand upon a public question should be expelled from the party and not permitted to rejoin for a period of years. This rule should be most strictly enforced when the *faus pas* is made in the hope of thereby winning the offender's reelection to office. It would also have the effect of automatically purging the organization of compromising, job-hungry elements.

(2) The only qualifications for participation in party work should be service and ability. Aliens should be encouraged to become citizens because of the increased propaganda power such status gives. Youth need not be encouraged to get old—and ossified, our persuasion should be the other way.

(3) Coöperation with reform parties is impossible as a permanent policy to any Socialist Party

worthy of the name. The Labor Party, like the craft union, is a product of capitalism and functions according to its methods and ethics. It starts with the assumption that the system is perfectly all right, except in some minor detail as it affects its own particular little group interest. So this and that group organizes for the advancement of its personal interests, in, by, and for capitalism. The socialist starts with the assumption that capitalism, as an economic system, is wrong, and that whatever use is made of its processes is only for the purposes of supplanting it with a socialist system. Starting thus from diametrically opposite viewpoints, there can be no coöperation between them unless (a) as a matter of temporary expediency the socialist sees in a momentary coöperation an opportunity for furthering his cause at the expense of Labor Reformism, or (b) the laborite rank and file deserts the reformistic position of its leadership in favor of a virile socialist stand. None of the suggested reform organizations present either opportunity at this time; to propose coöperation or fusion with them at this hour would be both miserable compromise of principle and stupid misjudgment of political conditions. It might chalk up votes and elect officials, but it would wreck our party.

(4) Certainly, the Socialist Party should forbid its elected officials to vote for an increase in the armament of the capitalist state. The same applies with equal strength to conscription, even though ultimately the cause of socialism will be advanced by its enforcement, despite our opposition. We are not the executives of capitalism, we are to be its executors, or, better, its administrators, for there is likely to be no will. Our aim is to prepare the minds of the masses for the coming social order. We oppose armament increase or maintenance for both immediate and ultimate reasons. Immediate, for the propaganda value of such a stand, so that capitalism alone may be blamed for the increasing burden of militarism upon the backs of the slowly awakening masses; ultimate, to have no part in strengthening the military power of the oppressing class.

(5) We need pay no attention whatever to the communist groups in this country. There should be room in our party for neither anti-political nor political self-aggrandizer. Any individual or group endorsing our program and principles should be made welcome within our ranks almost regardless of former affiliation.

The best thing for our party to do in this crisis is to stand true to the function for which it was organized and to remain in the path it has heretofore trod. At this very moment of a wide-spread acceptance of our ideas, at the very time when the thoughts of millions beginning to turn in our

direction attest the correctness of our twenty-year-old, yes, seventy-year-old position, it is proposed to desert our standard for a mess of political pottage. I trust the proposal will fail utterly of support.

E. T. Melms

(Member National Executive Committee Socialist Party)

(1) I strongly believe that socialist locals should exert control over their elected officials, especially over policies and tactics affecting the Socialist Party. This control, however, should be reasonable and should not be abused as it has been in a number of instances with which I am personally acquainted. It is of vital importance that our elected officials should stand behind the local and the working class in general and do all in their power to secure for the working class—the class which they represent—such beneficial legislation as is possible for them to secure under our present capitalist laws. Just as soon as a local does not exert some control over its officials, then such official is very apt to become stagnant.

(2) I can see no wrong in permitting minors and non-citizens to have a voice in the educational and propaganda work of the party, as well as in purely political matters. However, the foreign speaking comrades should also do all in their power to aid in the educational propaganda work of the party by becoming citizens of the United States as soon as possible. They are of very little aid in educational propaganda and political affairs to the organization unless they can participate in all of them to the fullest extent.

(3) I am not sure that a plan of coöperation between the Socialist Party, the Labor Party, the Nonpartisan League, etc., would work out effectively. I am opposed to any kind of coalition that would lead socialists to sacrifice their principles or any part thereof. Neither the Nonpartisan League nor the Labor Party, to my mind, has shown sufficient strength to warrant the Socialist Party to give way, in any shape or manner, on the political field. These parties are like many other political and industrial organizations which have appeared on the surface only to disappear in a short time. The Socialist Party must either become a strong organization politically and industrially or it can function only as a propaganda organization. In the last six months the Nonpartisan League has not shown strength enough in the different states where it has been operating to justify the belief that it will become a powerful political organization. The Labor Party, on the other hand, wherever it has functioned on the political field since its organization has been a miserable failure. I am perfectly satisfied that

any coöperation with all the above-mentioned organizations should be entered into provided, as already stated, that the Socialist Party adheres to the fundamental principles and purposes for which it was organized.

(4) I am absolutely opposed to our legislators voting for any military appropriations, unless they be appropriations to provide against invasion of this country by foreign enemies. The thought of such invasion at the present time seems to me nonsensical, to say the least. The workers of Europe will, before many years, make such a thing impossible, and today there are already signs that will lead us to the goal where an invasion of this kind will be utterly impossible.

(5) The Socialist Party should take in those members of the left wing organizations from the Communist and Communist Labor Parties who have practically been misled by its so-called leaders, but no one who has played an active part in either one of these organizations should ever be taken into the Socialist Party in the future.

My experience of some twenty odd years in the socialist movement convinces me that they can do a great deal more work outside of the organization than they can as disrupters and trouble makers inside of our ranks.

Mary Raoul Millis

(Formerly Secretary Socialist Party of Georgia)

We cannot deny that there is something seriously wrong with the Socialist Party. To those of us who have loved and believed in the party, its present condition of feeble struggle against vastly overwhelming odds is very distressing. It behooves us all, therefore, to add what mite we can of suggestion or service to bring about a better era.

We have not made the right appeal to the psychology of the American people—else why is it that the most liberty-loving and independent nation of the world should turn so deaf an ear to the philosophy of liberty?

I would suggest three answers to this question.

First, we have slavishly followed methods imported from the old world, instead of working out our own tactics to suit our needs—a custom which has condemned us to an isolation in American life which is as complete as it is peculiar.

Second, we have, with characteristic impatience, put a castle in the clouds before building a foundation on earth (we have talked, for instance, of "capturing the government" before the average man knew the sound of the word socialism).

Third, we have flown in the face of our own philosophy—we, who preach that a man's general course of action will be governed by his economic interests, have called upon our members to prac-

tice the most beautiful and self-sacrificing altruism by making and keeping pledges which militate in every direction against our economic and social advantage in life.

I think a step towards correcting mistake No. 1 would be to institute a course of coöperation, as full as possible without sacrificing our fundamentals, with the parties you mention in your questionnaire—the Labor Party, the Nonpartisan League, etc. It would be in accord with this idea to reduce the influence and participation in party affairs of those who have not yet become citizens.

An obvious method of correcting mistake No. 2 would be to give more emphasis to the educational part of our program; and it may be in order to ask here if it is reasonable to think that a philosophy of love and brotherhood can profit by a propaganda that is inflammatory rather than scientific?

I believe that the coöperative store offers a practical way of correcting mistake No. 3. It is for this reason that I am now devoting my time and energies to the development of that idea in my state.

I think the Socialist Party should continue to forbid its legislators from voting for military appropriations because such action is directly in line with our fundamental principles.

We should extend the right hand of fellowship to our brothers in the left wing organization, believing that their principles are the same as ours, and that the difference between us lies rather in questions of tactics and varying estimates of the degree of industrial and intellectual readiness of this nation for the Great Change.

J. B. Salutsky

(Editor of *Neue Welt*)

(1) Question one is hardly answerable for the reason that the Socialist Party exerts no control at all over elected officials. In point of fact, the recent split in the Socialist Party was due in the first place to the large measure of independence of action that elected officials enjoyed. The course pursued by the lone congressman of the party in the Capitol Building, and, in some instances, by the aldermanic group in the New York City Hall, contributed more than any other single factor to the formation of the organized "wings" and factions. Hence, it would follow, in my opinion, that the Socialist Party should install a system of responsibility and genuine control over the legislative activities of elected socialist representatives. Of course, such control should rest on coöperation between the party and its elected representatives. It should operate not as a purely disciplinary measure, but should begin from the moment of nomination. "Personal" campaigns should then be

done away with, that is, candidates should be fully and unequivocally pledged to the party program and to nothing less or more. No tacit alliances with outside influences should be made and real independence, except of party direction, should thus be vouchsafed. Party control should be exercised by the National Executive Committee. Local organizations should have jurisdiction only over officials and matters of purely local character, but even there the final decision should rest with the national organization of the party.

If the policy of *laissez-faire, laissez-passer*, in matters of party discipline, to which the socialist defense at the Albany mock trial has sought to commit the party, *post factum* and impliedly, should be accepted as *the* party policy, then the contention of the left wingers is right and Socialist Party candidates are not a bit better than any other good men running on any party ticket. Indeed, Socialist Party membership loses its significance, and the great sacrifices this membership inflicts upon the men and women in the party are in vain if the victories of the party should become the spoils of the individual victors at the polls.

(2) The present provisions of the party constitution are sufficient. Minors are not admitted except in the auxiliary organizations and non-citizens are urged to become citizens. As a matter of fact, non-citizens are not occupying any important administrative posts in the party (for instance, there are not now and hardly ever were non-citizens on the N. E. C. of the party). Special legislation on the subject would only tend to show that the "Americanizers" and "One-Hundred-Percenter" succeeded in scaring the the Socialist Party into the alien-danger fight. Danger ahead lies not outside, but inside of these very "One-Hundred-Percenter."

(3) The Nonpartisan League, while democratic in a measure, is primarily an upholder of private property and intrinsically anti-socialistic. However sympathetically we may view the league, there can be no talk of political coöperation with it. On the other hand, of course, it should not be attacked in the same manner as we attack the old parties by our oral and written propaganda. Our attitude toward the Labor Party should be of sympathetic understanding, but, unfortunately, there is as yet no such party in American political life. Pious wishes of honest individuals here and there don't make for a political party any more. "Boring from within" made for progressivism in reactionary craft unions. The Socialist Party will have to reckon with a Labor Party when such will emerge from infantile dreams, but so far there "ain't no such animal."

(4) By all means; you will beat militarism by

starving militarists only. Preaching alone will not do it.

(5) Whether Santeri Nuorteva's claim that the Communist Party has been called into existence by Mr. Mitchell Palmer's ambitions is true or not, it has proved a mighty good instrument for evil just the same. The Socialist Party should have nothing in common with it. It is for the Socialist Party to make clear the inherently reactionary nature of this would-be ultra-revolutionary creation of ignorance, democracy, and muddle-headedness. This will be achieved by a thorough cleaning of the party's own house, by its freeing itself of "parlor socialism" as well as of loud-mouthedness, by its adopting of an uncompromising attitude in theory as well as in practice. Unfortunately, the attitude of the leading party men in the course of the last twelve months has been very disheartening. In the first part of that troublesome year their attitude was that of competing with the left wingers in an unmeasured over-use of left-sounding revolutionary catch-words, this due to the one hundred per cent. American principle of competition with the lefties. And what followed then and found its culmination in the Albany trial was nothing less than a well-calculated campaign to reduce the party to the level of a "strictly kosher," one hundred per cent., tame, safe, and sane party of not over-radical reform. It is up to the party, to the rank and file if the leaders fail to do it, to find its frontiers on both sides, the right as well as the would-be left (communist), and install its banner of revolutionary Marxian socialism on the solid ground of class struggle and true internationalism. Pussyfooting toward the right as well as flirting with the left are equally suicidal to the party which has so little at present and strives for so much in the future.

Joseph Slavitt

(Lecturer on Socialism in Rand School)

(1) It is not really possible to control elected officials except by moral suasion or their own consciences and fidelity to the cause. Frequent conferences between them and party officials, caucuses, or conventions will help somewhat to achieve this object.

(2) Minors have had a voice in party affairs altogether out of proportion to their importance in the movement. In educational matters, their voice should be rather large; in propaganda matters, limited and always under control of the party; in purely political matters, and especially in party matters, very restricted and under strict control of the party.

(3) Yes, if possible.

(4) Yes, if possible and legal.

(5) Leave them alone. The fittest will survive.

John M. Work

(Formerly National Secretary Socialist Party;
Staff *Milwaukee Leader*)

(1) In my judgment, officials should report to locals and be advised by them. The advice should not be binding. If officials fail in a few instances to be true to the party principles and policies, they can be dropped at their terms' expiration.

(2) The active membership of the party should be confined to adult citizens. The others can be taken in as auxiliaries, but not have any voice in purely political matters.

(3) A year ago I said in your symposium that I would be ready to consider coöperation with the Labor Party when it had proved three things: that it was apparently permanent; that it was not going to flirt with the foe; and that it did not merely exist for the purpose of seeking political pap for its members. I also said that it should not have butted into the province of the Socialist Party, and that I hoped it would die speedily and be kind enough to stay dead.

Well, it did not oblige me by dying. I believe it has met my three conditions. In fact, I was convinced of this last summer, and, not being a delegate, I sent a communication to the Socialist Party emergency convention urging it to amend our national constitution so that we could coöperate with the Labor Party. This was not done, and it seems to me very unfortunate, for it is probably too late now to amend the constitution in time to agree upon common candidates for presidential and congressional offices this year.

I am, however, in favor of amending our constitution as soon as possible in such a way that we can keep our organization intact and at the same time make a working agreement—a sort of a federation—with the Labor Party, and also with the National Nonpartisan League if the nature of that organization will permit of it, in order to agree upon candidates and not split up the vote. Far from injuring our organization, this policy would, in my opinion, make for the growth of our party.

(4) I do not know of any reason why socialist legislators should vote for military appropriations, but I would not make any binding rule on the subject.

(5) Our doors should be open to such members of the Communist and Communist Labor parties as believe in political action. We have taken back lots of them already. We need not bother about our attitude towards the others, for they will have nothing to do with us. I, of course, do not want our members to have any bitterness or animosity towards them. All such negative feelings constitute a waste of energy and an obstacle in the way of progress.

The Albany Trial—A Digest

(First Month of Trial.)

Tuesday, January 20th. The trial of the five socialist assemblymen began in the Assembly Chambers, Albany, N. Y. The defense was represented by Morris Hillquit, Seymour Stedman, Gilbert E. Roe, S. John Block, Walter Nelles and William Karlin; the prosecution by John B. Stanchfield, Martin W. Littleton, Arthur E. Sutherland, Samuel A. Berger, Elon R. Brown, and Archibald E. Stevenson. The members of the Judiciary Committee of the Assembly acted as judges. These included Chairman Louis H. Martin, Louis A. Cuvillier, Maurice Bloch, William S. Evans, William W. Pellet, Theodore Stitt, George H. Rowe, James M. Lown, Jr., Edward A. Everett, Edward J. Wilson, Charles M. Harrington, and Harold E. Blodgett.

Charles Evans Hughes, Louis Marshall, Ogden L. Mills, Morgan J. O'Brien, and Joseph A. Proskauer were present as members of the New York City Bar Association. Hardly had the proceedings started than Mr. Hughes arose and asked that his committee be allowed to appear in the proceedings on behalf of the New York City Bar Association and in the interest of the public, "in order that the proceedings may be heard and determined in accordance with sound constitutional practice."

The motion was denied by the Chairman, on the alleged ground that many other associations had applied for representation at the hearing and that hard and fast rules had to be adopted. Mr. Hughes thereupon left a statement with the committee, which gave eleven grounds for demanding that the Judiciary committee report to the Assembly that there was no case against the five socialist assemblymen and that these assemblymen should be seated. Subsequently, if there were charges of law violation on the part of the assemblymen, these should be duly formulated and proved before the assemblymen were denied the rights accorded to any other member.

The Bar Association Brief

The brief left by Mr. Hughes recited the circumstances under which the assemblymen had been expelled and declared that the procedure was without legal precedent. In the Senator Smoot case, cited by the prosecution as a precedent, it was decided, according to the brief, that, once having taken the oath of office, a representative could be deprived of his seat only by the two-thirds vote specified by "the Constitution for expulsion." The suspension of the assemblymen had reversed "the rule applicable to the meanest criminal." The defendants, according to the

Hughes Committee, "are called upon to prove their right to their seats, although that right is evidenced by certificates of election and by the fact that, having taken the constitutional oath of office, they were permitted to take their seats as members of the Assembly. This is the first time in American history that one against whom treason and disloyalty are sought to be imputed has been called upon to establish the negative. It reminds one of the English State Trials in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It had been fondly supposed that the injustice that characterized them would never be revived under the American system of government."

The brief drew attention to the provision of the New York State Constitution—that the test of the oath of office be the only test required of representatives; that "no other oath, declaration or test shall be required as a qualification for any office of public trust."

The five assemblymen had passed that test, and yet it "is now sought to try them, without a jury, without a record of conviction, upon the charge that a political association with which it is said they are affiliated, but which is not the party that placed them in nomination, avows in its platform principles that are said to be detrimental to the country."

The committee argued the well-known principle that intention does not constitute criminality, but that intention must be followed by overt acts. It asserted that the proposition was fraught with the utmost dangers to representative government "which declares that a political constituency may be disfranchised because of the political creed of a party with which its elected representative is directly or indirectly affiliated." The brief cited the former exclusion of Catholics, Jews, and Quakers from office, and stated that "we have passed beyond that stage in political development when heresy-hunting is a permitted sport. . . . When the Constitution of the United States forbade the imposition of a religious test, and the constitution of the State of New York rising to nobler heights, forbade the imposition of any test other than that contained in the constitutional oath of office, it was believed that the bigotry and the intolerance that had affixed a blot upon the Constitution of England would never make their appearance in an American legislative assembly."

"If a majority can exclude the whole or a part of the minority because it deems the political views entertained by them hurtful, then free government is at an end."

The brief distinguished the present suspension

from the Brigham H. Roberts case, on the ground that Roberts' right to office had been challenged before the administration of his oath; he had been convicted of bigamy, and, furthermore, was merely a delegate from a territory, and not a constitutional officer. Even in his case, however, many believed that he should be seated. The brief concluded by a plea for open discussion as a safety-valve and with a denunciation of suppression on the ground that it fostered the very ideas it wished to combat.

The Charge

After Mr. Martin had forbidden the distribution of the briefs, on the ground that it would create confusion, he presented a statement of the matters to be brought up for discussion. "Information came to the assembly through various channels," he declared, "that the men mentioned in this proceeding were members of a party or society whose platform of principles and whose doctrines as advocated today called for and demanded the complete destruction of our form of government by the fomentation of industrial unrest, the bringing into play of force and violence and direct actions by the mass;" that the party expressed its accord and sympathy with the Soviet Government, that it passed an anti-war plank in St. Louis in 1917, and that the assemblymen agreed with the acts of the party.

Hillquit's Challenges

Mr. Hillquit challenged the right of the Judiciary Committee to conduct the proceedings and moved that the committee ask the assembly to appoint a new committee composed of members of the assembly who voted against the resolution to suspend the socialists, or who subsequently voted for its reconsideration. One of the first considerations of a trial body is "that it must not have formed an opinion of the guilt of the defendants. Otherwise it isn't a trial. It is merely a farce in which we go through the motions of a trial without reaching its substance."

Mr. Hillquit declared that the committee was appointed and selected as members of the Judiciary Committee by the defendants' accuser, Mr. Sweet, and that the Committee had "publicly, solemnly expressed its conviction of the guilt of the socialists" by voting for the resolution of suspension which condemned the socialists.

Mr. Stanchfield, in reply, declared that the accused were "entitled to no representation, and this committee itself could go ahead in secret and take testimony and report to the House and upon that report expulsion could be had and no one could complain." Chairman Martin denied the motion of the defense.

Mr. Hillquit thereupon challenged the appearance on the Committee of Mr. Pellet and Mr.

Martin, on the ground that they were members of the Lusk Committee, of Chairman Martin, because he was reported to have stated that he was about to introduce legislation declaring the Socialist Party of the State an outlaw organization, and of Mr. Cuvillier, who declared that the socialist assemblymen, if found guilty, ought to be shot. A person "who holds such an opinion," declared Mr. Hillquit, "is qualified as an executioner and not as a judge." This motion of the defense was likewise denied.

More Motions Denied

Wednesday, January 21st. Mr. Roe argued that, granting the constitutional right of the Assembly to inquire into the qualifications of the socialist assemblymen, the assembly had no power to exclude the socialists, pending the hearing of any charges that may be brought against them. Such exclusion, he declared, vitiated the proceeding and rendered the assembly an illegally constituted body. Mr. Roe's motion was denied.

Seymour Stedman moved to dismiss the case on the ground that the charges against the five did not constitute a cognizable offense under any legal definition, and, even if proved, would not authorize the committee in recommending an expulsion of these members. This motion met the same fate as the others.

S. John Block urged that the trial not proceed until a bill of particulars be submitted, so that the defense would know precisely what it would be called upon to meet—a right accorded to the meanest criminal. The motion was denied.

Martin J. Littleton delivered his parting speech before leaving to defend Senator Newberry of Michigan. Mr. Littleton's main contention was that socialists belonged to an "invisible empire which projects itself as a revolutionary force into every country, menacing its institutions and projecting its overthrow."

Assemblyman Evans Dissents

Thursday, January 22nd. William S. Evans, Democratic member of the Judiciary Committee from the Bronx, desired that he be recorded as declaring that, in his belief, "the assembly has no constitutional or statutory power to suspend or expel a duly elected member upon any ground other than that specified in the constitution or statutes."

Mr. Hillquit, in order to facilitate the proceedings, offered to read certain admissions into the record. Mr. Stanchfield objected, declaring that the attorneys for the state "purposed to prove the case in our own way."

The Socialist Party constitution was submitted in evidence.

Mr. Julius Gerber stated that, during his twelve years as Executive Secretary of Local New York,

he had never received an advance resignation from any candidate nominated for office in the Socialist Party. This statement was ordered by the Chairman stricken from the record.

Committee's Power Supreme

Mr. Stanchfield reiterated the assertion that the committee "would have the right to conduct this entire proceeding in camera. They could exclude the five assemblymen under investigation; they could exclude their counsel, and the whole proceeding could be conducted to a conclusion in that way, if we saw fit to urge you to do it and you saw fit to comply."

Mr. Hillquit replied that, as a proposition of physical power, he did not find any fault with Mr. Stanchfield's contentions, but that he did not wish to appear at the hearing on sufferance or courtesy by any favor; that "we either are here with all the rights of counsel in any court of justice, or before any tribunal, or we do not propose to be here."

Convenient Excerpts

The prosecution introduced the testimony of one Ezra L. Kauffmann, a policeman of Rochester, who stated that he purchased in Rochester a pamphlet dealing with the dictatorship of the proletariat, and published by the Jewish Federation of the Socialist Party. The prosecution introduced excerpts from the book which gave the argument advanced for proletarian dictatorship. The translation was read by Mr. Robinton, formerly of the Department of Justice.

On cross examination, Mr. Robinton testified that he had been given the pamphlet by a representative of the Lusk Committee with the general direction to translate such portions as would serve as evidence against socialism.

Q. "You were looking for such portions as would support the contention that socialism preaches violence, is that it?" A. "Absolutely."

Q. "Is it a fact that the author mentions a summarization of views of both sides, those who are opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat and those who favor . . . but you have translated only the portion which deals with the support of the dictatorship of the proletariat?" A. "Yes."

A further pamphlet on "Bolshevism" by a Dr. B. Hoffman was introduced, which, however, according to the witness, contained nothing to indicate the official attitude of the Socialist Party.

Mr. Hillquit moved to strike out the excerpts read from the pamphlets on the ground that no connection had been established with the socialist assemblymen, or with anything connected with the proceedings. The motion was overruled.

Clæssens on Elections

The speech of assemblyman August Clæssens, on November 7, 1919, at a celebration of the second anniversary of the Russian Soviet Republic in the Park View Palace, New York City, was introduced. Clæssens compared a social revolution with a locomotive, "not dangerous at all, but a very useful thing except to a jackass that will stand on the tracks." He continued:

"We socialists are social revolutionists; and for some of the detectives that are here let me tell you that we are really the most peaceful people in the world; so much so that we are pacifists, that we hate the shedding of blood—we hate the shedding of blood, for we believe that hanging and killing never did any man any good. It has no educative influence."

He then described the corrupt practices in the elections in New York, adding: "I know some people say, . . . if the government rests upon thievery and fraud, then you have no government, you might just as well refer to this nation as 'the United States of Thieves'; but I am not one of those to become pessimistic.

"We are celebrating the second anniversary of the success of fighting men and women, and if we celebrate that in the highest possible form, not only in our idealism, but in our enthusiasm, then we celebrate it also as martyrs, and not as cowards. . . .

"I have told any person who still remains a Democrat or a Republican—I do not care how honest and clean you may be, you are an accomplice of a crook. You have absolutely no right to speak of an American republic: there is no American republic. It is merely one huge institution based upon fraud— . . . —if the men and women cannot cast their ballots, if they cannot get counted their own ideas, what is the sense of this whole thing?"

He urged the use of the ballot, and economic, coöperative action and education as means of bringing about the social revolution and denounced the character of the election on the previous Tuesday and the election officials.

The hearings were adjourned until Tuesday, January 27th.

Monday, January 26th. Assemblymen Amos brought before the assembly several resolutions for the purpose of quashing the proceedings, but Speaker Sweet declared all of the motions out of order.

Waldman on Gary vs. Lenin

Tuesday, January 27th. The manifesto of the Third Internationale was read into the record.

The speech of Louis Waldman in the Brownsville Labor Lyceum on November 7, 1919, was also read. Mr. Waldman in his speech denounced

the Russian blockade which, he claimed, resulted in the starvation of hundreds of thousands of women and children.

"America today," he declared, "is one of the murderers of hundreds of thousands of women and children in Russia, and we are here to protest from the very bottom of our hearts."

He protested against our fighting a country against which war had never been declared, and asserted that the big business interests dictated the international attitude of Woodrow Wilson and the rest of the Cabinet. "Heretofore the function of government was recognized as being a jailer, a policeman, a tax collector, a military conscript, a war declarant . . . but a new state has been founded, and it says to the world, that the function of the state is . . . to organize the industries, the wealth, the resources, human and material, for the purpose of establishing things as they should be."

Waldman dealt with the false report concerning nationalization of women in Russia and criticized the divorce law of New York state. In conclusion he stated:

"We must select one of two alternatives: Either Russia lives and conquers the world—not Russia conquers the world, but its ideas and philosophy worthy of the Russian government today shall conquer the world—either that or the ideas and the philosophy of Gary and Wilson and Palmer, Lloyd George and Clemenceau are to conquer the world. Between the two, for my part, and for the part of thousands of socialists now battling in America today, we choose to stand by the ideas and philosophy and program and principles of the Lenins and Trotskys as those we approve."

A letter was submitted in evidence from the Eighth Assembly District, Socialist Party, New York, to L. C. A. K. Martens, "pledging its co-operation in establishing the first representative of the workers' government of Russia in America."

Mr. Stedman objected to the introduction of this letter on the ground that it was issued by the Left Wing which had no affiliation with the Socialist Party at the time of its organization. The objection was overruled. Other Socialist Party documents were placed in evidence.

Mayor Lunn as "Star Witness"

Wednesday, January 29th. Julius Gerber told about the split in the party during the summer of 1919. Mayor George R. Lunn, of Schenectady, a "star witness" for the prosecution, testified that, prior to the first election on the Socialist Party ticket in 1911, he had signed a resignation blank giving it to the members of the Socialist Party. He, however, refused to make out such a blank before his second election. He detailed his fight with the party after the second election over the

appointment of a non-socialist, and the subsequent expulsion of the Schenectady local for failing to oust him from membership. On cross examination he admitted that he had appointed during his term of office several non-socialists to whom no objection had been raised by the Socialist Party.

Mr. Lunn asserted that "a person who belongs to a political party is not ordinarily retained in appointive position if he is knifing some of the candidates and supporting others," and that the control of the Socialist Party was not much different from that of other organizations.

Q. "You at no time felt that any of the suggestions [by the members of the party local] were from corrupt motives in any sense, did you?"

A. "I am quite sure they were not; they were from devotion to their particular views as to how it should be done; and I did not always agree with them."

Q. "As a Democratic Mayor, . . . you have a city committee and a county committee there of Democrats?"

A. "I have."

Q. "And they make suggestions to you now, I suppose?"

A. "Yes, they do."

Q. "And tell you who they want?"

A. "Yes."

Q. "And they usually want Democrats?"

A. "Yes." (Laughter.)

Q. "Have you expressed any opinion on this proceeding [the suspension]?"

A. "I have. I am very much opposed to it. My antagonism to the Socialist Party is very great, but not so much but that I consider that this proceeding is contrary to the fundamental constitutional provisions; and I am in sympathy with the New York State law bodies, like the New York City Bar, as well as the State Bar."

Q. "You understand that the moral obligations to the Democratic or Republican Party are quite as fast and binding as the written one in the Socialist Party, generally speaking?"

A. "I think, regardless of parties, that the moral suasion used upon the elected official is made as efficient and fast, hoping they may succeed in landing their man and they are all alike."

The Committee, against protests from the defense, introduced the testimony of Ludwig Martens before the Lusk Committee. The speech of Assemblyman Charles Solomon was also introduced, in which he urged a collection for the steel workers on strike.

Testimony from Socialist Baiter

Thursday, January 29th. Debs' speech of March 12th in Cleveland, the Soviet Constitution, the St. Louis platform, and Lenin's letter to American Workingmen, were read into the records. The sabotage plank adopted by the party in 1912, excluding from the party those advocating sabotage, came in for considerable discussion. Alger-

non Lee testified that this plank was dropped because "it had ceased to be an issue within the party, as those who had considered sabotage as an efficient method of working class action had been eliminated."

Frank Wasserman, an anti-socialist lawyer, stated that Claessens in debate said that the constitution was a scrap of paper and that the people when they obtained control under a socialist

government would take things by force. This testimony was subsequently denied by Claessens. Mr. Wasserman also claimed that Solomon told him in private conversation that he believed in all that Bolshevism stood for, and that the revolution in America was coming sooner than Wasserman realized. [This interpretation of his remarks was subsequently denied by Solomon.]

H. W. L.

Socialist Review Calendar

Compiled by Caro Lloyd

FEBRUARY

1 SIBERIA. Vladivostok.

Parades, street meetings, etc. mark second day of city's complete liberation from Kolchak's authority. Red flags fly on every government building. (Assoc. Press.)

AUSTRALIA. Broken Hill.

Silver miners still on strike. Strike for better conditions started March, 1919.

2 U. S. A. Tombstone, Ariz.

Trial begins of 210 business and professional men charged with kidnaping and deporting into desert 1,186 striking copper miners and sympathizers at Bisbee, Arizona, in 1917.

RUSSIA. Esthonia.

Permanent peace signed between Soviet Russia and Esthonia. Latter to receive fifteen million rubles in gold (her share of Imperial Russia's treasure) but is exonerated from proportional payment of Imperial Russia's debt.

3 U. S. A. New York City.

Auditor Gaynor of the Interboro Rapid Transit at traction inquiry testifies that Theo. Shonts received \$125,000 bonus in 1913 from I. R. T. for negotiating its contract with New York City, and further bonus of \$25,000 the following year.

" Albany, N. Y.

Letter from Father Ryan, famous anti-socialist, made public by Morris Hillquit, condemning suspension of five Assemblymen as "most brazen and insidious political outrage committed in this country since 1876."

" Grand Rapids, Mich.

First witness called in Senator Newberry case. Judge Sessions rules out plea of patriotism on part of defense, declaring issue is amount spent at election, not merits of candidates.

BELGIUM. Brussels.

Senate annuls election of several socialist senators on ground that they did not pay amount of taxation required by constitution to qualify for the Upper House.

4 U. S. A. New York City.

Exchange Sterling falls to unprecedented point of \$9.19.

" Washington, D. C.

Ludwig Martens, before Senate committee, declares Allied representatives conspired to blow up railroad bridges and otherwise damage property and prestige of Russian Soviet government by force and violence.

5 U. S. A. New York City.

Ex-Assemblyman Benjamin Gitlow found guilty of "criminal anarchy" (publishing in *The Revolutionary Age* the manifesto of the Communist Labor party).

" Chicago, Ill.

District Attorney Chas. Clyne brings suit in Circuit Court of Appeals to have Victor Berger sent to Leavenworth immediately.

" Milwaukee, Wis.

Milwaukee Press Club expels Victor Berger.

- 7 U. S. A. Philadelphia, Pa. Women's Trade Union League of Phila. (over 150,000 workers) adopts resolutions opposing sedition bills; denounces Dept. of Justice for alleged efforts to lower standard of hours and wages in attempt to reduce cost of living.
- " Washington, D. C. Representatives of over 200,000 Federal employes make demands to national Democratic and Republican committees that Postmaster Burleson be retired.
- SIBERIA. Irkutsk. Admiral Kolchak, Supreme Ruler of All the Russias, shot at 5:00 a. m., after trial by the revolutionary committee.
- 8 U. S. A. Washington, D. C. A. F. of L. calls on 40,000 locals to enter political fight on non-partisan lines, electing "friends of labor" and throwing out "labor's enemies."
- " Spokane, Wash. Prosecuting Attorney Joseph B. Lindsley in Spokane Superior County Court says that membership in the I. W. W. constitutes a man "a common nuisance" and as such liable to jailing.
- RUSSIA. Odessa. Moscow wireless received in London announces occupation of Odessa by Bolsheviks.
- 9 U. S. A. Washington, D. C. Democrats in House ignore Wilson's appeal and reject compulsory military service plan by 106 to 17.
- " Lexington, Ky. Pitched battle between National Guard and mob determined to lynch Will Lockett (negro sentenced to death March 11). Five of mob killed and 17 wounded.
- SIBERIA. Korea. Moscow wireless, confirmed by Washington dispatches, reports Koreans have revolted, forcing Japanese to evacuate northern section of country.
- SPAIN. Madrid. Socialist candidates for municipal elections win seats in many small cities, and party likely to form strong opposition.
- 10 U. S. A. New York City. Merchants' Association, demanding Post Office inquiry, announces that it traced 7,900 letters in 1919, of which 2,229 or 28% were delayed. Curtailment of railway post office service one of causes alleged for "low level of efficiency" in Federal Postal Service.
- " Trenton, N. J. New Jersey Legislature ratifies Woman Suffrage amendment.
- " Washington, D. C. Union officials present demands of two million rail workers before Director General Hines.
- 11 U. S. A. New York City. Supreme Court Justice Weeks imposes maximum penalty (5 to 10 years hard labor) on ex-Assemblyman Gitlow, member of Communist Labor Party.
- " At New York City traction inquiry James Reed, engineer employed by city, estimates probable profits of Interboro Rapid Transit for 1920 at eleven million dollars.
- " Albany, N. Y. "Enactment of legislation authorizing higher fares on New York City traction lines at present session practically assured." (New York Times' special Albany wire.)
- " Boston, Mass. Application made for writ of *habeas corpus* in case of 20 alleged communists held on Deer Island, on ground that excessive bail demanded violates Article 8 in Bill of Rights of American Constitution.
- " Boise, Idaho. Idaho Legislature ratifies Woman Suffrage amendment.
- CANADA. Montreal, Quebec. 2,000 delegates of Grain Growers' League discuss affiliation with Canadian Labor, following lead of farmer-labor alliance now in control of Ontario government.
- BULGARIA. Budapest dispatch to London reports general strike called throughout Bulgaria. Railroads not running save for few trains with essential foods.

- GREAT BRITAIN. London. Amendment in favor of nationalizing coal mines, offered in House of Commons by president of South Wales Miners' Federation, defeated by vote of 329 to 64.
- POLAND. Warsaw. Socialist and workingmen's parties demand immediate negotiations with Russian Soviet government for peace settlement. Miners threaten strike otherwise.
- 12 U. S. A. New York City. American Civil Liberties Union states that iron torture cages are in use in Alcatraz military prison.
- " Phoenix, Ariz. Arizona legislature ratifies Woman Suffrage amendment.
- 18 U. S. A. New York City. Report of Committee on political reform of Union League Club approves deportation of "undesirable aliens," and upholds suspension of five New York Assemblymen.
- " Washington, D. C. Representative Tinkham of Massachusetts alleges Attorney General Palmer is responsible for deal with Louisiana sugar producers which cost the public over seven hundred million dollars a year in raised prices; demands investigation.
- " Chicago, Ill. Farmer-Labor Congress adopts reports and resolutions calling for cooperative education; establishment of credit unions and cooperative banks, for cooperative daily newspapers with mills to furnish their own white paper. Endorses government control of meat packing, and Plumb Plan for railroads.
- " " " Farmers' National Council, representing over 750,000 farmers in 18 different states, urge two-year extension of government operation of railroads and retention of all ships that can be used by the United States. Oppose restriction of civil liberties by peace-time sedition laws.
- SWEDEN. Stockholm. Branting reelected president of Swedish Socialist Party by annual congress.
- 16 U. S. A. New York City. Traction inquiry shows gross earnings of Brooklyn Rapid Transit from March to December, 1919, exceeded operating expenses by three million dollars.
- 17 U. S. A. Maryland. Legislature rejects Woman Suffrage amendment.
- CHINA. Shanghai. Mass meetings demand Peking government refuse to negotiate with Japan over Shantung. Demand matter be referred to League of Nations.
- 18 FRANCE. Paris. Paul Deschanel, new French President, grants amnesty to all political prisoners, civil and military, save those convicted of treason.
- 19 U. S. A. Washington, D. C. National Board of Farm Organizations (over three million farmers represented) in annual conference demands Congress remove restrictions on cooperative marketing and appoint committee to question presidential candidates. Favor progressively rising taxes on property.
- 20 U. S. A. Albany, N. Y. Evidence at "trial" shows 71 per cent. Socialist Party members throughout country and 95 per cent. in Manhattan are American citizens.
- " Lansing, Mich. Debs's name put on state primary as Socialist candidate for President.
- CANADA. Montreal. Grand Trunk shareholders accept government proposal to nationalize the road along with Grand Trunk Pacific. Making total government mileage of over 21,000 miles.
- JAPAN. Tokio. 25,000 persons from all parts of Japan take part in universal suffrage demonstration.
- RUSSIA. Murmansk. Captured by Bolsheviks. All North Russia now held by them.

- 21 SPAIN. Madrid. Cabinet resigns, forced by agitation of National Federation of Railroad Men for general rail strike on March 1.
- RUSSIA. Caspian Sea. Moscow wireless to London states Denikin fleet in Caspian has joined the Soviet government.
- 22 U. S. A. Washington, D. C. Senate votes 47 to 11 favor of Esch-Cummins rail bill granting roads 5½ per cent. guaranteed dividend and creating labor board.
- 24 POLAND. Warsaw. Polish Diet frames peace proposals to be submitted to Paris and London before going to Soviet government. Demands self-determination for territories west of frontier of 1772; independence of Baltic countries; relations with Ukraine if stable government is organized; guarantees against Bolshevik propaganda in Poland; indemnity for war injury in Poland and to Polish citizens in Russia.
- 25 U. S. A. New York City. 170 Russians held at Ellis Island for exile protest unbearable living conditions.
- " Cincinnati, O. Prison sentences from one to fifteen months imposed on 13 socialists accused of conspiracy to defeat the military draft.
- FRANCE. Paris. Federation of Rail Unions calls a strike. Albert Thomas, head of International Labor Bureau of League of Nations, to be sent to Russia to investigate.
- GREAT BRITAIN. London. Council of Premiers George, Millerand, and Nitti announce decision to resume trade relations with Russia, but with no recognition of the Soviet government. They inform border states they will no longer receive Allied support in warfare against Soviet Russia.
- RUSSIA. Moscow. Arthur E. Copping cables New York *Times*, "I cannot too emphatically report that Russia is now tranquil and orderly, and the members of its government, so far from hatching schemes of robbery, spoliation, and aggression, are toiling night and day in a self-sacrificing spirit which is almost fanatical."
- 26 RUSSIA. Moscow. Wireless to London reports new peace overtures of Soviet government to U. S. A., Japan, and Rumania.
- FRANCE. Paris. Leaders of rail strike announce as chief demand that railroads be turned over to the workers.
- JAPAN. Tokio. Debate on extension of suffrage to all males, cause of much agitation in the Diet, culminates when Premier, fearing vote would defeat government, obtains writ from Emperor dissolving the Diet.
- 27 U. S. A. Washington, D. C. Soviet Russia's peace proposal will not be considered or even published, says State Department. ("Open covenants openly arrived at.")
- Senator France introduces resolution advising opening of friendly relations with Russian people.
- 28 U. S. A. Washington, D. C. President Wilson signs Esch-Cummins rail bill restoring roads to private owners. Writes to Brotherhood and rail union chiefs upholding bill's plan of wage adjustment and refusing their request for a special wage tribunal.
- " Oklahoma City. Oklahoma Legislature ratifies Woman Suffrage amendment.
- FRANCE. Paris. The C. G. T. (General Federation of Labor) indorses rail workers' strike and issues call for sympathetic strikes in all industries. Government orders all rail workers to be mobilized.
- 29 U. S. A. Boston, Mass. Boston Symphony Orchestra, unionized after long campaign of opposition, joins the American Federation of Musicians.

Russian Documents¹

Results and Prospects of Our Economic Policy

V. Milutin

During the last two years our economic policy has been changing and developing as a result of the concrete conditions underlying the existence of Soviet Russia.

The first year was, in the main, a year of liquidation of the old capitalist relations. When the power passed into the hands of the proletariat, that class naturally had to take the economic administration into its own hands. During the first year the economic dictatorship of the proletariat transferred the means of production—the land, factories, mines, mills, and banks—into the hands of the organs of the Soviet Government. In the main the process of nationalization was completed within the first year after the revolution.

In that period, sixty million desyatins were taken over from private landowners, while twenty-nine central banks, together with their local branches, sixteen thousand merchant vessels, and as many as a thousand of the largest industrial enterprises were nationalized. The main branches of industry, such as the coal-mining industry, the electro-technical industry, and a portion of the metallurgical and machine construction plants were transferred from private to national ownership.

Economic Administration

During the first year our economic policy has also been directed toward the building up of the machinery of economic management. We could not immediately assume the administrative functions. For this we had neither the personnel nor the means. The enormous development of independent action among the working classes, however, facilitated matters for us even during the first year. When the owners left their establishments, causing disorganization of their industry, the mill and factory committees and the trade unions were usually able to handle the situation to a considerable extent. Towards the end of the first year the administrative machinery had been built on absolutely new foundations, from top to bottom, with the closest participation of the laboring masses. Thus, the economic policy of the Soviet Government, directed essentially toward the realization of fundamental socialist principles, has been carried out.

Another basic feature of our economic policy during the first year after the revolution was the

liquidation of the war and the transformation of our industry to a peace basis. We proposed to concentrate all our attention on serving the peacetime needs of the population. Every factory, every mill was arranging its program of production in such a manner as to bring about the transition from war-time production to peace-time service, meeting the needs of the large masses of the population.

Thus during the first year, in pursuance of its economic program, the Soviet Government attacked the old capitalist organs and organizations, created a new Soviet apparatus, transferred enterprises from private owners to the state, and regularized economic activity.

The Military Situation

The second year differed considerably from the first one, both as regards the external conditions affecting Soviet Russia and as regards the internal problems which the Soviet Government, and particularly the Supreme Council of National Economy, had to face. The Second Congress of the Council of National Economy, in its regulations and resolutions, had already determined the line which was to be followed in the domain of economic construction. In the first place, Soviet Russia was compelled to come into collision with international capital.

The second year had therefore passed under the ægis of struggle against aggressive international capital. We were confronted with the live forces of capitalism in the shape of the soldiers of the Entente Powers—English, French, Italian—who seized our most needed and most important positions from an economic standpoint. The British took the Caucasus, and we were thus deprived of naphtha (kerosene oil). The aid of the Entente Powers lent impetus to the advance of the Russian counter-revolution from the south, from the north, from the west, and from the east. The counter-revolution, backed by cannon, shells, and money, advanced on Soviet Russia. At the same time the bourgeoisie declared a blockade of Soviet Russia, in the hope of strangling her economically. All this determined our economic policy.

We were immediately compelled to proclaim the transformation of the entire country into a single military camp. We had to place our entire economic activity on a war basis. Before everything else we had to place the defense of the achievements of the proletariat. It was in this direction that our economic policy was guided during the second year of the existence of the Soviet Power.

¹Soviet Government reports from *Economic Life*, November 7, 1919 [Organ of Supreme Council of National Economy].

But at the same time we had to make further internal reinforcements of our economic organization and our economic activity. From the regulation of our economic life we passed over to direct management. During this second year we completed the nationalization of industry. At the present moment, as is well known, there are in all some 4,000 nationalised enterprises, which represent practically 90 per cent. of the country's total production. We created up to 99 industrial state monopolies, centralizing the entire industrial management. The working class itself furnished quite a considerable group of its own organizers and administrators.

Increase of Productivity

Our economic policy has also been directed toward raising industrial productivity to its maximum capacity. Of course, the concrete conditions under which we had to live and work were highly complex. It will be enough to point out that we had to get along during those two years on from ten to fifteen per cent. of the quantity of fuel needed. Nevertheless, owing to the centralization of the entire economic management, we succeeded in solving the problem of a fair distribution of raw materials and of fuel. Fears entertained by many that the working class might disintegrate proved to be groundless. The latest statistical data show that the number of workers, as compared with the pre-war period, has suffered the comparatively small reduction of approximately twenty per cent.

Lack of Fuel

The reduction in the amount of productivity was mainly due to lack of fuel. The fuel crisis which we are now experiencing is caused mainly by the loss to Soviet Russia of such fuel resources as the Donetz basin, which usually yielded about a billion and a half poods of coal (anthracite), and the Caucasus, yielding a billion and a half poods of oil. The loss of these regions dealt a colossal blow to our industry.

The Agricultural Problem

Finally, during the second year, outside of these basic problems of economic policy, was the most important problem of keeping in touch with our villages. The creation of collective forms of rural economy, the organization of Soviet farms, of agricultural communes, of ares, etc., were the first consideration. As regards the middle class peasantry, it was our aim to win over these many millions to the side of socialism, aiding and supporting them with those economic resources and means which were needed by them. The problem of connecting the city with the village, the industrial and rural economy, was continuously acute.

The policy of spreading the influence of the proletariat to rural Russia has received much promi-

nence. A considerable number of Soviet rural estates and of agricultural communes have been created, but up until the present time they have been merely submerged among the many millions of individual peasant estates. It is true that the organization of distribution has made it possible this year, as may be seen from experience, to arrange for a more systematic and better organized supply for the villages than during the preceding year. This already yields definite results. The grain crops this year promise to be considerably better than they were last year. All this, of course, bears testimony to the fact that the organized measures which we have been adopting are effective.

But at the same time we must bear in mind that the questions of distribution and supply remain among the gravest and most difficult problems in our entire economic life. It is due to this that speculation has still a large opportunity for development.

The positive results which have been achieved in this domain are accounted for chiefly by the fact that the large laboring masses have been drawn into the work of the various bodies in charge of distribution, that these latter have been consolidated, and the entire Soviet apparatus for distribution has been amalgamated with the coöperative system.

Thus, if we are to summarize briefly the final results of the economic policy of the Soviet Government during the second year of its rule, we might say that our economic policy during the second year consisted, first, in placing our economic activity on a war footing; second, in the transition from *mere regulation* of our economic life to *direct management*—the formation of corresponding governing bodies, the centralization of management, and the inducing of the laboring masses to direct participation in this work, and, third, in increasing production, taking into account all the concrete conditions under which we were compelled to work. [Italics editor's.]

The Third Year

The third year, which is only beginning to dawn in the life of the Soviet Government, will in all probability bring with it great changes in our relations with the outside world.

When the management of the economic life is centralized, when the means of production are socialized, it becomes impossible to crush, by means of economic legislation, a country as rich in various natural resources as is Russia.

The third year raises before us problems of further coördination between the city and the country, between manufacturing and farming, between the supply of the raw material and the finished product. Before us rise the problems of

further improving our organs of government with the object of raising their productivity, increasing the speed of their operation, bettering their composition, and improving their internal structure. We are further confronted by the problem of developing our productive forces, especially as regards the procuring of fuel, and in the domain of electro-technical work. We shall have to cope with the problems of increasing production and the improvement of the system of distribution.

Our economic policy will have to be directed chiefly toward the solution of the practical economic problems. As soon as the changed conditions the world over permit it, our policy will be directed toward the solution of broader questions of Russia's economic development. At the present moment and in the immediate future, all our energies must be used for the solution of the fundamental problem—the final annihilation of the aggressive counter-revolutionary forces, which, to a considerable extent, have already been shorn of their strength and defeated, but which are now making their last attempt to overthrow the Soviet Government.

The Development of the Rural Industries

Central Administration of Agriculture

The Supreme Council of National Economy has put into practice the idea of nationalization of all of our industries: at present there is not one mill or factory of any considerable size that is not the property of the people.

During the second year of its existence the Supreme Council of National Economy has made some headway in the work of nationalization of land. As a particular instance we might cite the fact that it was upon the initiative and through the energetic efforts of the Supreme Council of National Economy that the land fund for the sugar industry was nationalized. The total area of land nationalized for the sugar industry amounts to 600,000 desyatins.

The sugar-beet industry has furnished the initial step in the creation of the rural industries, since this particular industry has been better preserved during the transitional period of the revolution. The brandy-distilling industry occupies the next place and its development has been begun by the Supreme Council of National Economy during the last few days.

These two large branches of rural industry are followed by a number of lesser significance, such as the production of starch, molasses, butter, milk, tobacco, medicinal herbs, the group of fibre plants, etc. The Supreme Council of National Economy is

now laying the solid foundations for the expansion of all these industries.

Program of Supreme Council

What, then, is the program of action of the Supreme Council of National Economy for the development of the rural industries? In the first place, the supplying of definite land areas for the cultivation of certain plants; the introduction of definite forms of agricultural labor, and of uniform management for the manufacturing and agricultural industries, and the establishment of close connections between the industrial proletariat and the citizens engaged in the rural industries.

City and Rural Workers

Among the problems enumerated above, the foremost is that of uniting the industrial proletariat with the rural workers. The Supreme Council of National Economy has already begun to work on this task. Thus the industrial proletariat is now officially in possession of 90,000 desyatins of land, on which communes have been organized. The crops from these estates go to satisfy the needs of the associations in whose name the estates are registered. At the same time, the industrial proletariat, through participation in agricultural labor, is introducing new ideas into the rural industries.

Work of Reclamation

The Supreme Council of National Economy is mining the coal from the depths of the earth and exploiting the peat deposits. In order to utilize completely the resources, it is paying particular attention to the conversion of swampy areas, and exhausted turf deposits, into arable land, transforming the bottom of the exploited turf areas into vegetable gardens, the sections bordering upon the swamps into artificial meadows, and the uplands into fields. During last summer similar work has been accomplished on a considerable scale in the lands of the Central Electric Station, in the government of Moscow, the Ilatur Electric Station in the government of Ryazan, Gus-Hrustalny in the government of Vladimir, and the Comsa estates in the government of Nizhny-Novgorod. Thus, during last summer the work was organized in four central provinces abounding in large areas of land which cannot conveniently be used for agricultural purposes.

Garden Cities

Simultaneously the improvement of dwellings, and the building of garden-cities is being given careful and immediate consideration. This work is being carried on by the Supreme Council of National Economy at the electric station of Kashirsk, the Shartur station and the Central Electric Station.

In order to unify rural industries the Supreme

Council of National Economy has formed the central administration of agricultural estates' industrial enterprises, assigning to it the task of uniting and developing, as far as possible, the work of the rural mills.

Nationalization of Land

The Central Administration of Agriculture considers that one of its immediate problems is that of widely propagating the idea of nationalization of land for all rural industries and of the opening of new districts for those industries. In apportioning the land, specially valuable districts should be set apart, such, for instance, as the meadows overflowed with water from the Don river, fully suitable for the cultivation on a large scale of tobacco, fibre plants, and olives. These lands, if distributed among the peasants, will never yield such wealth as they could do were they nationalized for national exploitation.

Next on the program of the Central Administration of Agriculture is the building up of new branches of rural industry, including such as the working of sugar beets into molasses, and into beet flour, in the northern districts, the production of ammonium sulphate out of the lower grades of peat, the preparation of fodder out of animal refuse, the production of turf litter material, the preparation of new sources of nitrate fertilizer out of peat, etc.

Use of Electricity

Electric power must be utilized for the cultivation of land. The practical realization of this problem has been started on the fields of the electric power transmission department. This fall we

succeeded in tilling the ground by means of a power-driven plow.

The same experiment of last summer is going to serve as a basis for the electrification in the spring of 1920 of the water engines, which at present find no application.

In order to build up the rural industries, practical work must be carried on, simultaneously with that which is being done on the particularly important lands, also on such land as will not be the bone of contention between the proletariat and the peasantry. What lands are these? The swampy areas, the forest-covered lands, those districts where the people are starving, the dry lands, the scarcely populated districts, etc.

These are the brief outlines of the program. The foundations of absolutely all the development of rural industry, mentioned, have been laid down. The practical steps for the materialization of the plans have to some extent already been, or are being, undertaken.

All of this work the Supreme Council of National Economy had to carry out under extremely difficult conditions. A considerable part of the sources of raw material for the rural industries was completely torn away from the Soviet Republic. Another serious hindrance was the insufficient number of existing organizations which would be capable of fulfilling the tasks outlined by the Council. A considerable amount of harm had been done to this work by interdepartmental friction.

But difficult as the present conditions may be, and strong as may be the desire of the former ruling classes to turn back the tide of life, a backward step is impossible.

Book Reviews

Britain's Opium Trade

The Opium Monopoly. By Ellen N. La Motte. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1920. \$1.00.

Miss La Motte's book presents a remarkably telling array of facts for a brief against the profit system. It suggests that even our enlightened and civilized ally, Great Britain, forgets her enlightenment and her civilization if tempted by sufficient gain.

Most of us have a hazy notion that the British slate was not entirely clean so far as opium and China were concerned in the 19th Century, but we are likely to think of this as a past evil. It is well for us to know that today all through her eastern dominions it is the British government which is responsible for the production and distribution of opium. Heathen China has at last

managed to stamp out the raising of the poppy and the sale of the drug, Christian Britain encourages and extends the use of opium, for by it she is able to maintain her enlightened colonial policy. "We have seen," says Miss La Motte, "that certain British colonies, Hongkong and the Straits Settlements, for example, derive from one-third to one-half of their upkeep expenses from this traffic."

She takes her facts and statistics almost entirely from the Statesman's Year Book, official Blue Books or government reports. It seems that under what Miss La Motte terms "the benevolent protectorate" of Great Britain, Turkey and Persia are both producing an increasing amount of opium, so that it now ranks with their chief exports, but "India is still the source and fount of the British opium trade." To cultivators of the poppy in India, it seems, this benevolent British-Indian gov-

ernment loans money without interest. The product must all be sold to the government at a fixed price, and manufactured at the government factory at Ghazipur. A certain amount of the opium is then sent to Great Britain itself for medicinal purposes, and to the far eastern governments, and the balance is sold to the highest bidder at the auctions which are held each month in Calcutta. It is from these auctions that the drug finds its way by fair means or foul to the rest of the world, including America. The hold of the British government upon the trade in opium is so thorough that in her colonies in the East she maintains a careful system of licensing shops and divans, and, of course, all this adds largely to her revenue.

It is a delight to read one of Miss La Motte's books, and even in this which is little more than a pamphlet, one finds the unflinching courage and the keen insight which made her *Peking Dust* and the stories which make up *Civilization* so different from the productions of most tourists in the Far East.

E. W. HUGHAN.

A Modern Galahad

The Sangreal. By Irwin St. John Tucker. Published by the author, 4303 N. Paulina St., Chicago, Illinois.

Socialists are so often accused of tossing the past on the scrap heap that it is refreshing to find a socialist poet sensitive to ancient glories and eager to transmit them to the future. Every period passes under the spell of Arthurian romance, and every period tries to infuse its own passion into the immortal story. Spenser, discarding the conventional tale with the insouciant arrogance of the Renaissance, saw in Arthur the Lover of his idealized English queen, and placed his seeking figure in the midst of the glamour and pomp of a slightly disguised Elizabethan England. Tennyson holds closer mechanically to the old story which Sir Thomas Malory built on the foundation of Geoffrey of Monmouth; but he departs farther from it in spirit than Spenser, presenting mild mid-Victorian domesticities in the absurdly incongruous disguise of chivalry. The twentieth century is not likely to fall behind in Arthurian renderings; and no modern poet will make a more audacious attempt to pour new wine into the beautiful old bottles than Irwin Tucker in his moving drama. In his treatment, pacifism, internationalism, socialism, shine at every turn in fascinating and imaginative parable through the symbols born of a feudal and Catholic age; and the Sangreal itself becomes not merely the vanishing sign of the redeeming Blood of God, but a very sacrament of brotherhood. So speaks Galahad at the end of the play:

O blood that burst from the rent heart of Christ,
Thrill still in all our veins! There is no change

Of color or of warmth or of rich texture
That marks off king from peasant, nor one nation
From all its kindred nations; yet behold,
The Blood of God runs in the veins of man,
And all the nations are one brotherhood.
The Sangreal as God's own beacon burns
To call us to this knowledge; for his own kin
Are all that labor, gripping hands with him
To make the world a home for all his children.

The Sangreal shall burn in all our souls,
One blood shall pulse in all our kindred veins,
And all the hosts of men shall dwell in peace.

If Tennyson followed his Malory more conscientiously than Spenser, it may be said with assurance that Mr. Tucker knows his Malory more intimately than Tennyson. He has altered in some ways the obvious outlines of the epic, discarding the environing action of the Modred story, and handing the crown of Britain at the end to Lancelot, who abdicates in favor of Galahad; but he has used with subtlety many minor phases and incidents of the old version. To one who knows that version, the plotting is ingenious and suggestive. If anything, the plot is too intricate and hurried: especially in the latter parts melodrama is perilously near. But each situation taken by itself is charged with dramatic passion; the play would give such fine opportunities for emotional acting that one longs to see it on the stage.

To socialist readers, interest centers in the modern feeling of which the noble old story is made the vehicle. The drama opens in a pretty scene where the knights, rather bored, are amusing themselves as they wait for Pentecost to bring back wanderers and produce adventures; and the wise fool, Sir Pinel, strikes a sharp intrusive note:

Will some kind saint, with nothing else to do,
Explain to me, who am not all a fool,
What sense is in this mad sport, chivalry? . . .
Here go you knights, clad all in coat of mail,
The price of six good farms upon your back,
Roaming across the world. Somewhere you meet
Another knight, all similarly clad,
You fight, and one is taken prisoner.
And then the farmers, blacksmiths, shepherds, serfs
Must toil like mad from dawn to early dark
To pay your ransom. What's the sense in that?

GARETH.

Well, why not?
That is the purpose why such folk were born.
And if they did not, why with fire and sword
We'd lay their dwellings low, and slay them all.

PINEL.

Then would you lay your backs unto the plow,
And hammer out with your own lordly palms
The coats of mail so heedless thrown away?

GERAINT.

Our backs unto the plow? Insolent varlet!

In the whole vast range of mediæval romance one watches in vain for such a note as that.

Is it legitimate to use the aristocratic old story in this way? To transform the accredited symbol

of the endless solitary quest of the mystic for Uncreated Beauty into this symbol of fellowship? To change Galahad, in whom more than in any mediæval figure except Dante's Beatrice is focussed the contemplative and ascetic passion of his age, into a modern radical? To many, the procedure will seem sacrilegious or forced. At the same time, great myths have a curious way of lending themselves to ever new interpretations; and the Grail, with its Eucharistic suggestion, is a natural symbol of brotherhood.

Meanwhile, the separate figures, finely conceived, will linger in memory. Torre, the hermit-brother of Elaine, of Astolat, who has gained "sight of soul" through long expiations of another's sin, and attains the vision which the Archbishop can only wistfully desire, of the Redeemer of the race; the Archbishop himself, type of a hesitant Church with democratic instincts inhibited by false and shadowy loyalty to the existing order; Merlin, here taken as representative of the old heathenness,¹ who appears to work disaster and to predict in his dying rage the failure of Christendom. Perhaps the most impressive scene is that where among omens of coming war the dying wizard gives his clue to the ever-baffling puzzle, why the Grail quest weakened and dispeopled the realm it should have saved:

ARCHBISHOP.

How could you see the Sangreal and not die?

MERLIN.

Had ye been Christian, I indeed were slain;
In faithful hearts alone your faith hath power,
And Britain's heart, O King, is Pagan still.

Half Christian and half Pagan never yet
Maintained itself. The testing time is come,
O England, and you are unarmed to meet it.
Either be all or none; Faith, or the sword;
Christ or Tananis; not by wretched cheat,
The name of Christ above the breast of Thor.

The Sangreal

Slays them it doth not save. Yea, this I say,
A druid and a Pagan; lo! your faith
Can only save the faithful. Ho! I die!
But see! Tananis conquers half a Christ,
And he that parted Christ himself hath slain.
Look to yourselves! Death rides upon the air.

It is the poet himself speaking. The animus of this drama is Christian and Catholic, as it is radical. Only one who was priest as well as poet and socialist could have produced it; and only a man in such an attitude could hope for even the shadow of success in transmuting the deeper meanings of the marvellous old cycle of romance into our modern dreams.

VIDA D. SCUDDER

¹A perversion of the original, where Merlin, son of a devil and a holy nun, is impotently on God's side.

Man or the State

Man or the State. Edited by Waldo R. Browne. N. Y.: B. W. Huebsch. 1919.

Man or the State, a collection of essays against the state, includes selections from Kropotkin, Buckle, Emerson, Thoreau, Spencer, Tolstoi, and Wilde. With such a congeries of celebrities it is not surprising that they have in general but one point of agreement; they agree that the moral autonomy of the individual is of supreme value. But whether the individual as an end in himself is to be best protected by recognizing the state or by denying it, the reader must decide for himself.

One writer cogently remarks that "there will never be a really free and enlightened state until the state comes to recognize the individual as a high and independent power, from which all its own power and authority are derived." (p. 88.) And the next essayist bluntly asserts that "even in its most equitable form it is impossible for government to dissociate itself from evil; and further, that unless the right to ignore the state is recognized, its arts must be essentially criminal." (p. 94.)

It is, it will be seen, by no means clear what was the controlling idea in the selection of the material. Beyond showing that there is an historic case against the state, beyond showing that through several centuries and in varying idioms vigorous individuals have denied the state's omniscience, the book helps very little to clear the contemporary individual's mind.

The problem of the state is not merely historic; it interests us primarily in so far as light is thrown on such matters as civil liberties, the conscientious objector, direct action, the rights of minorities, labor unionism in the government, and similar issues. Instead of culling from modern theorists, whose idiom and illustrations have a present-day value, the editor does not even suggest their existence.

Any volume on the relation of man to the state that is to have any wide appeal or usefulness today must take account of such different scholars as Duguit, Figgis, Maitland, Laski, and Cole. For until the man in the street knows at what points the authority of the modern state restricts his own individual development and denies the unique significance of his own life, he will see no meaning in the problem of sovereignty; he will have no disposition to question its exercise by an absolute power.

ORDWAY TEAD.

John Spargo in 1919

Bolshevism. By John Spargo. N. Y.: Harpers. 1919.

In his *Bolshevism*, which is subtitled *The Enemy of Political and Industrial Democracy*, Mr. Spargo reveals himself a member of the Right-Menshevik school. On page 37, we are treated to an alleged Marxian formula: "It is quite obvious that there are times when class interests and class warfare must be set aside in favor of larger social interests." This is explained by an example. For instance, strikes during the Johnstown flood and the Messina earthquake would have been "dangerous and reactionary," and "Marx would never have questioned this important truth." The author's formula, however, dealt with the first revolution in 1905 in which the Russian socialists injected the class spirit and refused to collaborate with non-socialist elements.

Spargo's reference to the Malinovsky incident is an example of his unfamiliarity with the Russian socialist movement. Since Malinovsky, former Duma deputy and member of the Bolshevik faction, was found to be an agent of the government, Spargo infers that the Bolsheviks were particularly infested with spies, while, as a matter of fact, the Menshevik faction, as well as other revolutionary groups, had spies and provocateurs in their midst.

Though the author admits that the war was not popular with the Russian masses, he claims nevertheless that it was "not unpopular." Those who followed the attitude of the socialists in the various countries toward the war, know quite well that Russian Social Democrats—Bolsheviks and Mensheviks alike—were opposed to the war, and the entire socialist delegation in the Duma, under the leadership of the Menshevik, Tchaidze, voted against the war budgets and branded the war as an imperialist adventure of the Russian government, opposed to the interest of the workers of Russia, as well as of the other warring countries. It is true that there was a small "socialist" group, who made common cause with the capitalist bourgeoisie, and took a great interest in the prosecution of the war. Together with the Czar and his clique, they were hoping to make the world "safe for democracy" through the war and, like Milyukov, Gutchkov, and other imperialists, were incidentally expecting to gain possession of Constantinople. The author quotes a war manifesto published by these social patriots, claiming that the representatives of all existing socialist groups, "except the Bolsheviks," were united for the winning of the war. The names attached to the manifesto included, however, Alexinsky, a leading member of the second Duma and well-known Bolshevik. Yet it must be said that the

proportion of pro-war socialists who belonged to the Bolshevik faction was the smallest. It was quite natural for Spargo to link those socialists who opposed the war with the pro-German czarists, inasmuch as he made a similar accusation against the American socialists when he wrote to the National Secretary of the Socialist Party that a certain anti-war proclamation of the party might have been drawn by the German general staff.

One could go on indefinitely pointing out the author's ignorance of Russian revolutionary history. His statement that the share of the industrial proletariat in the revolution was "relatively small, far less than that of the peasant organizations," is so ridiculous that it needs no comment. The author treats Lenin's return to Russia in the same manner as other writers on the Russian Revolution whose chief aim is to discredit the leadership of the revolutionary movement. Spargo speaks of "unusual courtesies" which were extended to the travellers (Lenin and other socialists), implying that they were either sympathetic to the German cause or were agents of the German government. The fact that the train went through Germany sealed and that Mensheviks accompanied Lenin on his journey to Russia is not recorded.

The author deplors the fact that there was no organized middle class which could have taken over the reins of government when the Romanov dynasty fell. He waxes enthusiastic particularly when considering the composition of the second Lvov government. It included a number of socialists and was opposed by the Bolsheviks. We have it on the author's authority that "at that time, two months after the overthrow of the old régime, both city workers and peasants supported the policy of the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionists—the policy of coöperation with liberal bourgeois elements to win the war and create a stable government—as against the policy of the Bolsheviks." If the state of the working-class opinion is to be judged by the actions of some of the Menshevik leaders of the Soviets, the author is correct, but even then the masses were clamoring for socialist control of affairs and the slogan, "All power to the Soviets," was already raised by the Bolsheviks, who were daily gaining adherents among the proletarian masses. A few pages further on the author tells us that the United Executive Committee of all the Russian Councils of Workers, Soldiers, and Peasant Deputies, passed by a vote of 300 to 11 a resolution to investigate the leading Bolsheviks, Lenin and Zinoviev, as to their "German connections"—but "terror" prevented the investigation. The Mensheviks were in control of the Petrograd Soviet. The workers were supposedly supporting the Mensheviks. Yet an investigation inaugurated by a majority of 30 to 1 in the Soviet could not be carried through!

In his chapter entitled *Bolshevik War Against Democracy*, Mr. Spargo makes an attempt to discredit the Soviet government. He gives an extended list of names of persons who formerly were known to have been either spies or leaders of the black hundreds, and other pogrom-inciting organizations, and claims that these persons are now occupying positions of trust among the Bolsheviks. Among these names are mentioned also well-known communists, such as Kamenev, now president of the Moscow Soviet; Radek, who is connected with the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs; the first being referred to as a former "secret service agent," and the second as a "thief and police spy." Information of this sort is apparently obtained from counter-revolutionary and chauvinist sources and little attempt seems to have been made to verify the information.

The author denounces the Bolsheviks for their peace activities, imputing to them pro-German motives, reproduces in full pro-war documents published by Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionists, and, as quoted above, claims that the workers were supporting the liberal bourgeoisie in their aim to win the war. Later, he states, that "Russia had to have peace. The nation was war-weary and exhausted. The Allies had not understood the situation—indeed they never have understood Russia even to this day, and had bungled right along. What made it possible for the Bolsheviks to assert their rule so easily was the fact that they promised immediate peace, and the great mass of the Russian workers wanted immediate peace above everything else."

When free and unmolested access to Russia is open to the representatives of the socialist and labor movements of the world, and they meet at international gatherings to review the accomplishments of the Russian workers since the Revolution in 1917, great tribute will be paid to the work of those Russian socialist leaders who helped to direct the revolution through its natural course. The work of John Spargo in interpreting the revolution and the activities of its leaders will be classed among many other counter-revolutionary attempts to discredit the proletarian revolution and its chosen leaders.

ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG.

Books Received

- The Brass Check*. By Upton Sinclair. 1920. Pasadena, Cal.: By the author.
- The Traction Crisis in New York*. By Charles A. Beard. 1919. 28 pp. N. Y.: Municipal Research Bureau. 25c.
- Hands Off Mexico*. By John Kenneth Turner. 1920. 74 pp. N. Y.: Rand School.
- Liberty and the News*. By Walter Lippmann. 1920. 104 pp. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Howe.
- The Social Evolution of Religion*. By George Willis Cooke. 1920. 418 pp. Boston: The Stratford Press. \$3.50.
- Public Ownership of Railways*. With a Chapter on the Plumb Plan. By Carl D. Thompson. 1919. 100 pp. Chicago: Public Ownership League. 50c.
- In Conclusion*. By Carlyle C. McIntyre. 1919. 78 pp. Sierra Madre, Cal.: the Author.

A Rebel Soul

Horace Traubel: His Life and Work. By David Karsner. N. Y.: Egmont Arens, 1919. pp. 160. Price, \$1.50.

It was inevitable that such a book as this should be written about Horace Traubel. For he was one of the world's hated, ignored, and loved. Especially the loved. The most acid hatred, the most shrugging scorn, that he received, did not begin to touch the flood of love that he felt for men and women, nor the adoration that many of them felt for him. You either took him, or you didn't; and if you did, you took him hard. There was nothing of the half-and-half about it. And no one of his friends and admirers was closer to him than David Karsner, in whose house the fine old fighter spent the late autumn of his life; nor was there one of them better fitted to write this book.

You get something of Traubel from Mildred Bain's "Horace Traubel," published in 1913; a little more from Walling's "Whitman and Traubel," in which the author quotes with implied approval Traubel's internationalist, anti-patriotic utterances—some earlier Walling speaking. But you do not touch the brave-hearted rebel in his fulness until you get this book. There is more of him here than in the others.

The volume opens with a preface by Horace himself, a diffident, delightful bit of writing. Then we have, in simple and readable prose, Traubel's life, with just a hint of the world's harshness which he felt, but never whined about. His way always led over rocks, not roses; yet he called his book of poems "Optimos"—"The Cheerful Whole." He was no trousered Pollyanna, no syrupy Frank Crane; but he fought best when he was smiling. And after the life has ended, with his characteristic final word to the friends around him, "Laugh, for God's sake, laugh," Karsner passes into a treatment of Traubel as comrade and lover, writer, poet and prophet, revolutionist, and internationalist. The biographer's restraint is noticeable here; he does not mar the book with excessive claims of his subject's worth. Traubel's position as biographer and rebel is undisputed; his ranking as prose and poetic stylist is disputed by many, who deny him freshness or greatness as poet or prophet. The slow judgment of the future will decide; meanwhile, we should have the evidence; and this book furnishes much of it. The quotations given from Traubel are impressive; the cumulative effect of the heartening words grows with re-reading.

It is a partisan biography, but a sincere and delightful one, which does not distort, prettify, or uglify the still-living spirit we call Horace Traubel. Libertarians will cherish it; it brings closer the unaging child heart with its confident affirmations,

its flaring indignation at unfairness, its clairvoyant understanding of much still dark to us. It ties Walt Whitman's day to ours by a living chain; it is an impressive tribute by an admirer fitted to speak it. The future will deal more kindly with the memory of the stocky little rebel than his own day dared to: life's delicious irony again, which Traubel foresaw and appreciated. Traubel's message has begun to penetrate and permeate the heart of the labor movement, which the clever critics and dispraisers can never do. And there is where he will be content to dwell.

CLEMENT WOOD.

College Notes

The *Adelphi* I. S. S. chapter meets regularly at noon on Fridays. Every other week they invite an outside speaker to address them. On March 12 W. Harris Crook spoke before an interested group on "Labor: Promise or Menace?"

A new chapter has been organized at *Boston University* by Eli Kogos. Seven students signed the application for a charter.

The "Social Problems Club" of *C. C. N. Y.*, not content with bringing in over 280 students in the first membership drive, has now started a campaign for 500 members. In connection with the campaign, the club published a special pamphlet containing a "Statement of Principles," and issued a special supplement to the college paper for which statements were secured from many members of the faculty. Among their speakers for this term are Norman Hapgood, Percy Stickney Grant, John Haynes Holmes, Oswald Garrison Villard, Norman Thomas, Henry Neumann, James Harvey Robinson, Fiorello La Guardia, and Don Seitz. So successful have the weekly meetings been—over 600 attended the Norman-Hapgood meeting—that the Club has decided to hold two meetings a week. Besides the weekly lectures the program of the club includes Monthly Assemblies, Weekly Discussion Groups, and Study Circles. The officers of this vigorous organization are: Pres., Leo Linder; Vice-Pres., Henry Miller; Sec.-Treas., Walter Wolf.

The *Cornell* group recently arranged a successful meeting for Harry W. Laidler. He spoke on the movement toward Industrial Democracy.

Joseph Turkel, of the "*Harvard Contemporary Club*," is organizing an I. S. S. group within that body, for the special study of Socialism. Mr. Turkel is arranging a collection of Socialist literature in the college library for the free use of the students.

The *University of Michigan* chapter has recently held meetings for John Haynes Holmes and Alice Riggs Hunt.

A number of students at *Princeton* are planning to reorganize the I. S. S. chapter.

The *Wisconsin* Social Science Club, spurred on by the offer of an autographed copy of Laidler's "Socialism in Thought and Action," launched a membership drive which, according to David Weiss, "resembled closely a Methodist revival, netting about fifty new members." The chapter now has over 90 members. On Feb. 25th the club held the largest meeting ever on record at the *University of Wisconsin*. The largest hall in the city was packed with over 1,800 people to hear John Haynes Holmes, who spoke on "From Monarchy to Democracy in Industry." The students were tremendously impressed with Dr. Holmes' address, and are still talking about the meeting.

The *Boston Alumni* Chapter has formed a new Executive Committee, with auxiliary members from Harvard, Radcliffe, Wellesley, and other nearby colleges. The chapters recently held a very successful meeting for Scott Nearing.

The *Pittsburgh Alumni* Chapter has been reorganized by Harry Horelick.

The speakers at the "Camaraderies" of the *New York Alumni* Chapter during the past month have been: Charles Ervin, Herbert Ellsworth Corey, "Red" Doran, and Howard Scott. Jessie Wallace Hughan is conducting an excellent course on "What is Socialism?" at the Wednesday evening supper classes.

Harry W. Laidler will go on a speaking and organizing trip through the Middle West in April instead of in March, as first planned.

JESSICA SMITH.

The Intercollegiate Socialist Society

Announces its June Conference

Tuesday, June 22 to Monday, June 28, 1920, at
The Inn-in-the-Hills, Highland,
Ulster Co., N. Y.

SUBJECT: FORCES MAKING FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY: SHOULD THEY CO-OPERATE?

Specific topics to be dealt with: Russia, Germany, Great Britain; New and Old Unionism in America; Coöperation; Radicals of the Right (Nonpartisan League, Labor Party, Committee of 48); Socialist Groups; To What Extent Should American Radicals Co-operate?

Further details obtainable from the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.