

March 29, 1913

Five Cents

The New Review

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

Anti-Imperialism and Anti-Monopoly *H. S.*

Internal Struggles in the British Bourgeoisie
Theodore Rothstein

Woodrow Wilson and the Class Struggle . *Wm. English Walling*

Strike Tactics *Phillips Russell*

The Spill-Way of the Morning Moon *J. William Lloyd*

Concerning Historical Materialism
I. The Socialist Critics *Paul Lafargue*

The Cry of a Feminist *Mary S. Oppenheimer*

Why Madero Failed *Dolores Butterfield*

The Cup *Louise W. Kneeland*

150 Nassau Street

New York

The New Review

Published Every Week at

150 Nassau Street, New York City

by the

New Review Publishing Association

Alexander Fraser, *President*
Moses Oppenheimer, *Treasurer*
Robert M. Lackey, *Secretary*

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

One Year, . . . \$2.00 Six Months, . . . \$1.00
Foreign Countries, \$2.50 per year
Single Copies, 5 cents

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

HELP US

By sending the names of your friends, who you think might like to read the NEW REVIEW. We will send them copies of our publication, which is its own best advertisement. Many new subscribers have been gained in this way.

Mention the NEW REVIEW when you write or talk to your friends and comrades.

We will supply attractive descriptive folders to those who will distribute them.

New Review 150 Nassau Street
NEW YORK CITY

The New Review

Copyrighted, 1913 by New Review Publishing Association. Reprint permitted with credit

Vol. I.

MARCH 29, 1913

No. 13

Anti-Imperialism and Anti-Monopoly

In a remarkably clear and straightforward statement, President Wilson has announced the withdrawal of his Administration from the "Six Power Group," which has been trying to coerce China into accepting a large loan under extremely onerous conditions. The reasons for the withdrawal are, in brief, as follows: The Administration does not approve the conditions of the loan, which "touch very nearly the administrative independence of China," nor does it approve the implications of responsibility on the part of the American government, which are "obnoxious to the principles upon which the government of our people rests." The Administration is "not only willing, but earnestly desirous, of aiding the great Chinese people in every way" and "of promoting the most extended and intimate trade relationships between this country and the Chinese Republic," and it considers it its duty to "urge and support the legislative measures necessary to give American merchants, manufacturers, contractors, and engineers the banking and other financial facilities which they now lack," but it wants no more than the "open door of friendship and mutual advantage . . . the only door we care to enter."

The President's declaration of policy in regard to China is an open repudiation and reversal of the policy pursued by his predecessor. If consistently adhered to, it is bound to have far-reaching results upon the attitude of the entire Western world toward China. Instead of the mailed fist of the oppressor, it holds out the helping hand of friendship to a great people striving to rejuvenate itself while maintaining its political and cultural independence. The mention of the "Chinese Republic" implies a determination to give recognition to the new Chinese

Some of the articles to appear in future issues of THE NEW REVIEW

THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN

By *W. E. Hardenburg*

PERSECUTION OF THE POLES IN PRUSSIA

By *J. Kariski* (Berlin).

STATE SOCIALISM AND THE INDIVIDUAL

By *William English Walling*.

SIDELIGHTS ON THE CENSUS OF 1910

By *Benjamin Glassberg*.

THE GRAND JURY SYSTEM

By *Frederick Haller*.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

By *J. Salwyn Schapiro*.

government, a recognition hitherto withheld by the European powers as well as by the American government. The declaration also sheds light upon the program of internal policy to the carrying out of which the President and his Secretary of State appear to have dedicated themselves.

The President's announcement has been received with a show of cordial approval by the acknowledged press organs of Wall Street. Moreover, J. P. Morgan & Co., on behalf of the American syndicate, have issued a statement to the effect that they had originally joined the international syndicate, not of their own free choice, but at the urgent solicitation of the State Department under the Taft Administration, and that they readily consent to withdraw at the desire of the present Administration. In short, the group of American bankers concerned in the transaction is composed of disinterested patriots, who are at all times ready to obey their country's call of duty.

The role of disinterested patriots is not one in which the American people have been accustomed to regard the leaders of High Finance. Maybe if we knew the whole history of this transaction we would come to entertain a higher and worthier opinion of our great financiers. We certainly would have a better understanding of the entire scope of this new departure of the Wilson Administration. Let us, therefore, cast a hasty glance over the origins and development of this international transaction.

After the Chino-Japanese War (1894-95), all the great European powers pounced down upon China, taking possession, in one form or another, of ports and more or less extensive slices of territory. Manchuria and the Kwantung peninsula, Weihaiwei, Kowloon, Kwang-chow-wan, Kiao-chow, were seized by Russia, England, France, and Germany. After the governments came the financiers. The year 1898, which became so notable for the many seizures of territory, was also notable for the large number of railroad concessions granted to foreign bankers under extremely favorable conditions. Of course, there was continual rivalry among the banks of the various countries, both for concessions and profitable loans. In each country there was a favored bank or banking group, which was virtually granted a monopoly in Chinese territory by its own government, and each of these banks or banking groups strove for a time to monopolize the largest possible portion of China as its own exclusive field of operation. This was the famous "sphere of influence" policy, which for a time threatened the integrity and very existence of China as an independent state. But finally, after much friction,

there was formed in 1909 a syndicate of English, German and French banks to act as a unit in all loans and railway matters.

Meanwhile, however, the American financiers were not idle. In 1898, that year so fateful for China, a Chinese company having a concession to build a railroad from Hankow to Canton concluded a contract with an American company, known as the China Development Company, by which the latter was to raise the sum of \$20,000,000 for purposes of construction. More than one-half the shares of this Hankow-Canton Railroad company subsequently fell into the hands of King Leopold of Belgium, but in 1904 J. P. Morgan & Co. repurchased these shares. One year before this, Morgan received a promise from Prince Ching, then Chinese Regent, that he would be admitted, on a footing of equality with the English, in the construction of the Hankow-Szechuan railroad. This promise was confirmed in 1909, and it was on the basis of this concession that the American syndicate (consisting of J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co., the First National Bank and the National City Bank) forced its admission in 1910 into the international syndicate. Undoubtedly the American syndicate had the backing of the Taft Administration, but it was by no means the passive and unwilling agent that its public statement would have us believe it to have been.

After the Chinese Revolution, Russia and Japan forced their entrance into the international syndicate. Thus the "Six Power Group" came finally to be formed. But the demands of the international syndicate now became most exorbitant and oppressive, partly owing to the participation of Russia and Japan, whose aims were predominantly political, and partly owing to the extensive and pressing needs of the new Chinese government. To liquidate the revolution, the latter required immediately the sum of \$30,000,000. But the international syndicate proposed in 1912 a loan of ten times the amount, \$300,000,000, on the conditions that both the expenditure of the loan and the administration of the salt monopoly, by which it was to be guaranteed, be placed under European control. It is to these conditions that President Wilson refers when he says that "they seem to us to touch very nearly the administrative independence of China itself," and it is these conditions that might lead "in some unhappy contingency" to "forcible interference in the financial, and even the political affairs of that great Oriental State," just as similar conditions led to forcible intervention and loss of independence in Egypt, Persia and Morocco, and to a less extent in Turkey.

The Chinese government very naturally shrank from accepting these oppressive conditions. It turned for help to independent bankers who were not included in the various national syndicates of which the international syndicate was made up. It obtained such help, at various times and in comparatively small amounts, from both German and English firms. The loan of \$50,000,000 which C. Birch Crisp & Co., of London, attempted to raise last year, caused some stir in the press on this side, owing to the role which an American, A. Wendell Jackson, played in it. But this loan was not a success, only a part of it having been subscribed, owing to the determined opposition of the British Foreign Office, which insisted on the monopoly rights of the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank. But the net result of all the small loans that the Chinese government was able to obtain was a change of attitude on the part of the international syndicate, which now proposed a reduction of the loan from \$300,000,000 to \$125,000,000, and instead of absolute control by European agents of both the expenditures from the loan and the salt monopoly, it now proposed control of the expenditures by a Chinese commission with a European adviser acting as an employé of the Chinese government, and administration of the salt monopoly by European officials in the Chinese service. Such is the present status of the "Six Power Group" loan project, from which the American syndicate has withdrawn as a result of President Wilson's declaration of policy.

Thus we see that President Wilson's reversal of the policy pursued by his predecessor is due to a combination of two distinct factors: First, the policy of anti-imperialism (in the Far East, but not in the Caribbean countries!) to which the Bryan element of the Democratic party has again and again pledged itself; and second, the policy of anti-monopoly, which Bryan has always championed and to which Wilson has given so peculiar and distinct a coloring. The government steps out of the alliance with High Finance. China is not to be forced into becoming a dependency of international finance, nor are the diplomacy and military power of the United States to be utilized for the purpose of obtaining loans and making them secure. Furthermore, the small clique of bank trust magnates must henceforth admit the lesser men to a share of the spoils, whether in America or in China. The multi-millionaires will not be permitted to crowd out the mere millionaires. This is not an effete European monarchy, like England, in which the Foreign Office shamelessly pronounces in favor of a monopoly

by one bank. Henceforth all American capitalists, not only bankers, but also "merchants, manufacturers, contractors, and engineers" are to be encouraged by "legislative measures" to compete in the Chinese and other foreign markets "with their industrial and commercial rivals." The primitive equality of mere citizens may have vanished never to reappear, but the equality of capitalists is to be restored and maintained in all perpetuity by a Democratic Administration responsive to the needs of the people and having an abiding faith in the ideals of the founders of the Republic.

H. S.

Internal Struggles in the British Bourgeoisie

By THEODORE ROTHSTEIN (London).

A careful observer of English public life can find some very interesting food for reflection in the little incidents which have of late occurred in the British Parliament. One such incident is the sudden intervention of the Speaker of the House of Commons in the discussions on the Government Franchise bill, which brought the proceedings in connection with it to an abrupt close. It will be remembered how the disaster came about. The Government bill had passed the second reading and was about to enter upon the committee stage. The bill provided for the extension of the franchise to practically the entire adult male population of the United Kingdom and the committee stage was mainly to be devoted to the consideration of various amendments for the inclusion of women in the bill. This was to be done by arrangement with the government, which had, by the mouth of Mr. Asquith, promised to accept, and to make part of its measure, any amendment that would be accepted by the House. The advocates of woman suffrage made accordingly very elaborate preparations for insuring the passage of their motions. There was to be first a motion, standing in the name of Sir Edward Grey, to delete in the text of the bill the word "male" so as to leave only the word "person." That by itself would not have meant the extension of the franchise to both sexes, since the courts of law had long decided that the word "person," even when standing by itself, always meant "male person." The ob-

ject of the amendment was to rally all the advocates of woman suffrage, whatever their particular "school" might be, and thereby force the door for the introduction of further amendments. Of these the first demanded the extension of the franchise to all adult women; the second, had the first been defeated, claimed the franchise only for women-householders and wives of householders; and the third, should the second have proved unacceptable, demanded the parliamentary franchise for such women as were already entitled to vote in municipal elections. It was a very shrewd and very practical arrangement calculated, if the House had a majority for any women's suffrage at all, to bring the vexed question—at least provisionally—to an end. But it turned out that the Suffragists had made their reckoning without the host, who in this case happened to be the Speaker. For on the very eve of the commencement of the proceedings the Speaker suddenly intimated that the adoption of any of those amendments would so change the nature of the Government bill as to make the leave granted, in the first instance, for its introduction, invalid, in consequence of which he would be obliged to stop further proceedings. Thereupon the Government had no option but to withdraw the bill, and the whole business collapsed.

The impression of the incident at the time was that the action of the Speaker in stopping all amendments had been a pre-arranged affair between him and Mr. Asquith who, being an opponent of the extension of the franchise to women and yet bound by his solemn promise to accept the decision of the House in the matter, found in this ruling of the Speaker an easy means of getting rid of his pledge. That may or may not have been the case, since we have no solid facts to go by; what is interesting, however, is that the action of the Speaker was accepted by everybody as a law—*dura lex sed lex*—which had to be obeyed, and only evoked—so far as the present writer was able to survey the press—two public protests, one from Professor L. T. Hobhouse and another from George Bernard Shaw. Yet that action was by no means irreproachable. While some precedents may, indeed, be quoted in support of it, others, and still more signal, because happening also to be connected with franchise bills, may be cited showing that such alterations in a bill as would have been introduced by the above amendments were not always regarded as rendering it invalid. It was clearly the duty of the Speaker, in such conflicting circumstances, to give the Suffragists the benefit of the doubt, and if he did not do so, it was clearly due to his personal lack of sympathy with them. This

inference is the more justified as the possible course of obstruction, which he might pursue in this case, had been suggested to him publicly by the *Times* more than eighteen months previously; and the fact that the Speaker did not adopt it till the last moment shows that the suggestion had not carried much weight with him at the time when party passions were not yet at their height. It was his reactionary sympathies, then (the speaker, it must be observed, was a member of the Tory party before he was elected to his office), which induced him to lend a ready ear to the opponents of woman suffrage and to decide to give a ruling in accordance with *some* only of the precedents.

Had this action of the Speaker stood by itself, it might have been simply put down against him as evidence that he was not quite adequate to the position he held. But that action is not solitary. Some time ago, in November, a still graver incident occurred which, unlike the present one, did arouse considerable indignation in Radical ranks. It arose out of the proceedings on the Home Rule bill at the commencement of the so-called report stage. The day being a Monday, when a number of the "legislators" had not yet returned to Westminster from their week-end, a Tory member, Sir F. Banbury, got up a little conspiracy among his friends who had secreted themselves in a club close by, while he moved an important amendment to the financial clauses of the bill. The House being "thin" on both sides, the Minister in charge of the bill did not trouble himself much about the fate of the adverse motion, but when it came to dividing the House, the Tory benches suddenly filled with the conspirators, and the Government was left in a minority. The ruse was too obvious to carry any weight, and the Government, so far from resigning, announced on the following day its intention to move a resolution rescinding the amendment. This procedure had no precedent and might well in other circumstances have been resisted by the House. But then the circumstances themselves were without precedent in their scandalousness, and in addition, the Government's action had the private approbation of the Speaker. Nevertheless when it came to the resolution a fearful hubbub arose, the Ministers were not allowed to speak, and the sitting had to be suspended. On re-assembly the same scenes were repeated with still greater violence, and ended in a perfect riot, one of the Ministers, Mr. Churchill, even getting hit with the Speaker's book of procedure thrown into his face by a zealous Tory member. It was significant enough that the Speaker allowed this rioting to go on without applying any of those whole-

sale disciplinary measures which his predecessors knew so well how to apply in the case of the Irish and other rebels. The worst, however, was that so far from supporting the Government in a course to which it was entitled and which had had his own approbation, the Speaker on the following day himself intervened on behalf of the Opposition as "the protector of the liberties of the minority," and suggested that as "the proposals of the Prime Minister had met with very strong feeling on the part of the Opposition" the House should be adjourned and a compromise be sought! This was an open betrayal of the Government into the hands of the unscrupulous obstructionists and clearly revealed the Speaker's bias. The suggestion, however, was adopted, and after a couple of days' consultation between the Speaker and the Prime Minister, in which also the King's private secretary took part, a means was found of getting rid of the obnoxious decision of the House without recourse to direct rescission.

These incidents are certainly curious. For many generations the impartiality of the Speaker, his high sense of his office, and the perfect equity with which he wielded his autocratic powers have been the pride of the British Parliament. Formally the theory is still accepted and officially acted upon. The outside public, however, sees that this traditional pride has no longer much foundation in fact. The present Speaker no longer pays attention to the traditions and obligations of his office: he frankly acts as a Tory whenever a definite choice has to be made between the one and the other party.

It is remarkable to what an extent the same phenomenon is observable elsewhere in the high offices of the State. What, for instance, can be compared with the great reputation which the British Judiciary has hitherto enjoyed not only in England, but throughout the world? From the time of Montesquieu to our own, the "great unpaid" have served as an illustration of the British genius for discarding all partisan bias and acting with the sole aim of serving justice and the interests of the State. To doubt the partiality of a judge, to hint that he might with some advantage be subjected to a popular control, to suggest that he might derive the authority of his office from election and not from appointment for life—all this and much more was regarded as sheer sacrilege. It was the proud boast of England that her judges knew no politics and no social distinctions and discharged the duties of their responsible office with a single eye to justice. Yet those who remember the political libel cases arising out of

the general elections of 1910, which came before the courts two years ago, can scarcely doubt that the justification for this pride has now departed, and that the British Judiciary has become imbued with a very strong political partisanship. Whenever a Tory took action against a Liberal it was almost a dead certainty that he would win and the latter would be mulcted in heavy damages, be the libel of the mildest and committed in the most excusable circumstances. As against this, if the plaintiff happened to be a Liberal and the defendant a Tory, the case for the most part would end in favor of the Tory, even if the libel be serious and committed without the slightest provocation. Thus between January and October, 1911, nineteen actions were tried of Tories against Liberals and thirteen actions of Liberals against Tories. Of the Tory actions no fewer than eighteen were won, and the plaintiffs obtained a total of no less than £16,980 in damages. But of the Liberal actions against Tories only six were successful, and the total amount of damages awarded to the plaintiffs was just £550 plus one farthing. Can it be said that the British Judiciary is still holding the banner of impartiality high? Why, they do not even attempt to *conceal* their political bias, and the remarks which, for instance, the late Justice Grantham on repeated occasions permitted himself to pass in the court upon the Liberals and the members of the Liberal Government had even to be reported to Parliament. As with libel cases, so it was even with election petitions: an election petition against a Liberal was repeatedly successful, while one against a Tory invariably ended in a failure.

What shall we say of other institutions which hitherto have enjoyed the reputation of standing outside and above parties and discharging their duties without regard to any political sympathies? Take the Civil Service. How often did we hear in the past that unlike his colleagues in America, the British official was only concerned in discharging his duties and was as equally zealous in obeying the orders of a Liberal as of a Conservative Government? Yet at present who can doubt that the British civil service has distinct political views and acts upon them very often in opposition to the policy of the Government? When two years ago a certain circular was issued by Mr. Holmes, Chief Inspector of the Board of Education, with the sanction of Sir Robert Morant, then Permanent Secretary of the Board, urging the appointment of Inspectors from among Oxford or Cambridge men in preference to others, the public was shocked at this evidence of caste feeling among public servants who are sup-

posed to assist a democratic Government in its work. Yet every one knew and knows that most of the Government departments, but especially the Foreign Office, the Lord Chancellor's establishment, and the Board of Education, are honeycombed with pronounced Tories, while others, like the Board of Trade, are run by not less pronounced Liberals. There is no such thing nowadays in England as a non-party civil service: politics is made by it just as effectively, if not so openly, as by Parliament itself.

Or shall we take the Crown itself, that eminently above-party institution, which it has been the pride of the Britisher to compare rather with an hereditary presidency of a democratic republic than with a monarchy such as is known on the continent of Europe? The intervention of the Crown on the side of the Tories in the obstructionist scandal over Sir F. Banbury's resolution has already been mentioned; its intervention, however, in the constitutional struggle over the House of Lords had been still more signal. Both the present and the late King repeatedly sided at that time with the Tories, urging upon the Government the necessity of a compromise and ultimately even succeeding in inducing the Government to dissolve Parliament and to seek a renewed mandate from the electorate.

What is the meaning of all these curious changes of spirit, of which even the action of the House of Lords on the memorable night of November 30, 1909, in rejecting the Liberal budget, and the overt and covert obstruction carried on in the army and navy against the policy and the measures of the Liberal Government may be taken as a reflection? At no time previously have such incidents been known in the strictly constitutionally governed England where the Crown and the House of Lords were regarded as little more than ornaments, and the Speakership, the Judiciary, the Civil Service, and the army and navy were supposed to stand aloof from all party politics and carry out loyally and impartially the duties allotted to them by the Government for the time being in office. What, we ask, is the meaning of this change, and how has it come about?

We shall begin by betraying a secret: all the high reputation which these institutions enjoyed was nothing but a legend based upon a misunderstanding. At no time did the Crown or the Judiciary or the Speaker or the Civil Service or even the army and the navy stand above politics and discharge their duties without regard to policy; only those politics and policies were the *common* politics and policies of the ruling bourgeoisie and were directed *against the people*. And as the people had no

voice to proclaim its grievance and as the bourgeois class was the only class which both to itself and to foreign observers constituted the nation, the legend of the non-political and non-party working of the above institutions obtained currency. At the same time, however, it is true that so far as the bourgeoisie itself was concerned these institutions stood above parties, for the simple reason that the bourgeoisie was not divided against itself and pursued in all fundamentals a policy which was identical, in spite of all nominal party divisions.

The historical reasons for this identical policy and, what at bottom it amounted to: interests of all sections of the bourgeoisie, need no detailed elucidation. Like everywhere else, the English bourgeoisie had to fight long and hard before it overcame the power of the landed aristocracy and its executive authority, the Crown. Unlike everywhere else, however, its victory was the more complete as the aristocracy and the Crown had no armed force to oppose to the rebellious middle-classes. owing to England's insular position which enabled the State to dispense with a large standing army and, indeed, prevented the formation of an aristocratic military caste. The Reform Act of 1832 marks the attainment to power of the bourgeoisie, and the abolition of the corn laws in 1846 completes its triumph over the landed aristocracy. Whatever opposition of interest had meanwhile arisen between the large and petty bourgeoisie—an opposition which found its political expression in the union between the latter and the working class in the Chartist movement—was also healed up by the anti-corn law legislation which cheapened the necessaries of life and thereby supplied the petty bourgeoisie with tolerable conditions of existence. But the landed aristocracy itself soon became reconciled to its defeat, owing to the vast opportunities for enrichment which the brilliant expansion of English trade and industry in the course of the next generation or two opened to it. The economic value of its land, indeed, decreased enormously, but whatever it lost in one direction it more than gained in another, by taking part in the industrial and commercial work of the capitalist bourgeoisie. The result was an economic approximation between the two rival classes, with a perfect blending on the border line. The landed aristocracy became largely capitalistic, with a vital stake in the industry and commerce carried on by the higher bourgeoisie, while the higher bourgeoisie acquired lands and permeated to a considerable extent the ranks of the ancient aristocracy. The entire propertied class became, therefore, to a high degree, a

homogeneous bourgeois-aristocratic class, with no great internal division of interest and, therefore, no fundamental disparity of party policies. It is from this time that the doctrine of the English Social-Democrats dates that the distinction between Liberals and Tories is merely one of name, since at bottom the English ruling class is one and indivisible.

Is it to be wondered at that, with this homogeneousness of the ruling class as the cardinal factor of the public life of the State, the latter's instruments should have been able to regard and, indeed, place themselves above and outside parties and discharge their functions with perfect impartiality as between the political divisions of that class? On the other hand, is it to be wondered at that with the disappearance of most of the ancient antagonisms between the two component elements of the new ruling class, the ancient feudal aristocracy and the latter-day capitalist bourgeoisie, such bulwarks of the former as the Crown and the House of Lords should have gradually found their *métier* gone and sunk into a sort of political nirvana?

But times change, and we change with them. The main factor which rendered the conciliation of the different sections of the ruling class possible was the magnificent and ever-progressing economic development of the country itself, conditioned by her peculiar historical conditions which gave her a long and privileged monopoly in the world's market. The Civil War in America and the Franco-Prussian war, which brought into the world two great new national States, sounded the death-knell of this monopoly, and the more the situation developed the more patent it became to the British bourgeoisie that her halcyon days of unrestricted domination over the world were gone. More and more frequently did she feel the pressure of foreign competition, and jealousy and fear began to play upon her nerves. Gradually the temper and the ideas of certain sections among her underwent a change. *Laissez faire* became an obsolete doctrine; the State was called upon to exercise an active influence on behalf of the capitalist class; the idea of a federation of the Empire or, at least, of a customs' union between the motherland and the colonies against the rest of the world, got hold of many minds; the necessity of carrying on an energetic colonial policy against the commercial rivals, and the consequent need for a great navy and army became an article of faith; and last but not least, the idea of protective duties was launched and instantly found a vast number of adherents. The result of these new ideas and policies was the formation of a deep cleavage in the

hitherto closed ranks of the bourgeois-aristocracy. These ideas were substantially a return to the ideas of the feudal and landed aristocracy, and at the same time they appealed to the interests of the large bourgeoisie, from which, indeed, they had sprung. It was then the class of large industrialists, combined with the class of large landed proprietors, which, with a few special exceptions, rallied under the new banner of Imperialism, Militarism and Protection. On the contrary, the middle and especially the lower bourgeoisie, whose sole means of holding their ground against the aggression of the more powerful capitalists consisted in freedom from heavy taxation and in the low cost of the necessaries of life, remained true to the old faith. Short of a complete change in the basis on which the bourgeoisie as an economic class is constituted, nothing could be more fundamental than the cleavage which was produced by these divergent tendencies of the two sections of the capitalist class.

Naturally the cleavage also found expression in the *political* field. Liberalism stood for the faith which was associated with the old *laissez faire*, Free Trade and Anti-Militarism. The Conservative connotation was essentially the reverse of all this, but inasmuch as it was the traditional creed of the landed aristocracy, and the landed aristocracy became, in the period following its defeat of 1832, partly blended with and partly subordinated to industrial and commercial capitalism, Conservatism itself adopted the Liberal hue and became to some extent reconciled to the Liberal articles of creed. Now, however, with the formation of the cleavage within the bourgeois-aristocratic ranks, the old Conservative creed asserted itself and became the crystallization point for the larger bourgeoisie and her aristocratic ally, while the middle and petty bourgeoisie rallied round the Liberal banner. The hitherto nominal distinctions between Liberalism and Toryism once more became endowed with real social contents, and the rivalry between the two assumed an acuteness and an earnestness which English political life had long lacked. This, in its turn, reacted upon the social cleavage, making it wider and clearer, and the process is still going on, depriving Liberalism of the support of the larger capitalist elements and collecting them, as by a sort of polarisation, on the other, the Conservative, end.

What was to become in these circumstances the position of those quasi-neutral institutions which were mentioned above? Here history has taken her revenge. All these institutions were remnants of the feudal and absolutist order of things, which bourgeois Liberalism had left standing in the days when it fought

for the supremacy of the new capitalist order. It did so for fear of the masses, whom it would have been obliged to mobilize if it had wished to make a clear field, and it did so on the understanding that they would not exercise their functions except—if at all—in the interests of the new order. This was a compromise which greatly assisted in the work of reconciliation of the vanquished with the victor, and it was faithfully observed by the institutions in question because, as we saw, the political reconciliation soon acquired a material basis. To all bourgeois students of English history and the English constitution this unfinished work appeared as the height of political wisdom and was always contrasted with the over-finished work that was accomplished by the French bourgeoisie, to the disparagement of the latter. Was it not really an act of wise statesmanship to have left certain positions in the hands of the aristocracy and monarchy on the understanding that no practical use should be made of them in the selfish interests of the class occupying them? And was it not wise to withdraw certain other positions of authority and power from the control of the people on the understanding that they should remain neutral so far as the two rival sections of the ruling class were concerned? By acting thus Liberalism may have erred against the canons, so dear to the French heart, of political symmetry, but it avoided all wasteful friction for the future, it prevented counter-coups and reaction, and at the same time it preserved against the popular tide certain valuable advance-posts which acted as a breakwater.

But now everything has changed. What was good in a period of co-operation became a disadvantage in a period of strife, for no sooner did the two allies again separate than the so-called neutral positions were turned by those who held them into forts, and a deadly fire was directed from them against their nominal possessors. The Crown, the House of Lords, the Judiciary, the Speakership, the higher Civil Service, the Army and the Navy—all the “neutral” institutions which had survived from the days of Absolutism and the reign of the feudal aristocracy as irresponsible and uncontrolled elements in the Constitution, have suddenly become animated with new life and a political purpose to the discomfiture of the “statesmen” who had viewed them hitherto as a pledge of inter-capitalist social and political harmony. They have all become trumps in the hands of the Conservative party which has gathered within its fold the Imperialist, Militarist, and Protectionist elements of the larger bourgeoisie and landed aristocracy, and their neutral character has disap-

peared. The petty and middle bourgeoisie is now paying the penalty for the non-completion of the political work effected by it, in conjunction with its powerful brother, three generations ago.

At some future date the political philosopher will be able to trace and dissect this interesting socio-political process more clearly than we can at the present moment. But one thing is already observable: while the masses of the British proletariat as represented by the Labor Party are committing the mistake of identifying their interests with those of the petty bourgeoisie in the latter's fight against the coalition of the two upper sections of the ruling class, our own friends, the Social-Democrats, are committing the contrary mistake of still classing the two sections together and fighting both of them with equal ardor.

Woodrow Wilson and the Class Struggle

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING.

Intellectually Wilson is an autocrat. Not only has he stated his belief in a large measure of concentration in the hands of the executive, but he shows his disbelief in the necessity of representative government. It is upon benevolent intellectuals that Wilson relies, and not upon the representatives of the various social classes in the community: “It is easier to see things as a whole if you will but resort to those who have studied them as a whole.” Wilson does not propose to confine his advisers to such benevolent social philosophers, for he says he is going to consult the small business man and also “financiers and lawyers and manufacturers and merchants and those whose interests have usually been at the center of policy.” But his chief reliance is to be upon those who have studied things as a whole and upon “experts,” of which he gives us a specimen list headed by the philanthropists (a strange proceeding for one who does not wish to base his government on benevolence) and followed by the engineer, the forest expert, the student of soils and agricultural methods, and the masters of technical and vocational education. It is significant that only part of the educators are mentioned, but it is above all to be noted that there is no reference to any expert on labor matters or any provision for representatives of the working people or of the masses generally. It is to be a government for the people but not by the people.

This is almost as clear an exposition of class motives as

George W. Perkins' statement, reported by Roosevelt and approved by him, that the former came into the progressive movement to make the country a safe place for his children and the children of his associates, or Roosevelt's statement to the New Haven Chamber of Commerce that, while he approved of radical measures, he wanted them to be carried out by conservative men like those before him—because they were *not* interested in these measures. In a word, Roosevelt not only believes in benevolent reform, but in benevolent reform to the exclusion of democratic reform.

Wilson, on the contrary, has made some unqualified declarations of democracy, as in the following apostrophe to the trust magnates: "We do not deny your integrity; we do not deny your purity of purpose; but the thought of the people of the United States has not yet penetrated to your consciousness. You are willing to act for the people, but you are not willing to act through the people. Now we propose to act for ourselves." This brings us to ask who "the people" are in Wilson's conception. To this question Wilson has furnished several very clear answers. The "people of the United States" are identified with "the men who are sweating blood to get their foothold in the world of endeavor," and are endeavoring "to start a new enterprise." And again, "the ordinary men" and "the unknown masses" are identified with "the man who is on the make."

We here come to the center of Wilson's social philosophy: "The first and chief need of this nation of ours to-day is to include in the partnership of government all those great bodies of unnamed men who are going to produce our future leaders and renew the future energies of America." He wants to give his chief energy to promoting the growth of small towns such as he has "seen in Indiana," because they own their own industries, evidently thinking chiefly of the individuals who actually do own the industries in these small towns, and completely ignoring the majority who own nothing. Undoubtedly a certain proportion of the small business men of the small towns have risen from below. But even this is far less frequent than it was half a century ago, while the proportion of small towns in this and every other country is constantly growing less.

The central point in Wilson's program is to remove the limitations of "private enterprise" so that "the next generation will be free to go about making their own lives what they will," again limiting his attention exclusively to the middle classes which have the capital or the educational privileges absolutely

indispensable in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred for success even in the smallest private enterprise. Small businesses, he nevertheless insists, are to be provided for the whole population: "The genius and initiative of all the people" is to be called into the service of business, and the new generation is to be able to look forward "to becoming not employes but heads of small, it may be, but hopeful, business."

When Wilson refers to equal opportunity on several occasions, he means only "equal business opportunity" for those who have the capital or requirements to set up in small business. But it is important to note also that he knows perfectly well what equal opportunity really is, and that he must therefore consciously reject it. In this country, he says, "no man is supposed to be under any limitation except the limitations of his character and of his mind; there is supposed to be no distinction of class, no distinction of blood, no distinction of social status, but men win or lose on their merits." And again he says that the thing he demands fundamentally is that everyone should be free and "should have the same opportunities everybody else has."

Wilson's law of social progress is: "Every country is renewed out of the ranks of the unknown, not out of the ranks of those already famous and powerful and in control." He should have said rather that every country is renewed in part out of certain of the ranks of the unknown. The overwhelming majority of people in the best positions of society are the children of those who are already well up in the social scale, and even those who are recruited from lower classes very rarely come from the working class itself, but rather from some section of the lower middle class. Again, Wilson looks forward to the time when "there will constantly be coming new blood into the veins of the body politic; so that no man is so obscure that he may not break the crust of any class he may belong to, may not spring up to higher levels and be counted among the leaders of the state." The fact that a few individuals who are not born among the upper classes may be admitted, seems to be an ample justification in Wilson's mind of the whole social system. How many persons are elevated seems to be a secondary consideration. Wilson's law of progress merely provides for enough new blood to keep the top of society vigorous and to allow it to continue its rule permanently, as he admits himself when he confesses in the passage already quoted that very few persons actually do rise.

Yet, besides endorsing equal opportunity generally, Wilson makes numerous declarations which, if honestly put forward

and honestly interpreted, ought to satisfy any Socialist, and others which by an apparently slight and logical amendment are equally satisfactory: "The amount of wages we get, the kind of clothes we wear, the kind of food we can afford to buy, is fundamental to everything else." He understands particularly that political institutions are based upon economic institutions: "Laws have never altered the facts, laws have necessarily expressed the facts." Two other passages leave no question that Wilson not only accepts this view, but understands it fully and interprets it consistently: "History is strewn all along its course with the wrecks of governments that tried to be humane, tried to carry out humane programs through the instrumentality of those who controlled the material fortunes of the rest of their fellow-citizens If you will point me to the least promise of disinterestedness on the part of the masters of our lives, then I will concede you some ray of hope; but only upon this hypothesis, only upon this conjecture: that the history of the world is going to be reversed, and that the men who have the power to oppress us will be kind to us, and will promote our interests, whether our interests jump with theirs or not." Here we have the materialist interpretation of history brought to the point of a full justification of the Socialist theory of the class struggle. Wilson definitely states that our masters of industry do not speak in the interest of those they employ, and it is difficult to know how he would make any distinction in this respect between monopolists and businesses which are not monopolistic.

Wilson even speaks of "the governing classes" and of the need of a government "unassociated with the governing influences of the country," which he very rightly states to have consisted up to the present of the trusts and their associates. "Where there are classes in point of privilege," he declares, "there is no righteousness, there is no justice, there is no fair play." The possession of any amount of capital, however, he does not regard as a "privilege," nor the possession of expensive and restricted educational opportunities.

In another illuminating passage he shows how the upper class is continuously bribed, and while he undoubtedly means this to be applied mainly to the monopolists he does not say so, and we have a right to take him at his word: "A cynical but witty Englishman said in a book, not long ago, that it was a mistake to say of a conspicuously successful man, eminent in his line of business, that you could not bribe a man like that, because, he said, the point about such men is that they have been bribed—not in the ordinary meaning of that word, not in any gross, cor-

rupt sense, but they have achieved their great success by means of the existing order of things and therefore they have been put under bonds to see that that existing order of things is not changed; they are bribed to maintain the *status quo*." As a description of ruling class psychology it would be difficult to add anything to this. In another passage Wilson says that "the masters of the government of the United States are the combined capitalists and manufacturers of the United States." Since, according to his own statement, he is looking forward to the time when the government will represent "the whole system of business," we have a right to interpret this in our sense, but we should be ready to admit that probably he refers here to existing industrial combinations only and not to the political combination of small capitalists.

Many other passages bring the reader very near to the Socialist position though not going the whole way. For example, he opposes "the conduct of our affairs and the shaping of our legislation in the interest of special bodies of capital." It would be almost impossible for him honestly or logically to reject an amendment here striking out the word "special." He is not afraid of the word revolution. We are "on the threshold of a revolution," he says, and "we are going to reconstruct economic society as we once reconstructed political society." The changes to be made are "radical," but Wilson does not fear revolution because he thinks it will come "in peaceful guise" and that we will "win through to still another age without violence." And, indeed, the State Socialist program when complete will constitute a revolution—within the bounds of capitalism—and it is also true that capitalism has nothing to fear from any revolution that is not ready at least to reply to violence by violence, to answer a denial of the right to strike and a declaration of martial "law" by insurrection.

Wilson's radicalism is easily explained, but it is none the less valuable on that account. When he says that he opposes "a small controlling class" we can always make a hit with the working classes and the classes in general by moving to strike out the word "small," and pointing out that it makes no difference to slaves whether their masters are few or many. The question that he asks of the combined large capitalists we can ask of the politically combined large and small capitalists: "Are these men to continue to stand at the elbow of government and tell us how we are to save ourselves,—from themselves?" Similarly another of his basic principles applies to our problem with a very slight and unescapeable change: "You can't, by putting together a

large number of men who understand their own business, no matter how large it is, make up a body of men who will understand the business of the nation as contrasted with their own interest." Obviously it makes no more difference *how many* are the men who understand their own business than it does *how large* this business is, in either case they will never "understand the business of the nation as contrasted with their own interest."

Wilson is entrapped in his own logic, which is a far more valuable situation to us than that of Roosevelt, who never had any logic of his own and is only being very gradually forced into a logical position by circumstances. For even Roosevelt has been forced within the past year to some admissions as to class government and class rule. While trying still to maintain his own balanced and therefore meaningless opposition to "the mob" and to "the plutocracy"—a trick that is repudiated by Wilson—he nevertheless admitted on March 20, 1912, that "some classes have had too much voice in the government," while by June 18 he seems to have had an intermittent glimpse of a great light. For the first time he declared that "the great majority of capitalists" were "naturally hostile to the Progressive party." And he also admitted the existence of a whole class that went with the capitalists: "Associated with them are many men whose selfish interest in privilege is far less obvious. I genuinely regret that we have with us so small a percentage of the men for whom life has been easy, who belong to or are intimately associated with the leisured and moneyed classes; so small a proportion of the class which furnishes the bulk of the membership in the larger social, business, and professional clubs, and which supplies the majority of the heads of our great educational institutions." Roosevelt naturally regrets that his own class is against him: "They could do us good by joining with us, for it is earnestly to be wished that this movement for social justice shall number among its leaders at least a goodly proportion of men whose leadership is obviously disinterested, who will themselves receive no material benefit from the changes which as a matter of justice they advocate." He believes that this class feeling is wrong because the people are really helpless and harmless: "The people would never harm them." Yet he does acknowledge that a capitalist "class consciousness" exists and that it is based on the fear of the capitalists "lest something that is not rightly theirs may be taken from them." He reverts to his demand for "disinterested" leaders "to whom much has been given," but then again acknowledges that sometimes "the interests of the capitalist class are against the interests of the people as a whole." It is only

a pity that up to the last, even in his speech of October 31, immediately before election, he completely negatives his denunciation of "the selfish greed of the haves" by balancing against it "the selfish greed of the have-nots," and by denouncing the desire of the many for better conditions at the expense of the few as "the brutal selfishness of envy." While we cannot say, then, that Roosevelt has abated one jot of his hatred of the masses in so far as they are economically or politically militant, we must admit that he has also, with the most perfect inconsistency, taken over the Socialist phrases, and it is only a question of time till Wilson will force him to drop his denunciation of the masses and their aspirations, just as it is only a question of time till he will be forced also to sever his connection with many of the benevolent magnates with whom he is associated.

Strike Tactics

By PHILLIPS RUSSELL.

There are more ways of killing a cat than choking it with butter; and there are more ways of conducting a strike than by merely stationing a few pickets here and there, and then drawing up a set of demands to be forwarded to the employers.

Changing conditions demand changing methods. New developments demand new tactics, and the successful strike organizer of to-day must not only be a man of action but also a thinker. He must use his head as well as his hands. He must be not only an inspirer but also a strategist.

In the old days—and they are not so far back, at that—the strike organizer was usually an official of a union. His scheme was to negotiate first and fight afterward. The old unionism held that a strike was a deplorable thing for all concerned and to be avoided as far as possible. When a group of workers had been driven by oppression into a state of desperation that could no longer be ignored, it was customary for the old style union to send an official to the scene of trouble. His usual procedure was to ascertain the grievances and then tell the workers to be patient while he "took the matter up" with the boss. His plan was to approach the employer in a friendly spirit, as if apologizing for the annoyance, and enter into a "conference" over a good cigar. These conferences might last days or even weeks, after which it would be announced either that "an adjustment" had been arrived at or that a strike could no longer be avoided.

If a strike was necessary, the old-style organizer pulled out as many of a certain trade or craft as he could, threw out a few stationary pickets, then bombarded the boss with settlement committees to obtain the best terms possible. If the employer remained obstinate, the strike became a sort of passive siege, strike benefits were ordered paid, and the workers stayed in their homes or hung about the street corners, till after a period of weeks or months, the strike was declared either lost or won.

But these methods are now becoming old-fashioned and futile. A new and revolutionary unionism has arisen which has introduced us to tactics and fighting methods that doubtless seem outlandish, bizarre, and undignifiedly spectacular to the old-line unionist, but which are undoubtedly effective, according to circumstances. Due credit for showing us many new ideas in the way of strike tactics must be given to that young and vigorous organization, the Industrial Workers of the World. Whatever may be said of the I. W. W., there is no denying the fact that it is infusing a new spirit into the labor movement of America.

A few months ago there was a strike of construction workers against contractors who were building track for the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Northwest. It was ferocious from the first and no quarter was given on either side. Before long the strikers discovered that one of their biggest enemies was the saloon. Too many men were finding it more comfortable to loaf around the warm stove in the backroom than to freeze out on the picket line. Besides, it was found that the saloons were being used as stalking-traps by the detectives and hired thugs of the bosses, and strikers were being repeatedly drawn into useless brawls in which it was easy to blackjack or shoot men who were otherwise active workers in the strike. It was suspected, too, that the saloon-keepers were standing in with the contractors and furnishing them valuable information. So a boycott was ordered against the saloons and all strikers were instructed to stay away from them. But these instructions were not obeyed by a number of strikers whose spirit was willing enough but whose flesh was weak. These men were appealed to, but in vain. The strike committee was equal to the emergency. It adopted drastic measures. Its next step was to picket the saloons as well as the contractors camps. The next striker who was seen approaching a saloon was warned to stay out and all strikers who were seen sneaking out by the backway were reported to the committee and disciplined. A striker could drink out of a private bottle, if he wished, but he must not enter a saloon. There were some who protested

against this summary action, of course, but the committee was backed up by the sentiment of the strikers as a whole, and when it became evident that the tone and temper of the men were improving because of the absence of liquor and saloon fights, the kickers soon subsided.

The Lawrence strike showed us many new methods. The mass or moving-chain style of picketing adopted there has since been used in the garment workers' strike in New York. The situation of the mills in Lawrence made this method peculiarly effective. Some of the largest of them lie in a long line, only one block from the principal business thoroughfare, and though the militia barred the strikers from the street that ran beside the mills, it could not prevent them from using Essex Street as much as they pleased, as long as they kept moving.

In Little Falls the moving chain of pickets, forming a continuous circle, presented a novel and beautiful picture. Most of the strikers were women and girls. They were fond of bright colors, especially red sweaters, and the sight of this brightly colored line circling round and round the mills invariably aroused the wonder and admiration of train passengers, the railway station being close by one of the principal mills.

Later, however, the police succeeded in breaking up and preventing the formation of this picket line by brute force, so new tactics were made necessary. It was found that a large part of the strike-breaking force was coming from Utica over the inter-urban car line, and since the strikers could no longer picket the terminal in Little Falls, they went to Utica and picketed the terminal there and succeeded in persuading many prospective strike-breakers not to board the cars at all.

In great mass strikes the participants sometimes become restless in their enforced idleness, and "grouchiness" and depression are apt to result. The only way to prevent this is to give each striker something to do—to make each individual feel that it is upon his participation that the success of the strike depends. That is why mass picketing, mass parades and mass demonstrations are so essential. The strikers draw courage from one another, feel their common interests, and realize the necessity of solidarity.

At Little Falls the strike lasted twelve weeks and at one time all forms of activity were suppressed. No picketing, no parading, no open-air meetings were allowed and it was dangerous for even a small group of strikers to gather at any one spot on the streets. Nothing was left them save their nightly hall meetings.

They soon tired of continuous oratory, consequently it became necessary to vary the program. And every night for three months there was practically a continuous vaudeville. Speeches were kept as brief as possible and every visitor who appeared was invited to make a few remarks. Those who couldn't speak were made to sing. Every striker who was jailed was put on the stage after his release and made to relate his experiences. These were almost always given with a comic touch that never failed to make the audience roar with laughter. As fast as possible speakers were developed from the ranks of the strikers themselves, men and women alike, and several of them became effective orators. One evening the "home talent" varied all the way from little John Kokis, six years old, who told about his wonderful trip to Schenectady in a charming treble, to old Jan Barchefsky, sixty-six years old and former Prussian soldier, who spoke his opinion of the police in no uncertain terms. In this way the spirits of the strikers were kept from flagging and many of them remarked that they had a better time during the strike than ever before while at work.

Just after the later Lawrence strike that was called as a protest against the imprisonment of Ettor and Giovannitti, the merchants and business men whose establishments lined Essex Street organized the parade to demonstrate against the I. W. W. These gentry afterward had reason to regret their rashness, for the word went out that no mill worker was to buy any more goods on Essex Street, but to do his trading elsewhere. Several merchants afterward announced in effect, that they would "be good" hereafter if only that boycott were called off.

Organized publicity can be made a tremendous factor in a strike. The list of labor and Socialist papers in the United States and Canada now runs into the thousands and most of them will gladly print strike news if properly prepared. Capitalist newspapers will also print helpful news sometimes. In former times reporters, from whatever paper, were usually treated with rank discourtesy by labor leaders and sometimes were refused any information whatsoever. This is a great mistake. Reporters are very human and are likely to give just what they receive. Some of them will prove to be traitors and spies, but the majority are perfectly willing to be fair in their stories if received courteously and given the proper information.

In cases where the capitalist press is grossly unfair there are other ways of disseminating information. At Little Falls the one newspaper was a sheet of slime and finally it refused altogether

to print news from the strikers. In consequence they printed their own bulletins in newspaper form, and when the police arrested the newsboys and confiscated the copies they were selling on the streets, a directory was secured and a copy was mailed to every person in town. One bulletin mailed to prominent citizens contained "Christmas greetings" and expressed regret that the strikers were unable to join in the cheer that the more prosperous residents of the town would enjoy, and then the reasons why were enumerated. It may have been only a coincidence, but a day or two after the mailing of this bulletin a committee of prominent citizens was formed for the purpose of forcing the mill barons to settle.

Whatever the difficulty, love for the cause will find a way if brains are set to thinking. If forced to retreat from one point, the army of labor can generally find another through which to break. In the past, strikes have always been regarded as if they were unusual occurrences that were not likely to happen again, and proper provision was never made for handling them or putting them on an organized basis. But the labor general of to-day is learning that the way to win battles is to be prepared for them. He must have his lieutenants and aids ready and waiting, and as soon as he arrives on the field he must organize his councils of war, his sappers and miners, his sharpshooters and scouts, his captains of commissariat and war chest. If the cost of living continues to rise at the present rate, there will be more strikes in the next ten years than ever before in the history of this country, and they will be on a larger scale. The class war is on and it must be fought on the principles of regular warfare.

The Spill-Way of the Morning Moon

By J. William Lloyd.

The westering moon hung high its lamp of gold,
 And flung a full-orbed splendor, keenly bright,
 Upon the ice-glazed snow-crust; till its tide
 Spilled from the sky-dam of that mountain top
 A silvern river, splashing glorious light
 Down the dark ridges, 'tween the rocks and trees,
 O'er slopes and fields, wide-widening in its flood
 Of shining silence on my dazzling sight.

And, lo!—a little wind went down the world,
 Whispering the gods tobogganed there that night.

Concerning Historical Materialism

By PAUL LAFARGUE.

(Translated by Richard Perin).

I. THE SOCIALIST CRITICS.

More than half a century ago Marx set up a new theory for the interpretation of history, which he and Engels applied in their researches. But the historians, sociologists and philosophers are so fearfully afraid of being compromised by this Satan of Communism and of losing their bourgeois innocence, that they cannot bear to hear of this theory; they ignore it entirely. And even many Socialists who know it dare not approach it, for they are fearful of reaching conclusions that would wreck the bourgeois conceptions which they still unconsciously retain. Instead of experimenting with this method, of which no proper estimate can be made until a practical test has been made of it, they discuss its value *per se* and discover in it a number of errors; it underestimates the ideal and its force, they say; it treats with brutality the eternal truths and principles; it takes no account of the individual and his acts; it leads to an economic fatalism, which absolves men from all endeavor, etc. What would these good people think of a carpenter who, instead of working with hammer, saw and plane, preferred to cavil at them? He could abuse them loud and long, for there are no perfect tools! This barren criticism can be transformed into fruitful criticism only when it is based upon experience, which, far better than the cleverest argument, reveals the shortcomings and shows the way to improvement. In the beginning, man made use of the awkward stone hammer, and its use alone taught him so to form and modify the principle of the hammer that to-day we meet in industry with more than a hundred types of hammers, varying in material, weight and form.

The intellectuals always wander into perverse ways, in which the workers never lose themselves. Five hundred years before the birth of Christ, Leucippus and his pupil, Democritus, introduced the idea of atoms to express the structure of matter; instead of turning to experiments to test the correctness of the atomic hypothesis, the philosophers for more than two thousand years discussed the atom, the fullness of infinitely enduring matter, the vacuum and mutability, etc.—and it was not until

the beginning of the nineteenth century that the chemists utilized the ideas of Democritus to explain the composition of bodies and of gases. The atom, which the philosophers could make nothing of, became under the chemists' hands "one of the most powerful means of investigation that human reason could invent," as a famous man of science recently declared. But now this wonderful tool has in use been proved inadequate. The radio-activity of matter, which makes its appearance as X-rays and cathode rays, forces the physicists to divide this smallest, indivisible and impenetrable particle of matter into bodies still smaller than the smallest, which exist alike in all atoms and are charged with electricity. The smallest atom, the hydrogen atom, is said to consist of about one thousand such little bodies, which revolve with extraordinary velocity about a core, exactly as the planets and earth revolve about the sun. According to this, the atom would be a solar system in miniature. We can find no more striking example of the barrenness of mere discussion and the fruitfulness of experience. In the material and intellectual world the deed alone is fruitful. "In the beginning was the deed!" says Goethe.

The economic conception of history is a new tool with which Marx provided the Socialists for the purpose of bringing a certain order into the chaos of historic facts, which the historians, sociologists and philosophers were unable to classify and explain. As a result of upper class prejudices and narrowness of mind the Socialists now possess a monopoly of this tool; but the latter, before using it, wish to be convinced that it is in all respects perfect and the key to all the problems of history; in this way they might discuss it forever and write articles, brochures and entire books without advancing the question by a single thought. Men of science are not so timid; they think: "In practice it is of secondary importance whether theories and hypotheses are correct so long as they lead us to results that are in accordance with the facts."* The physicists are now in a position to realize that the hypothesis of Democritus is erroneous and inadequate to the explanation of the phenomenon of matter, which has recently become the subject of so much investigation; but notwithstanding this the atom served as the basis upon which modern chemistry was built up. Marx did not present his theory of history as a system with axioms, theorems, principal and auxiliary propositions; to him it was merely a means

* W. Rücker, Opening Address at the Natural Science Congress in Glasgow, 1901.

of investigation; he formulated it in lapidary sentences and put it to the test. We can only criticise it by disputing the results which it gives us, for instance, by analyzing and disproving the theory of the class struggle. But this is carefully avoided. The historians and philosophers regard the Marxian conception of history as a vicious weapon possessed of the devil for the very reason that it led him to the discovery of that mighty motor of the historical movement.

The Cry of a Feminist

By MARY S. OPPENHEIMER.

At a recent meeting of the Sunrise Club, in New York, four speakers, two men and two women, one man and one woman being physicians, the others laymen, discussed the subject: "How shall we deal with the Problem of Prostitution?" Though the discussion was thoughtful and of a high order, it touched but a small part of that vast and ancient problem. The time at command was too short.

It is not my purpose to enter into detailed comment on the views advanced by the respective speakers, though one point made by the man physician might well be impressed upon those of us who, as Socialists, repeat parrot-like the cry that prostitution is the result of poverty alone, meaning by poverty want in its most extreme form. In support of his argument he urged that a great part of the recruits to the army of prostitutes come from the ranks of girls at domestic service, girls who do have food, clothing, a little ready money and a roof over their heads. Part of the talk was along the middle class lines of the money made, directly or indirectly, by graft or in other ways, by influential members of the community, mainly low-grade politicians and their allies and henchmen, and the resulting influences that combine to push girls over into prostitution and keep them there.

On the whole it was less what was said than the general tone of the discussion, and the feeling more or less consciously underlying it, that made the evening significant. Both of the men who spoke have given time and thought to the woman question. Both are large-minded and able. Yet without meaning it, prob-

ably without being conscious of it even, both sounded in their talk the age-long note of male domination, and a cheerful confidence that in the long run all women of intelligence must end by regarding the matter just as they did. For there could be no point of view but the male point of view.

As a result of the ancient solidarity of sex asserting itself thus unconsciously in the men, the new solidarity of sex, the solidarity of women as women, asserted itself vigorously in the women speakers who resented with some energy the note struck in the discussion by the men. These were not a little astonished and somewhat hurt to find themselves the object of an attack of this sort. Perhaps they did not rightly understand that they were merely serving as a kind of vicarious atonement for the many men who are indifferent or actively hostile to the cause of the advancement of women.

Much of the significance of the evening lay in this militant feminist note. Now feminism is not an end in itself, nor is it a doctrine desirable for its own sake. Feminism is a fighting weapon for the cause of women, a reaction from the long rule of man and the consequent repression of womankind. Like all reactions, it is full of exaggerations and crudities and its expression is often unduly harsh. Many adult women, long emancipated from the ideas of subordination taught them in childhood, still cherish a feeling of bitter resentment toward those ideas, akin to that the freethinker often has for the church that once held him in thrall. This feeling is doubtless unreasonable. Nevertheless it exists and tends to give to feminism much of its sharpness. The most extreme expression of the movement is to be found in the militancy of the English suffragettes. Here in the United States, Suffrage is its voice, though many suffragists are hardly feminists, and many feminists do not overrate the power of the ballot.

Often men, even those who are willing to accord women their full liberty, do not understand the movement and are troubled by its manifestations. They set it down to hysteria when they can explain it in no other way that is satisfactory to themselves. In their hearts they really fear that the altar of the home is shaken at last.

Just now many factors contribute to nourish and foster feminism artificially. Perhaps the chief of these is the fact that our modern industrial development has in a sense brought women into their own by giving them command of more money and more individual freedom than they ever had before. Out of this

comes the slow awakening of that solidarity of sex which has been the monopoly of men hitherto.

In its present violence of expression, feminism is only a passing phase of society. It is the surging tide of women in revolt against generations of repression and tragic endurance. With better conditions and the cessation of the need for revolt, it will merge into that larger world where men and women stand side by side, each independent and each taking due care in the work of the world.

Ten years ago, or perhaps five years ago, such a discussion would have been impossible in New York City or anywhere else in America. More than three hundred men and women attended the dinner, the larger part of whom were unquestionably attracted there by the subject. These people are not regular "Sun-risers," for they rarely or never attend when the Club has, as it often does, addresses on subjects of general interest given by able and well known speakers. They come for the purpose of being shocked. The Sunrise Club occasionally has much to suffer from the casual and rather morbid-minded visitor. But the large audience of the other evening followed the discussion with interest and serious attention.

Why Madero Failed

To the Editor of the New Review:

Having read with interest your editorial in the NEW REVIEW of February 22nd upon the Mexico situation, I desire to submit a few comments upon it, as I have been a resident of Mexico since childhood and am more or less familiar with conditions, political and economic, in that country.

No article which I have read, since the beginning of Mexico's trouble, has seemed to me to show so clear an insight into the fundamental causes of the trouble and such thorough appreciation of the actual condition of the Mexican nation as that in the NEW REVIEW. Where you refer to the Madero administration as a "rival clique," however, justice compels me to set forth something of what I have had opportunity to observe in regard to that administration.

Francisco Madero did not represent any clique. Although himself a multi-millionaire, with a veritable empire in Coahuila, interests in banks, mines, cotton mills, etc., he seems to have been one of the very few who are able to overstep the bounds of their own class and recognize the rights of another class. This wealth was his by inheritance, but at heart, despite his birth, he belonged to the people. He had been educated in the United States, and it was his earnest desire to see established in his own country something of the political democracy he had seen here, which, however far from perfect, was greatly in advance of the medieval despotism ruling Mexico. However, he had gone no further

in politics than the writing of a very able book (the publication of which was suppressed), dealing with the history of the Diaz regime and the actual condition of the country.

In 1910, when Porfirio Diaz was preparing for his eighth unanimous re-election, the economic and political situation of the country was such that a new political party was formed which contemplated putting into the field a candidate for vice-president against Ramon Corral—the idea being to reach the economic trouble as far as was possible through the political channel. This was unprecedented, for neither Diaz nor Corral had ever had a rival candidate. So many persecutions were launched against the new party that General Bernardo Reyes refused its nomination, and other men either followed suit or fled the country when it was offered them. The Anti-Re-electionist party then offered the nomination (for President) to Francisco Madero, who accepted it. As a matter of personal ambition, I think even his enemies must concede that a banker and son of bankers, having an empire in land, has little need to risk his life and fortune for the presidency of a republic.

The story of the persecutions he endured, his arrests, attempted assassinations, etc., is a long one, and has little to do with the present article. The story of the scandalous electoral fraud of 1910 also need not be detailed here. These political outrages precipitated a revolution which the economic situation of the country made inevitable. Although that revolution is usually referred to as the "Madero revolution," in reality Madero could no more have made that revolution for his own ambition than he could have prevented it. Had he never been born, the revolution would still have taken place. He simply had the courage to be its leader, to give it dignity and cohesion.

Six months after the winning of that revolution and the resignation of Porfirio Diaz, Francisco Madero was elected President of Mexico by an overwhelming majority of the Mexican people.

Densely ignorant, a certain portion of the nation appeared to expect that the mere fact of Madero's election would make an instantaneous and magical change in their economic status, and though he took pains to tell them that the battle was only half won, they could not realize why this was so.

Madero's principal promise had reference to the subdivision of the lands—for the agrarian problem is the problem of Mexico. It might have been a wise thing had he simply confiscated the enormous estates without more ado. The peons would have understood this move, and the feudal owners of the estates would perhaps not have had so much money on hand with which to make trouble for the new administration. On the other hand, such an attempt might have produced all manner of complications. Rightly or wrongly, Madero preferred the single tax to a violent and arbitrary confiscation and subdivision, and prepared to apply it.

Almost every state and territory in Mexico is owned by three or four, sometimes one or two men, and the mighty landowners all over the country prepared to fight the land tax measure. Ousted from political control though they were, they nevertheless had tremendous influence at their command; but for all their intrigues, their bribery of officials, and their threats, Madero sent out engineers to survey and appraise the great estates. It is noteworthy that he began this revaluation in Chihuahua and Coahuila, where his own family estates are located.

This matter of the land was by no means the only offense of the new administration. It had organized labor unions throughout Mexico, and when the factory owners called upon Madero to lend them troops to "quell riots" and force their striking workmen back to work at starvation wages, as in the good old days of Diaz, he refused, and they had to raise the wages. Here let me say that those labor union men have been loyal to Madero throughout.

The peon element, on the other hand, was divided. The miracle they expected did not materialize. Illiterate, they did not know about, or did not understand, the land tax measure and its effect if once it could be put in operation. They wanted to take possession of whatever land was nearest them, and when they were ejected, the cry went

up among them that Madero was a deceiver. The vicious element produced by extreme ignorance and extreme poverty had never laid down the arms given it by the Madero revolution, but had turned from fighting to looting isolated haciendas. The discontented joined them. These disorders, however, amounted to practically nothing, until Terrazas, after seeing the revaluation figures upon his 12,000,000 acres of land in Chihuahua, paid Orozco, then military commander of that State under Madero, to throw the state into revolt.

This revolution was successful in so far as it tied the hands of the progressive administration, depleted the treasury, and threw discredit upon the government and the nation alike. It was in reality fomented and financed by Terrazas and his allies through hired agents, availing themselves of the ignorance and viciousness of a large class of Mexicans—a condition for which the people of Mexico are not in the least to blame, since the condition has been imposed upon them by their despotic exploiters. Clamoring for the division of the lands, the revolutionists themselves effectually prevented the carrying out of the measures which would have automatically distributed the land among the men who would work it, and thus constituted themselves the allies of their own enemies.

With the people of Mexico thus divided, some sustaining their President, while others were in arms against him, the ousted despotism, personified in Felix Diaz, seized the opportunity, through the treason of the federal army, to imprison and assassinate Madero and Vice-President Pino Suarez, Gustavo Madero and others, and to arrest and persecute the remnant of the democratic government, terrorizing the City of Mexico. No one can possibly doubt what the Diaz-Huerta faction means for the people of that country if it prevails. It will be the old despotism over again, minus whatever ghost of a saving grace the old Diaz regime may have had.

It is too early to prophesy, but judging by appearances, Mexico is not nearly so glad to see the "Restorer of Peace" as he fancied she would be. Even despite the iron censorship maintained by the traitorous usurpers, the news leaks out of men rallying everywhere to the ranks of the Constitutionalists; and unless Wall Street forcibly sustains them, Felix Diaz and Victoriano Huerta must shortly go the bloody route they have prepared for themselves.

DOLORES BUTTERFIELD.

Los Angeles, Cal., March 10, 1913.

The Cup

By Louise W. Kneeland.

Let me drink of the cup of thy lips, oh my Beloved,
Then to my soul come rest and release from pain.
The very ecstasy of joy, oh my Beloved,
Let me drink of the cup of thy lips again, again!

I have drunk of the cup of thy lips, oh my Beloved,
When the cold hand of Death on my heart hath lain.
Thou hast brought life from the still grave, oh my Beloved,
Let me drink of the cup of thy lips again, again!