The New Review

Vol. II. MAY, 1914 No. 5

ANNOUNCEMENT

The NEW REVIEW will henceforward be edited co-operatively. And we believe that the new editorial board represents every shade of Socialist opinion. These are the editors:

Frank Bohn	William Bohn
W. E. B. Du Bois	Floyd Dell
Max Eastman	Louis C. Fraina
Arturo Giovannitti	Felix Grendon
Isaac A. Hourwich	Paul Kenneday
Arthur Livingston	Walter Lippmann
Herman Simpson	Robert H. Lowie
William English Walling	Helen Marot

Albert Sonnichsen

These editors are agreed that what the Socialist movement most needs, upon the side of theory, is an impartial review. We shall publish no editorials, and within the limits of our subject matter we shall declare no editorial policy. We purpose to give the English reading public a genuine international review—a summary and digest of the events and ideas of each month that bear upon the world's progress towards industrial democracy. This will be the only review of its kind in the English language, and we intend to make it indispensable to every man or woman who has a thinking interest in social or economic change.

Besides thus gathering the data for a progressive understanding of Socialism, we shall make our magazine a free forum for the original discussion of tactics, aims, and ideals in the labor union, co-operative and political movements. We shall publish signed articles by the editors and contributors. And as to the subject matter and viewpoint of these articles, we shall have no timidity, no bigotry, and no reserve. Our columns will be wide open to the sincere expression of radical ideas.

To ensure freedom and catholicity, to guard against growing old, rigid, or dogmatic—we shall come together at an editorial meeting once every month and there have out our differences and determine the character of the issue next to appear. An executive committee meeting weekly, will carry our joint decisions into execution.

We are able to say that the business office is upon a firm footing, and the NEW REVIEW—which has already won a hearty international welcome—is going right on to a great future.

There is a wide and active demand for a new review—a review that shall cut under the pretenses of cultural respectabilty, toss literary and academic and political and theological ideologies to the wind, and deal strongly and pointedly with the economic causes of things.

With this purpose, and without pedantry or "popularization," without scholastic or journalistic affectation, but with practical and true science for an ideal, we re-establish the NEW REVIEW and we ask you to join in and help.

THE TRUTH ABOUT LINCOLN AND THE NEGRO

BY ROSE STRUNSKY

[Much of the evidence has been omitted for lack of space, but will be found in Miss Strunsky's forthcoming biography of Abraham Lincoln.]

There would be little need of detaching the definite, almost Homeric attributes which have wound themselves around the name of Lincoln, were it not for the fact that to-day, with the rise of the

New Nationalism, we are asked to use this mystic figure as the touchstone for the exigencies of our modern political life. That he should rise so quickly in the popular imagination to the colossal and fixed outlines of an epic hero is readily understood. The task of keeping this Republic going upon the basic principles of an equal economic opportunity for all (or rather, to state this shibboleth more accurately, upon the pioneer rights of the free access by each to the goods of nature), was truly accomplished by him. Moreover, the rush to take advantage of the new freedom to the use and formation of capital which the solution of the Civil War offered, left no time nor made it psychologically possible to maintain a picture of the hero with all the shadings and modifications of truth. Besides, herodom does not permit of modifications. And so to the popular mind the name of Lincoln is followed by the attribute, 'The Great Liberator," as the name of Zeus is followed by "the Wielder of the Thunderbolt."

If we are really to apply the policies of Lincoln to the problems of to-day, then it is high time to place in truthful and critical order just what these policies were and what their significance. In this matter of emancipation of the Negroes. from slavery and his conception of what was to be their role in the social and political life of America, it is especially necessary that his true attitude be given, for on no phase of Lincoln's career has there been so much fable and popular dictum accumulated as upon this. The picture of Lincoln looking out upon space with sad and loving eyes, his right hand outstretched presenting the Emancipation Proclamation, his left resting tenderly upon the head of a newly-freed and grateful slave kneeling at his feet, can no longer be satisfactory.

"A veil of melancholy" might indeed have rested on his face and his eyes be "sad and loving," but his acts were hesitant, compromising and without any faith in the ultimate benefit of that Emancipation Proclamation which we have always pictured him as holding so gladly and firmly in that eager outstretched hand.

If we are really to come to an understanding of the needs of the Negro to-day, we have to come to an understanding of what Lincoln and the men of his time meant to do by the Negro in 1860. It must be remembered that war and politics raised the Negro to citizenship, *North* as well as South, that the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments forced legislation in behalf of the Negro in the unfriendly West as did the Thirteenth in the South.

Lincoln was of the West, and his hesitancy to act in favor of the Negro, even after the exigencies of events demanded action, showed the strong and driving conviction of the West that there

was little place for the Negro in their social philosophy or on their land.

That does not mean to say that Lincoln was not sincere in his opposition to the institution of slavery, but it means that he was not an abolitionist, nor that he had the same hopes and desires for the black race as he had for the white. Being against Negro slavery for the white man's reason, he was not only ready to compromise with the institution itself, but was also ready to compromise with the principles that underlay it. Not only did he not want to disturb slavery in the states where that "institution" already existed, but he did not want the Negroes to live in freedom side by side with the whites in the new territories for which he was fighting. He could not conceive of the two races enjoying the same political and social privileges. His democracy was a white man's democracy. It did not contain Negroes, as it did not contain slaves or laborers "fixed in that condition for life," or large landlords or large capitalists. It was the democracy of the small white farmer.

He was remarkably unchanging in his point of view. From his first public utterance on the subject of slavery as a young man of twenty-eight, to his Emancipation Proclamation and his innumerable other statements concerning slavery and the Negro, he held to a consistent and fixed policy. He was firmly opposed to the extension of slavery—slavery was a wrong to the slave, but of more vital importance—it was a wrong to the white man. "If Judge Douglas does not like the Negro," he said, "let him not bring him out into the new lands—let that remain for the white."

Farther than this white man's conviction against the economic and (being somewhat of a practical materialist) therefore moral value of slavery, he would not go.

In his first public utterance on the subject of slavery in 1837, he protested against certain pro-slavery resolutions which were passed by the Illinois legislature. Slavery, he declared, was founded on both injustice and bad policy, but, he carefully added, he considered the promulgation of abolition doctrines to tend rather to increase than to abate its evils. This negative anti-slavery statement is the keynote of his conviction. For a young statesman at the beginning of his career to fear the propaganda for the abolition of an evil which he considers both an injustice and a bad policy, showed an instinctive yielding to the aggressive slave-holder. The national exigency demanded a much more positive program, if the calamity of an internecine war was to be averted. Even Washington had a broader outlook upon the country's problem, and his statement that his first wish was to see some plan adopted "by

which slavery in this country may be averted," showed a care for the future.

A decade later we find Lincoln in Congress, suggesting gradual and compensated emancipation for the District of Columbia. This was only meant to force an expression on the subject from the Federal Government, and could have no immediate bearing. But even this mild demand, the effect of which would have been felt in the nation's attitude toward new territories, he considered too hostile to the slave owners, and a few months later he brought in a resolution in order "to conciliate divergent interests," which provided for the extension of the Fugitive Slave Law to the same district.

When he emerged from that curious lapse in his life, when he withdrew from politics entirely, a time of inner struggle and development, which lasted from his return from Congress in 1843 to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, he still maintained the same intellectual position on these great questions. The years of crisis did change the nature of his being, which was peculiarly attuned to what the American politician calls harmony. A sad, futile humanism held him, which left him uncertain whether his personal bias against the subject race sprang from an inner hostility or the knowledge of the hostility of his fellow citizens.

A strong and active abolition movement, based on moral and intellectual grounds, was going on during these years, a movement which Lincoln saw close at hand, but which he never joined. Herndon, his law partner for twenty intimate years, was an ardent Abolitionist, in close touch with the leaders in New England. Herndon kept Garrison's *Emancipator*, which Lincoln read regularly, and was in constant communication with Parker and Channing.

Lincoln knew of these men and their work. He may have sympathized with them, but the movement never called him. While Herndon joined the Free Soil party and the New Liberty party, Lincoln remained an old line Whig, a Clay man, and canvassed the country for Taylor. It was Herndon who signed his name to the call for the Bloomington Convention of the Republican party in 1856, much to the horror of Mrs. Lincoln's relatives and his own former law partners.

In the series of joint debates with Douglas in 1854 the question of slavery and the problem of the Negro in America was discussed from every angle, and it is easy enough to find Lincoln's exact position. He had to define it very clearly before audiences that were critical and ready to vote against a man who could not hold within himself the balance of all the contradictory sentiments on this question.

In the very first debate, in Ottawa, Illinois, he said definitely: "I agree with Judge Douglas. He [the Negro] is not my equal in many respects—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man."

This much-quoted statement, generally given to show the innate principles of freedom and justice which animated Lincoln, carries with it a fundamental contradiction, which he himself recognized. If social and political equality were forbidden the Negro, and the whites must remain socially and politically superior and dominant, as he believed, then even after emancipation another condition would arise scarcely better than slavery itself. In one of the Douglas debates, Lincoln asked what should be done with the slaves: "Free them all, and keep them among us as underlings? Is it quite certain that this betters their condition? I think I would not hold slavery at any rate, yet the point is not clear enough for me to denounce people upon."

He surrendered still further to the anti-Negro arguments of "white domination," and in his debate in Charleston, Illinois, defined what he meant by equality:

> "I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarrry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

Over and over again he asserted that he did not want to interfere with the institution of slavery where it existed. He had "no legal right to do it and no inclination to." He yielded to the institution of slavery, he said, as had the framers of the Constitution, with the hope that some day it would be ultimately extinct.

These statements might have been made for reasons of political expediency, were he not so insistent upon adding that, with the extinction of slavery, he did not want the condition of free whites and free blacks living together on the same land. "What I would most desire," he said, "would be the separation of the white and black races."

He saw no way of bestowing citizenship on the Negro. "So far as I know, the Judge [Douglas] has never asked me the question before. He shall have no occasion to ever ask it again, for I tell him very frankly that I am not in favor of Negro citizenship."

Again, referring to the Dred Scott decision, he said: "My opinion is that the different States have the power to make a Negro a citizen under the Constitution of the United States, if they choose. The Dred Scott decision decides that they have not that power. If the State of Illinois had that power, I should be opposed to the exercise of it. That is all I have to say about it."

If he was unwilling to bestow political equality, that principle taught from infancy to every American, it goes without saying that he was against the social equality of the Negro, for here the American is innately unfriendly to the race. In the Charleston debate he said:

> "I do not understand that because I do not want a negro woman for a slave I must necessarily want her for a wife. My understanding is that I can just let her alone. I am now in my fiftieth year, and I certainly have never had a black woman for either a slave or a wife. So it seems to me quite possible to get along without making either slaves or wives of negroes. I will add to this that I have never seen, to my knowledge, a man, woman or child who was in favor of producing a perfect equality, social and political, between negroes and white men. . . . I will also add to the remarks I have made that I have never had the least apprehension that I or my friends would marry negroes if there was no law to keep them from it; but as Judge Douglas and his friends seem to be in great apprehension that they might, if there were no law to keep them from it, I give him the most solemn pledge that I will to the very last stand by the law of this State, which forbids the marrying of white people with negroes."

It is clear that slavery to Lincoln and to the Republicans was not a problem to be viewed from the angle of the Negro, as it was to the Abolitionists, but from that of the free white small farming class, which composed a majority of the nation. And so from this point of view he announced openly to the people that he was not then, and never was, in favor of the unconditional repeal of the Fugitive Slave law, that he did not stand pledged against the admission of any more slave states into the Union, nor to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; that all he was impliedly if not expressly pledged to was the right and duty of Congress to prohibit slavery in all the United States Territories.

"I do not wish to be misunderstood upon the subject of slavery in this country," he said. "I suppose it may long exist and perhaps

the best way for it to come to an end peaceably is for it to exist for a length of time."

After his election and before his inauguration, the Congress of the United States had passed a far different Thirteenth Amendment from the one passed five years later and heralded as "that great and sublime event" which lifted a race from bondage. In this former proposed Thirteenth Amendment it was resolved that no constitutional amendment should be made in the future "which authorized or gave to Congress the power to abolish or interfere within any State with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said State." On assuming office, Lincoln not only did not protest against it, but approved of it in his inaugural address of March 4th. Only the immediate secession of South Carolina prevented the amendment from being ratified by the States. Had the South not seceded then, there is little doubt that with Lincoln's influence it would have received the necessary two-thirds majority.

When the war commenced it became evident that the institution of slavery would be endangered by it. The Northern armies marching through the South confiscated slaves along with other property. In fact, the Negroes themselves came swarming into the army for protection and freedom. Each military commander, as he advanced into the enemy's territory, had the power of emancipation. It was this very exigency of the war which Lincoln fought hard to prevent for almost two years. He had no faith in the cries of the Abolitionists for the peremptory wiping out of the institution. He never heeded nor respected their cries, deeming them a small sect of visionaries, without influence, scorned and laughed at by the people. "That abolition-sneak," Mrs. Lincoln once said of Seward—a tell-tale phrase. While Boston voted for Lincoln, it mobbed Wendell Philipps on its streets. The East was not as earnestly anti-slavery as the West. Commerce and manufacture did not conflict with slavery as did farming; in fact, except for the question of the tariff, they profited by it. The East was won away from the South, not because of slavery, but because she became tied by canals and railroads to the West, where the real slavery conflict took place. And in the West "abolition" and "anti-slavery" had two different meanings.

So convinced was Lincoln that the country was not for abolition that he did not heed the abolition demands of the border states themselves, although usually so careful to conciliate them. He offended the radicals in Missouri by revoking General Fremont's emancipation proclamation, and by continually supporting the conservative faction in that state, to such an extent that they were

irreconcilable to the very end, refusing absolutely to give him their votes at the time of his renomination for President.

But the Northern arms were long unsuccessful. He could not restore the Union on the old basis, because, to quote his own phrase, "the longer the basket that holds the eggs is being shaken, the more eggs will break." Not being able to reconcile this more conservative element, which called for the "Union as it was and the Constitution as it is," he had to comply with the more radical elements of the North who were supporting him with their arms and votes. But this he did very tentatively and shrewdly. He issued a preliminary emancipation on September 22, 1862, which was meant not as a blessing to the Negro, but as a warning to the Southerner in rebellion that his slaves would be confiscated if he did not render allegiance to the government. He gave them a hundred days in which to lay down their arms. Had the Southerners been less bent upon victory, they could have returned to the Union with the institution of slavery intact. Seeing that the Northern armies were ruthlessly abolishing the institution, he began working out several plans by which this forced abolition would be made more bearable to the expropriated slaveholder. His plan, on the one hand, was to urge Congress and the states that emancipation be gradual and compensated, and on the other that the Negroes be exported or colonized as soon as freed. He did not believe that freedom would benefit the Negro if left unprotected upon the hands of his embittered master. He was opposed to bestowing the suffrage upon the Negro, perhaps because he understood that the suffrage without the economic power to sustain that equality which it promises was worthless. But he did not propose to give him the means of becoming economically free,—a thing which even Russia attempted, by the distribution of some of the land taken from the landlords among the twenty-three million liberated serfs. His solution of the problem was the separation of the races.

The history of his acts from this time on is a history of his activity in the direction of gradual and compensated emancipation, and incessant minor attempts at colonization. He understood that colonization on a large scale was an impossibility, but he was sorely worried over the status of the Negro after freedom should have been accomplished, and he hoped by some successful example to set a precedent for colonization that would be followed. His great concern, however, lay in averting "the indispensable necessity for military emancipation and arming of the blacks" by "appeals to the Border States for compensated emancipation." The border states refused to adopt his resolution, which was that "the United States ought to co-operate with any State which may adopt gradual abol-

ishment of slavery, giving to such State pecuniary aid, to be used by such State in its discretion to compensate for the inconvenience, public and private, produced by such change of system." Congress laid the resolution on the table, while the border state representatives themselves refused to make any such resolution before their own legislatures.

> "How much better for you and for your people to take the step which at once shortens the war and secures substantial compensation for that which is sure to be wholly lost in any other event! How much better to thus save the money which else we sink forever in the war! How much better to do it while we can, lest the war ere long render us pecuniarily unable to do it! How much better for you as seller, and the nation as buyer, to sell out and buy out that without which the war could never have been, than to sink both the thing to be sold and the price of it in cutting one another's throats? I do not speak of emancipation at once, but of a decision at once to emancipate gradually. Room in South America for colonization can be obtained cheaply and in abundance, and encouragement for one another, the freed people will not be so reluctant to go."

He wrote a personal letter to a Republican from Delaware, arguing against the plea of expensiveness which his plan of gradual emancipation with compensation would entail. He gave the price of the slaves and the cost of one day's war, and showed that it was three times the cost of all the slaves in Delaware. He computed the cost of the slaves in Delaware, Maryland, the District of Columbia and Kentucky at $400 each and showed that by eliminating eighty-seven days of war their cost would be covered. He had even worked out the manner in which this sum was to be paid to the states if they would initiate this plan.

In his special message to Congress of December, 1863, he proposed a Constitutional amendment which would give universal freedom, but this freedom should be gradual, covering a period of thirty-seven years up to January 1, 1900, and the slaves were to be paid for by the Government.

The Republican Congress was hostile to his suggestion that Northern money be used in compensating Southern slaveholders. Their interest lay not in doing justice to the slaveholders or to the Negro, but in maintaining their own power, which they could do very well by emancipating the slave and enfranchising him, and preventing him by the legislation of the Western states from emigrating to their lands. The Democrats, with reactionary blindness, refused to see the trend of the times, and strongly opposed the measures on the ancient premise that they interfered dangerously with the domestic institutions of the states. Lincoln's request from the House for $180,000,000 to be used for compensating loyal slaveholders and an appropriation of $20,000,000 for colonizing freed Negroes came in so late in the session that it was not considered.

While urging compensation he was at the same time devising plans for the colonization of the freed Negro. Apart from asking Congress for appropriations, he appealed to the Negro himself. As early as August, 1862, he called a deputation of colored men to him and urged them to colonize in Central America:

> "Your race is suffering, in my judgment, the greatest wrong inflicted on any people. But even when you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with the white race. You are cut off from many of the advantages which the other race enjoys. The aspiration of men is to enjcy equality with the best when free, but on this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of ours. Go where you are treated the best, and the ban is still upon you. I do not propose to discuss this, but to present it as a fact with which we have to deal. I cannot alter it if I would. It is a fact about which we all think and feel alike, I and you. We look to our condition. Owing to the existence of the two races on this continent, I need not recount to you the effects upon white men, growing out of the institution of slavery. . . . . The practical thing I want to ascertain is, whether I can get a number of able-bodied men, with a mixture of women and children, who are willing to go when I present evidence of encouragement and protection. Could I get a hundred tolerably intelligent men, with their wives and children, and able to 'cut their own fodder' so to speak? If I could find twenty-five able-bodied men, with a mixture of women and children,—good things in the family relation, I think,—I could make a successful commencement. I want you to let me know whether this can be done or not. This is the practical part of my wish to see you."

The colored deputation answered, politely enough, that it would consider his proposition, but refused to take kindly to it, and it was learned in the end that Central America, where he was to send them, did not want them. Later he obtained some sums of money from Congress, and an island was bought in the West Indies, Ile D'Vache. Several hundred Negroes were collected and put upon this unknown corner of the world. It turned out to be a poisonous, malarial country, covered with reptiles, and a ship had to be sent to bring back the few survivors. Nevertheless, he kept on with his experiments, even going so far as to discuss with a Mr. Bradley, a Vermont contractor, the proposition of removing the whole colored population into Texas, there to establish a republic of their own. Toward the end of the war, after the Thirteenth Amend-

ment giving Constitutional freedom to all the Negroes had been passed, he called in General Butler and discussed with him a plan of exporting the Negro soldiers to some foreign land, to Liberia, South America or Demerara.

> "General Butler," he said, "I am troubled about the Negroes. We are soon to have peace. We have got some one hundred and odd thousand Negroes who have been trained in arms. When peace shall come I fear lest these colored men shall organize themselves in the South, especially in the States where the Negroes are in preponderance in numbers, into guerilla parties, and we shall have down there a warfare between the white and the Negroes. Would it not be possible to export them to some place, say Liberia or South America, and organize them into communities to support themselves? Now, General, I wish you would examine the practicability of such exportation."

Butler thought that if Lincoln did not mean to enact the horrors of the middle-passage, but give the Negro all the air-space that the law provided, he could not possibly gather ships enough to export them all from the country, for allowance had to be made for increase of families while on board the boats. But he proposed another plan for which Lincoln showed great interest. "If I understand you, Mr. President," General Butler went on, "your theory is this: That the Negro soldiers we have enlisted will not return to the peaceful pursuits of laboring men, but will become a class of guerillas and criminals. Now, while I do not see, under the Constitution, even with all the aid of Congress, how you can export a class of people who are citizens against their will, yet the Commander-in-Chief can dispose of soldiers quite arbitrarily. * * * I know of a concession of the United States of Colombia for a tract of thirty miles wide across the Isthmus of Panama for opening a ship canal. The enlistments of the Negroes have all of them from two to three years to run. Why not send them all down there to dig the canal?"

The death of Lincoln coming soon after this interview prevented the development of the plan.

Far from being discouraged by his failure to receive a response from Congress on the question of compensation, he planned a still greater request two months before the end of the war. This was that Congress empower the President to pay $400,000,000 to the respective slave states in proportion to their slave population in 1860.

His cabinet unanimously vetoed the document. Folding it up with a sigh, he put it away, but not without a secret hope that he would be able to use it in the near future. Tentatively and as a private suggestion, he wrote to the Governor of Louisiana that perhaps it were well to admit some of the colored people "for an elective franchise, as, for instance, the very intelligent and especially those who have fought gallantly in our ranks. They would probably help in some trying time to keep the jewel of liberty within the family of freedom."

Slowly his demands grew with the needs of the time. In the Amnesty Proclamation he promised that the National Executive would not object "if the States would recognize and declare their permanent freedom and provide for their education, which may yet be consistent as a temporary arrangement with their present condition as a laboring, landless and homeless class."

That was his solution, if the Negro had to remain side by side with his former master,—education and a qualified franchise. He had little hope that it would be accorded in the right spirit, he had little hope that the Negro would be ever permitted to rise out of his condition as a "laboring, landless and homeless class." If only some strange land would hold him!

ROOSEVELT'S "SOCIALISM"

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

Just when we were making up our minds that we knew all about Mr. Roosevelt, or enough, or as much as we wanted to know, along comes this "Autobiography" (the Macmillan Co., New York) and sheds a new light on the subject. It reinforces the prevailing view of Roosevelt's personality. But it gives us a new light on his Progressivism and his "Socialism."

The autobiography shows that personally Roosevelt is a standpatter. He denies that he has developed in the slightest degree since he first went into the Presidency in 1901. He argues strenuously that he has learned nothing and forgotten nothing. He defends those of his reactionary associates whom he dares to defend; most of the others he wisely ignores. For fear of possible consequences to himself there is only one colorless reference each to Joseph Cannon, to Philander Knox, and to Elihu Root, and there are only two to Senator Aldrich. Roosevelt did so much to promote the fortunes of these notorious enemies of the people, and they did so much for him, that he does not dare discuss them at

length. However, presuming on the mushy sentimentality of a large part of the public, he has nothing but praise for the dead Senators and arch reactionaries, Quay, Hanna and Platt. Some of his Cabinet appointments, such as the corruptionist Payne of Wisconsin, he is careful not to mention, while others, like Robert Bacon, partner of J. Pierpont Morgan, he impudently praises. Also he whitewashes his intimate friend, Senator Lodge, who no doubt knows too much about him to be susceptible of any other treatment.

In other words the leader of the Progressives denies that he personally is capable of progress and asserts that he attained his present perfection about the year 1901. Fortunately we are able to disprove this statement from his own book, for he now takes a considerably more radical position than he did even during the campaign of 1912. Wilson's "New Freedom" and Inauguration Speech have forced Roosevelt to a more and more radical social philosophy, and as radicalism is the only program on which he has any chance to be re-elected there is no reason to doubt his sincere devotion to those new ideas.

Roosevelt has now traveled very far along the road towards Collectivism and Democracy. For example, he says:

> A democracy can be such in fact only if there is some rough approximation to similarity in stature among the men composing it.

This statement describes an advanced Social Democracy approaching Communism. Roosevelt moreover recognizes the necessity of organized class action to make democracy effective, especially as a counter-weight to existing corporations:

> It therefore becomes necessary for these ordinary individuals to combine in their turn, first in order to act in their collective capacity through that biggest of all combinations called the Government, and second, to act also in their own self-defense, through private combinations, such as farmers' associations and trade unions.

His progress towards Collectivism (under small capitalist control, of course), is equally striking:

> By the time I became President I had grown to feel with deep intensity of conviction that governmental agencies must find their justification largely in the way in which they are used for the practical betterment of living and working conditions among the mass of the people.

There can be little question that Roosevelt's feelings on this matter, whatever they may be, developed not, as he says, while he was President, but, on the contrary, while he was not President, but wanted to become President again. He continues:

> A few generations ago an American workman could have saved money, gone West and taken up a homestead. Now the free lands were gone. In earlier days a man who began with a pick and shovel might have come to own a mine. That outlet too was now closed, as regards the immense majority, and few, if any, of the one hundred and fifty thousand mine workers could ever aspire to enter the small circle of men who held in their grasp the great anthracite industry. The majority of the men who earned wages in the coal industry, if they wished to progress at all, were compelled to progress not by ceasing to be wage-earners, but by improving the conditions under which all the wage-earners in all the industries of the country lived and worked, as well, of course, as improving their own individual efficiency.

Here is his statement of the principles which are guiding him now, whether they guided him while President, as he claims, or not:

> The principle to which we especially strove to give expression, through these laws and through executive action, was that a right is valueless unless reduced from the abstract to the concrete. This sounds like a truism. So far from being such, the effort practically to apply it was almost revolutionary, and gave rise to the bitterest denunciation of us by all the big lawyers, and all the big newspaper editors, who, whether sincerely or for hire, gave expression to the views of the privileged classes.

These statements by no means mark the limit to Roosevelt's evolution in the radical direction, for he boldly tackles the labor question:

> The Nation and the Government, within the range of a fair and just administration of the law, must inevitably sympathize with the men who have nothing but their wages, with the men who are struggling for a decent life, as opposed to men, however honorable, who are merely fighting for larger profits and an autocratic control of big business.

Up to this point, his statements, though somewhat vague, seem distinctly to lie on the labor side. But the next sentence, which is as follows, considerably complicates the situation:

> Each man should have all he earns, whether by brain or body; and the director, the great industrial leader, is one of the greatest of earners, and should have a proportional reward; but no man should live on the earnings of another, and there should not be too gross inequality between service and reward.

That there should be no too gross inequality between reward and service, is a statement to which the most reactionary employer could give assent, though it does not entirely destroy the force of Roosevelt's previous statement.

Again we read that "there should be an increased wage for the worker of increased productiveness." This is good, as the worker often gets nothing from his improved efficiency. But

Roosevelt does not say that the worker in this case should have a wage increased *proportionately* to his increased productiveness. And again he says: "When labor-saving machinery is introduced, special care should be taken—by the Government if necessary—to see that the wage-worker gets his share of the benefit, and that it is not all absorbed by the employer or capitalist." Again nothing is said about the worker getting a *proportionate* share of this kind of advance; on the contrary, the statement that the employer should not get *all* implies that the worker ought to be satisfied to get anything of this increase, provided it is not insignificant. Roosevelt gives an illustration as follows:

> Not a cent goes into the pay envelope of the workmen beyond what they had formerly been receiving before the introduction of this new machinery, notwithstanding that it had meant an added strain, physical and mental, upon their energies, and that they were forced to work harder than ever before. The whole of the increased profits remained with the company. Now this represented an increase of efficiency with a positive decrease of social and industrial justice.

At last we have something definite. The worker is *not* to get a proportionate benefit from the increasing efficiency of machinery, he is *not* to get a proportionate share of this increased productiveness, but he is to be paid only for the increased strain involved, and social and industrial justice require only that he should be paid always the same for the same effort. All the advantage of technical progress is to go to profits. Wages are to be increased only according to increased effort. "Dividends and wages should go up together." So that after all labor is to get some slight share of the increasing prosperity. But this is only on condition that labor is ready to accept *a reduction of wages when divdends go down:*

> If the reduction in wages is due to natural causes, the loss of business being such that the burden should be, and is, equitably distributed between capitalist and wage-worker, the public should know it.

Roosevelt agrees that labor must be organized and must use its power over the government and that "wage-earners have certain different economic interests from, let us say, manufacturers. . . .", but he does not want these organized political expressions of divergent economic interests to take the shape of political parties. There is to be no class-war, since the interests employers and employees have in common are far more important than the interests that hold them apart.

This position might seem unclear, but it is made perfectly definite by the illustration of Roosevelt's attitude in the great Anthracite Coal Strike of 1902. He admits that all of the arbitrators of the commission, except one, "represented the propertied classes." Even this one representative he had appointed under the title of "an eminent sociologist." This was the reactionary labor leader, E. E. Clarke, of the Brotherhood of Railway Engineers, who is now acknowledged also to be the most reactionary member of the Interstate Commerce Commission (although he is the only labor member on the commission).

It is quite clear that while Roosevelt wants to grant certain improvements to labor, he does not demand any *economic rights* whatever in its behalf. An undefined share in the increase of production, under a system, such as that of the Anthracite Strike Commission, where labor does not have equal or superior representation, means no share in particular. In fact, one of Roosevelt's statements shows that he does not really wish labor to have any *share* at all, but only a fixed minimum standard of what he happens to regard as decent living conditions. He wants to keep labor one or two steps from beggary:

> The right to use one's property as one will can be maintained only so long as it is consistent with the maintenance of certain fundamental human rights, of the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, or, as we may restate them in these later days, of the rights of the worker to a living wage, to reasonable hours of labor, to decent working and living conditions, to freedom of thought and speech and industrial representation,—in short, to a measure of industrial democracy.

This, at least, is frank enough. Roosevelt wants "a measure of industrial democracy," that is, he opposes full industrial democracy, and consequently he opposes the class war which has industrial democracy as its aim.

But even more illuminating than the Autobiography is the collection of expressions about the class-struggle made in campaign speeches and especially those passages that compose the climax and final chapter of his "Progressive Principles". In his speech at Santiago (Chile) he said that the Progressives are not Socialists, because Progressives believe in "the ideal of social consciousness," while Socialists believe in class consciousness. But he knows very well that social consciousness is the Socialist ideal also. Does he then deny that class consciousness and privilege exist? And if they do exist, does he deny that they must be destroyed by an attack of the non-privileged? Let us see.

He says that "the great majority of capitalists" are "naturally hostile" to the Progressives, that "the men who are most benefited by privilege" as a rule "cannot be expected to feel friendly to those who assail privilege", that "sometimes the interests of the capitalist class are against the interests of the people as a whole".

Here we have a struggle of the capitalist class against the non-privileged. That the interests of the two classes are not *always opposed* does not weaken these statements in the least. No intelligent Socialist claims that they are.

Roosevelt says that this situation does not "surprise" him. What is our amazement then when he says (on the same two pages) that he is "puzzled" at the attitude of "the men who belong to the money and leisured classes", when they "fear the people so intensely that they uphold every species of political and business crookedness in the panic-stricken hope of strengthening the boss and special privilege". To be sure, he no longer refers here to the larger capitalists, but to the merely "moneyed" class, whose interest in privilege, he says, is "less obvious". But clearly it is merely less in magnitude.

He does not see this, however. The "class-struggle" that he recognizes is only "natural" in the case of the large capitalists. When "those who belong to or are intimately associated with the leisured and moneyed classes" express the same hostility to the Progressives, he calls them "foolish creatures", for "the people would never harm them; yet they still dread the people." He is indeed puzzled at this behavior, which he vaguely attributes to "unmanly fear" and to the effort to "shield their soft personalities from the public". Yet is the fear of this class groundless—even in Mr. Roosevelt's own "puzzled" brain? It certainly is not, for he himself admits that the moneyed classes are in a panic "lest something that is not rightly theirs be taken away from them". Is there any clearer way of saying that they are in the same class with his "capitalists", that they are privileged and are "naturally hostile" to those who want to take away their privileges? And indeed, Mr. Roosevelt even admits this when he says: "Apparently these men are influenced by a class consciousness to a degree I had not supposed existed in any such strength".

This apparent *naiveté* of Mr. Roosevelt would indeed be very puzzling if we did not know its origin, namely, his vain hope to line up the leisured and moneyed classes against the very large capitalists whose support he had lost. But the motive does not concern us here. Along with the absurdly contradictory phrases just quoted there is a perfectly clear and satisfactory statement of the class-struggle between the large capitalists (whom he calls just "capitalists") and their opponents, together with an unwilling confession that the moneyed and leisured classes, from whatever motive, are on the large capitalists' side.

In the Autobiography he repudiates *Marxian* Socialism as an exploded theory, and points out that "many of the men who call themselves Socialists are in reality merely radical social reformers." An article by Roosevelt in the *Hibbert Journal* (in October), however, after giving us to understand that the Progressives do not care whether their program is going to be called Socialistic or not, nor whether it will be rightly or wrongly so called, merely disclaims *"thoroughgoing"* Marxian Socialism. This carefully chosen phrase suggests that moderate Marxian Socialism may no longer be objectionable. In the *Century* article, finally, he says that his goal is "partial collectivism" and "so much of Socialism" as fits in with his other conceptions.

So it seems that Mr. Roosevelt, who had already adapted 80 per cent. of the so-called Socialist reforms, is now ready to adapt a similar per cent. of the hackneyed Socialist phrases. The only Socialism he leaves severely alone is that which demands that wages be increased at the expense of profits—which means that he is still about 100 per cent. an anti-Socialist.

I. W. W. *VERSUS* A. F. OF L.

By JOSEPH J. ETTOR

[It is perhaps unnecessary to state that Ettor is a member of the Executive Committee of the Industrial Workers of the World. His article, therefore, voices the opinion of a large section of that organization, and has a corresponding importance both to those who sympathize with his views and to those who—at any point—oppose them.]

Tom Mann has come and gone. He came "with an open mind", he gave the subject of the I. W. W. "careful consideration", and finds himself forced to consider the I. W. W. a "dual organization" which is "wasting its efforts".

Tom Mann is not the first labor leader who has spent a short time in this country, made up his mind about the I. W. W. and given, when he left, aid and comfort to the elements that back up the political machine in the A. F. of L.

It was hoped that he would not fall into the same error. But now that he has gone, his article in the *International Socialist Review* (Chicago) and *La Vie Ouvriere* (Paris) is being repro-

duced with favorable comments by Socialist political publications, craft union periodicals, and even capitalist papers, in the pious effort to show that the I. W. W. has no reason for existence. "England's greatest labor leader says so."

So it is necessary to consider and discuss the various points he makes against the I. W. W. in his article.

In the first place, he makes much of the statistics of membership—over two million in the A. F. of L., and at the most, thirty thousand in the I. W. W.

Now there are some things to be said about the two million membership of the A. F. of L. We will analyze it.

When Mann was here he must have learned something of the *protocol*, the contract, the check-off system—devices by which the A. F. of L. unions gain a large membership at the sacrifice, not only of working-class principles, but at the cost of wages and hours.

For the benefit of the uninformed, I will explain what the protocol, contract and check-off system are. First the protocol:—

Some years back the cloak-makers of New York went out on strike for better conditions. After some ten weeks' struggle the strikers' demands were compromised, but before going to work the employers' association wanted a guarantee that the peace established would be lasting—that the workers would not go on strike from time to time. This fear was soon overcome by drawing up a protocol which virtually places the control of the union in the hands of the employers, for it gives them equal say in the governing power of the union—the interests of the employers and union officers have been harmonized. They work and act together against the workers—these are interested in peace for profits' sake, the others for the sake of assuring a steady income of dues without taking any of the risk involved in the class struggle. The disciplining of the workers is in the hands of a joint-committee, so is the redressing of whatever grievances the workers may have against any of the employers, and *vice-versa*.

Some time ago the membership succeeded in ousting Attorney Meyer London as their representative on the Joint Board and put the power into the hands of a more radical man—Dr. Isaac A. Hourwich. The attorney for the Manufacturers, Mr. Cohen, immediately put in a protest that Hourwich's aggressive policy and actions were in violation of the existing protocol, and that the employers would retaliate by refusing to recognize the protocol as any longer binding them and would lockout the workers. The result was that the referendum supporting Hourwich was annulled, Hourwich was discharged, and the "situation was saved".

This protocol has now become the order of the day and has been forced on the "organized" clothing workers generally. For the time being, at least, it binds to capitalism and its labor allies 300,000 slaves, over half of whom pay dues and are counted in the two million members of the A. F. of L., against their will.

In a discussion last year in New York City the two attorneys, Cohen for the Manufacturers and Meyer London for the Union, argued for the protocol from their respective standpoints. Cohen argued that the protocol should be supported by employers generally, as it successfully kept the I. W. W., with men like Haywood, Ettor and Giovannitti, from lining up the workers and creating industrial disturbance. Meyer London argued for the support of the A. F. of L. generally, as the protocol plan was an effective protection against the propaganda and organization of the I. W. W. It saves our people from the revolutionary propaganda and blocks the efforts of Ettor and Giovannitti, he declared.

In the coal mining industry we have the check-off system and the contract. The coal barons "fear" the union so much that they actually collect the dues for the union in parts of Pennsylvania, the whole of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and many other states. The bosses actually deduct the dues, assessments, fines, etc., from all the employees and give a check for the total amount to the secretary of the "union". For years past the contracts have been made for a stated number of years—one, two and three years—but they always expire on the first of April, and thus we have witnessed the spectacle—a strike of coal miners in April, May, June—yes, a strike of coal-miners some years back was actually declared on the Fourth of July. But then that is no more humorous than the ice-wagon drivers going out on strike in the month of January! These contracts not only expire at the opening of warm weather, but also in such a way that in one state they may be on strike and across an imaginary state line union coal-miners are digging coal for the same employers against whom the strike is on, on the other side of the state line.

Some years ago the writer had occasion to ask a prominent district president of the Coal Miners—Feehan, of District Five, Pennsylvania—if they were not ashamed to have the coal barons collect the dues for the union. His reply was very significant: "If we didn't we would not have one-third of the membership we now have". So that out of the so much boasted 400,000 members in the coal miners' union only one-third, perhaps, are union men who would belong if the masters did not bless the union.

Their reputed and boasted strength does not bring much result.

It did not prevent the killing, as reported by the official statistician at the last convention of coal miners, of *2,370 in the coal mines of the United States last year.*

We could cite more instances to prove our point, but it would require too much space in this paper. We go on to another assertion in Tom Mann's article, in regard to the A. F. of L.:

> The labor movement is still essentially sectional, each organization being fully autonomous and very often indifferent to the action of all other organizations. But the feeling of solidarity, of real and militant unity, is developing, and developing rapidly.

What is there to prove this? The facts are—that at the *last four* conventions of the A. F. of L., for the first time, fraternal delegates of the "American Federation of Catholic Societies" have been admitted without any registered dissenting voice or vote.

Conventions of various state labor bodies and International trade unions continue to open with the benediction of some reverend gentleman who invokes the grace of God "in the deliberations of this gathering". The last convention of the A. F. of L. in Seattle, Washington, was favored with speeches of "welcome" by the Governor of the state, the Mayor of the city, a Cabinet member, and Catholic Bishop Hoban, whose affiliation with the mining interests of Montana are well known. He told the delegates, "We will support you just so far, but if you get too revolutionary we will oppose you", and threatened to form Catholic unions, etc. All this without a voice of protest on the part of the "militants" present.

We quote again from the article:

> The American Federation of Labor bitterly resents the action of the I. W. W., especially in their forming new organizations where unions already exist.

Comrade Mann should have stated just how the A. F. of L. "resents" the action of the I. W. W. In Lawrence they first declared that the strike was not justified—that since the law had reduced the hours of labor, "reasonable and legitimate unionists" could not expect the same pay for less hours of work. Then John Golden, the president of the A. F. of L. textile workers, telegraphed Lawrence's chief of police: "If there is anything I can do for you in connection with the strike let me know at once." The reply was to come to Lawrence at once. Golden's efforts, with those of the A. F. of L., against the Lawrence workers are too well known to require repetition at this time.

In the strike at Little Falls, N. Y., the police, mostly members of the Jackspinners' Union, "resented" our pickets with club and gun in hand—and A. F. of L. button and police badge on their coat lapels.

In the great struggle of the Akron (Ohio) rubber workers, the A. F. of L. sent out circulars to all parts of the country advising against sending any contribution to the I. W. W. in Akron, saying that there was no strike there.

To prove our point further we submit the following widely printed press dispatch:

> Indianapolis, Ind., January 21.—Attacks on the American Federation of Labor cropped out in the convention of the United Mine Workers of America during the debate on the resolutions committee report late to-day. The speeches against the federation were started by Duncan McDonald, the Illinois labor leader, during the discussion of a resolution regarding industrial unionism.
>
> "If any one can get a progressive resolution through the American Federation of Labor," declared McDonald, "he will deserve a monument, for he will be as great a man as Washington. That body is reactionary, fossilized, worm-eaten and dead."
>
> McDonald said he, as a delegate of the Mine Workers, had attended the Seattle Convention of the Federation and was almost thrown out bodily for supporting a resolution favoring industrial unionism.
>
> "The conditions in the American Federation of Labor are about as Delegate McDonald has stated," said President John P. White of the miners. "So far it has been impossible to get an industrial resolution passed by that body. The time is coming soon, however, when the labor leaders will have to see that in industrial unionism lies the only hope of the labor movement in this country."

Mann continues:

> The I. W. W. viewpoint is that organization by trades is an actual hindrance to the real interests of the workers, who aim at the realization of their economic emancipation; they maintain that the great majority of workers are not skilled, but unskilled, that eleven or twelve million of these latter are not organized, and that hitherto the American Federation of Labor has given their welfare but very little thought.

We say, as to the above, that as a matter of fact the A. F. of L. is a skilled workers' corporation, organized by and for the skilled, and controlled by and serving the economic interest of the skilled workers, against and at the actual expense of the unskilled and unorganized, foreign and native workers alike. It has not only "given their welfare but little thought," it has given it no thought at all. Whenever it paid any attention to organizing the unskilled it was invariably done for "military reasons", so to speak. The unskilled were organized, not for the benefit that organized power could bring to these laborers, but that they might be utilized

in some struggle of the skilled mechanics. As soon as the job was done the unskilled organizations were invariably broken through the co-operation of the skilled corporation and that of the masters.

Says Mann:

> It is indisputable that the I. W. W. propagandists have done very much to educate this unorganized mass, particularly the floating workers, known here as migratory. It is equally true that they have urged and aided them in their struggle to obtain the best conditions of life, and it is very probable that if the I. W. W. had not taken the interests of this special category of workers in hand, their circumstances would not have been improved as they have during recent years.
>
> But, while I admire the fighting spirit of the I. W. W., I cannot praise their capacity for organization.
>
> To have failed in getting together even approaching 100,000 workers is not a very encouraging result, after eight years of continuous effort toward organizing this mass of workers in a country of nearly 100,000,000 inhabitants. In some of the cities where the I. W. W. have most successfully fought their battles, nothing but an embryo of an organization exists; in others, one finds not even that.

To the above we say it admits our position and justifies our past conduct. But we have not failed in our capacity as organizers. As a matter of fact we have been conducting a long fight against the capitalist class and all their institutions, against the multifarious aggregation of allies that in fact stand by capitalism and pose as friends of labor providing that labor accepts them as leaders.

Can there be any dispute that if the I. W. W. struck bargains with employers, compromised its principles, signed protocols, contracts, had the employers collect the dues, and acted as "good boys" generally, we should have a half million members? There is no such doubt in the minds of those who know the facts. But rather than sacrifice our principles, kow-tow to all sorts of freak notions, declare a practical truce with the enemy, and have a large number of dues-payers, we have preferred to be true to our own purpose in spite of all opposition. Our men have sweated blood in carrying on the propaganda for a real revolutionary labor body —revolutionary in methods as well as final purpose. Our men have gone and continue to go to jail without a whimper, yet note all the whimpers of Gompers, Morrison, Mitchel and the pals of the McNamaras!

Tom Mann again:

> The steel industry of Pittsburg is one of the industries where they have been engaged in a long struggle; they fought in McKees Rocks; still, today not 20 members of the I. W. W. are found in the whole district. In fact, neither the old unions, nor the new, can pretend to have secured a foothold in the Pittsburg district. Out of 200,000 workers employed in the steel mills, blast furnaces, etc., less than 3 per cent. are organized; and these thousands of workers are compelled to labor 12 hours a day and seven days a week.

Here again all the facts are not stated. In the various periods of I. W. W. struggles in the Pittsburg District we never had, as a matter of fact, more than 5,000 raw recruits to conduct the struggle against corporations that are the strongest entrenched in the whole country. But Tom Mann might have offered an explanation why it is that the A. F. of L., which has "greater capacity in organization", has not only failed to organize this district but as a matter of fact lost the once very powerful organization it had there. The Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers was born in the Pittsburg District, it held its first convention there, it was nurtured and helped along by the Carnegie Steel interests, it had thousands of members, but when they tried to fight they were crushed to dust.

One comparison may be made on this point. The A. F. of L. has *lost* every important struggle with the steel barons of the Pittsburg district and finally has lost all of its members. The I. W. W. *won* all its battles, but failed to retain the organization after the fight, because we refused to tie ourselves with contracts. I can state from practical experience in that district that had we been willing to strike bargains with employers we could now show thousands of dues-paying members.

The A. F. of L. since 1908 has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in efforts to re-organize the steel workers. It has various city trades partially organized. It has kept dozens of its ablest organizers employed steady in the district. In 1910 a special convention of all the International A. F. of L. Union presidents was held in Pittsburg, assessments were levied, all the internationals were to send their picked organizers. Congress and state legislatures were petitioned. "War on the Steel Trust declared". Gompers threatened to take the field personally. The result? Less organization of the A. F. of L. now than before, the best, oldest and very flower of their unions, the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, destroyed to all practical purposes by the power of the Steel Trust.

And now some advice:

> As things appear to me, after many and exhaustive conversations and discussions with workers under all conditions, I declare with energy that the I. W. W. should work in harmony with the American Federation of Labor. There is not the least need of two organizations. The field is large enough that all may well co-operate in the economic struggle.

The above may well be said. But as much as we may desire to "work in harmony", we cannot do so without sacrificing our principles and betraying hundreds of thousands of workers who look to the I. W. W. for aid and guidance. We cannot "work in harmony" with an organization of which that ultra-capitalist organ, the New York *Sun*, has well said: "The A. F. of L. is the greatest bulwark against Socialism in this country".

If the reasons that led to the formation of the I. W. W. had been petty and transient there would not be any necessity at this time for Comrade Mann to "declare with energy that the I. W. W. should work in harmony with the A. F. of L." The I. W. W. would not have been born, much less have lived through all the struggles and intrigues of the past eight years. The fact that we weathered storms that at times made old stalwarts waver, is sufficient proof that no transient reason caused the I. W. W. to be organized. It has lived because it had an economic purpose to serve, and whatever may be in store for it in the future it cannot be gainsaid that it did not serve its purpose in developing necessary elements of future labor struggles. Austin Lewis has well remarked that even if the struggles at Spokane, McKees Rocks, Lawrence and Paterson are all the I. W. W. was responsible for, it has well fulfilled its purpose and met all expectations. But who is to say that we have reached the end of our mission?

Says Mann:

> The American Federation of Labor is not diminishing; it is growing; its ideas are not retrograding—they are expanding. It is not more reactionary than formerly; it is less.

We deny the above in toto, and most energetically do we deny that the A. F. of L. is growing less reactionary. We could give any number of facts to prove our contention, but since our Comrade contents himself with a mere statement we will not offer any proof other than the following fact: Up to a few years ago it was possible not only to find opposition candidates to Gompers for president, but thousands of votes were cast against him—hundreds by instructions of the affiliated unions. At the last convention he was elected almost unanimously, receiving all the votes in the convention but one, who voted *no* by instruction.

More advice:

> The control by the politicians, whose influence, both in the unions and in the Federation, is increasing, is the greatest danger to which it is exposed at present, and this is because the militants and the energetic and vigorous men in the I. W. W. refuse to work within the unions. They thus leave the field free to the politicians, whose task becomes comparatively easy.
>
> We know what happens when the politicians capture and control the unions; we see it in certain countries in Europe. Therefore, in conclusion to these notes, I declare that this is a great pity and that the fact that the admirable fighting spirit of the "industrialists" now in the I. W. W. is not exercised within the American Federation of Labor may well cause a disaster. To continue to use this fighting spirit against the Federation is, to my mind, to go contrary to everything I consider as decisive experience.
>
> I am convinced that if the militants adopt the tactics that I have outlined, the mass of workers will readily respond to their appeal; that the workers' field of activity will become considerably enlarged and that the organization will develop at a much more rapid rate than hitherto.

The above again is the result of misinformation. We tried to work within the A. F. of L. but found ourselves at an absolute disadvantage.

The theory that what is needed to save the Federation is the energetic and vigorous men who are now in the I. W. W., is on a par with the "Socialist" advice of how to save the nation; but we don't want to save the Federation any more than to save the nation. We aim at destroying it. The Socialists advised us to roll up our sleeves and become active politically within capitalism —"We must capture the government for the workers", etc. We tried, but the more we fooled with the beast the more it *captured us*. Our best men went to "bore" from within in capitalist parliaments and city councils only to be disgusted, thrown out, or fall victims of the game and environment in which they found themselves. Our experience with the effort to capture the A. F. of L. in this country has been the same. We lost our best men, they went there either to be disgusted or become parts of the machine itself, and we learned at an awful cost particularly this: That the most unscrupulous labor fakers now betraying the workers were once our "industrialist", "Anarchist" and "Socialist" comrades, who grew weary of the slow progress we were making on the outside, went over, and were not only lost, but, like our former comrades who are now politicians, became the greatest supporters of the old and most serious enemies of the new.

We are not wasting our efforts by fighting the class-struggle inside of that capitalist institution with a labor name, the A. F. of L. We, as a matter of fact, are abler to do it better outside, for we are not tied up by its rules. We are developing and building a fighting machine in which only revolutionists have anything to say as to "how" and "what". We are not speaking too strongly when we say that the A. F. of L. is a capitalist institution and we can't possibly work inside of it and not get lost.

The point that the A. F. of L. is composed of wage-workers is begging the question. There are many other institutions com-

posed wholly or in vast part of wage-workers, such as the churches, armies, political parties, etc. But these institutions can by no amount of effort be turned to the purpose of the revolution. The Federation is no less completely in the hands of forces that are anti-revolutionary and whose economic interests are anti-proletarian.

In the struggle of the proletariat the object must be to destroy the power of institutions organized against the working class purpose, and not to capture them, for we should have to destroy them even after the capture.

The revolutionary industrialists of America are not responsible for the present division in Labor's ranks—we have done all that is in our power up to the point of sacrificing our principles and our honor as revolutionists. The division is not of our making. Those whose course and behavior was not true to the everyday battle and ultimate revolutionary purpose of the proletariat are responsible for it. As for any disaster that Comrade Mann fears may happen, we may point out that we have avoided the disaster in the past, as in the case of Haywood in Idaho, Ettor, Giovannitti and Caruso in Massachusetts, and in many more cases of that nature.

The labor movement has had to bear the disaster in the McNamara case only, and that because of the cowardly and unrevolutionary attitude of the A. F. of L. The industrialists played an honorable part in that struggle, even though it was not of our making. We took our places in that struggle, giving our energies and enthusiasm, as we do in all struggles, with no other object in view but that of solidarity. When the disaster came we were the only organized body that refused to join the pack of wolves, while the A. F. of L. and a part of "Socialist" officialdom were denouncing the boys even when the jail door was being shut in their faces for life.

Finally, says Tom Mann:

> Our task is to urge the workers' organization to action, to enlarge the ideas animating them, destroy the sectionalism isolating them, inspire them with our ideal and prepare them without delay to seize, in every country, that reduction of hours of labor that puts a brake on capitalist exploitation.
>
> That is the special action of the hour. Therefore, for all the workers of Europe, of America and of the world, the rallying cry shall be, Solidarity! Solidarity! and again Solidarity!

We can assure Comrade Mann that the Industrialists of America will not be found turning a deaf ear to the cry of Solidarity. We have made that the rallying cry and hope of hundreds of thousands of our fellow workers. But we mean to devote ourselves to the solidarity of labor for the revolution, and not solidarity with politicians, labor betrayers, craft unionists, priests and preachers, Militia of Christ and Civic Federation.

SOCIALISM AND THE FEMINIST MOVEMENT

By E. BELFORT BAX

In an article in the March number of the NEW REVIEW, by Mary White Ovington, Socialists are taken to task for not being enthusiastic on the Feminist question. The upshot of the article is the advocacy of the solidarity of womankind against men; in other words, the preaching of a sex war.

Now some of us Socialists think we have already too much Feminism in the Movement, and hence it is well perhaps that Socialists who are bitten by the Feminist craze should have clearly brought before them the direction in which certain sex-obsessed women who have joined the party, wish things to shape themselves.

In the article in question we find the usual falsification of fact familiar in all Feminist propaganda. There is the customary denunciation of "masculine despotism" and the corresponding female "slavery," a thing which, as I have conclusively pointed out in my book, the "Fraud of Feminism," does not exist. On the other hand, no mention is made of female *privilege*, of woman's immunity from punishment for crimes committed against men, and of the weighting of the scales on the woman's side in the administration of justice generally. This non-existent despotism of men against women is assumed as a matter of fact, but no attempt is made to show in what it consists and where the alleged slavery and oppression of women comes in. If the mere non-possession of the franchise constitutes oppression and slavery, then we are invited to accept an altogether new definition of those words.

My object in the present article is, however, not to expose once again the false assumptions in general on which the theory and sentiment of modern Feminism is based, but to criticise one particular false assumption, to wit, that Socialism must necessarily include Feminism in some form or shape. Now Socialism, which implies economic equality and political equality as between classes and nations (at least such as are on approximately the

same level of development), does not, I contend, necessarily involve a mechanical equality between the sexes. And why is this? Because the basis of an equality fails in the latter case. In that of classes one has to do with a difference created by economic conditions and social environment, *i.e.*, in the case of classes we are concerned with a distinction which is purely sociological in character. A similar observation applies *mutatis mutandis* to races in substantially the same stage of development. With the question of sex it is far otherwise. Here we are concerned not with a sociological but with a biological difference, an *organic* distinction, and hence not to be got rid of by any readjustment of *social* relations. Socialism forces as its goal the extinction of the divisions of class altogether, likewise the obliteration of existing race and national divisions insofar as these mark rival and potentially antagonistic state-systems. But no one can allege that he or anyone else has as his goal the abolition of sex-distinctions.

We may conceive the realizability of a *classless* society, but hardly of a *sexless* society. Hence the conception of Socialism as generally understood, does not *per se* involve that of the sex-equality which modern Feminism professedly aims at.

The question of Feminism, therefore, cannot be "rushed" upon Socialists, on the plea of consistency with Socialist principle, with any logical justification. It has to be argued out on its own merits. If those anti-Feminists are right who contend that the average of womankind is organically inferior to the average of mankind, and that this natural inferiority is the ultimate ground of differentiation of social function between the sexes, then the inferiority in question will militate as much against the attainment of a mechanical sex equality under Socialism, as under any other order of society. I am aware that most Socialists have allowed themselves to be "rushed" in this matter, and as a consequence female suffrage has been made a plank in the party platform, and leaders, such as Victor Berger, who is mentioned, have been driven to bow the knee in the temple of the Feminist Rimmon (probably against their real judgment). This is unfortunate, though as far as it has already happened it cannot be helped. But it is about time now for plain speaking in the matter and for placing the whole Feminist contention, so far as Socialism is concerned, on a basis of argument rather than of bald assumption, such as has been the attitude hitherto adopted. Given an average intellectual, and, in certain aspects, moral inferiority of woman as against man, and there is obvious reasons for refusing to concede to woman the right to exercise, let us say, administrative and legislative functions such as have hitherto accrued to men.

After all, the end of a Socialist commonwealth is not an abstract and mechanical equality of function, but the welfare of the whole society. And as regards this, the numbers and calibre is noteworthy of those among women themselves who regard their own sex as inefficient for political and judicial functions and who in consequence oppose the idea of female enfranchisement or any other form of the direct influence of women in public affairs. They resent the notion of being governed by women.

In the present article I do not pretend to discuss the whole problem of sex-capacity and its implications. I am only concerned here to enter a protest once more against the old assumption that Socialism necessarily involves Feminism, which I find again treated as a foregone conclusion in Mary White Ovington's article.

I would further point out that sex-war is a game that two can play at, and if "women have their obligation to stand with all other women who are fighting" against men as a sex (for this is what is meant by the phrase "masculine despotism"), a similar obligation may be claimed for men. These advocates of Feminism never seem to care to face the question, What are "woman's rights"; *i.e.*, they never attempt to show the grounds for regarding the claims made on behalf of women in the present day by the Feminist fraternity as constituting "rights." This is always taken for granted and is often allowed to go unchallenged even by opponents. If women, calling themselves Socialists, are going to preach baldly a sex-war, declaring it to be the "obligation" of all women as women "to stand with all other women who are fighting, etc," time may soon come when men will begin to recognize *their* "obligation to stand with all other" men who are fighting against what they may consider as female usurpation and an attempted "feminine despotism." For the rest, the writer of the article, like most of her sister "anti-manists," does not seem to realize that any success women may achieve in their "anti-man" crusade is entirely due to the help given them by "rats" from the camp of men themselves, and that, failing this aid, their efforts would be powerless and futile.

Were men to stand loyally by their sex in the "sex war" Mary White Ovington so strongly advocates the anti-man females would no longer be "dangerous." However this may be, the attempt to saddle Socialism with Feminism which is so often being made is, I contend, without any justification in fact or in logic. Various Feminist contentions have, it is true, from time to time, obtained a place in the Party programme, but after all said and done, Feminism has never been more than a cuckoo's egg in the nest of Socialism.

GIOVANNITTI'S POEMS*

BY ANNA STRUNSKY WALLING

"They are the blows of my own sledge
Against the walls of my own jail"——

blows such as only he can strike, into whom the strength, the passion and the hope of the people have entered. And though he often writes from within the walls of his jail, greater than any poem that Giovannitti has yet created is the living poem of his inner freedom in a world upon which the sun of freedom has not dawned!

Behind Shelley there stood no movement. The cannon of the people were not trained upon the enemy, for the collective human mind had not yet discovered the enemy. On one side were the suffering, the oppressed, the imprisoned; on the other the exploiters and oppressors, themselves trapped by an inexorable system into a living death of darkness, but the two were not arrayed in battle. Passionately and despairingly the poet sought to express this, and his song of freedom was self-inspired—the song of one man. Giovannitti, a hundred years later, sees the hosts arisen or arising, hears the tread of their onward march, and he sends his poems as "Arrows in the Gale."

Never was a man more integral to the movement, more expressed by the movement and more expressive of it. Created by the forces of struggle, his genius inspires to struggle and revolt. The idea that is shaping in the minds of the people that freedom and equality can be fought for and achieved is the idea in which he moves and lives and has his being. The light that is spreading in the heart of the people, their awakening for the first time in the history of mankind to the possibilities of life, is what has set him on fire.

In "The Thinker," which is inspired by Rodin's statue and has the same still, breathless intensity, an ocean-like vastness and depth, he states his bill of human rights and his prophecy:

Behind your mighty frame, in fright
To stay you, moan the dark, dead years.
Heed not the voices of the night,
Heed not the echoes of your tears.

* "Arrows in the Gale" by Arturo Giovannitti, with an Introduction by Helen Keller. Frederick C. Bursch, Riverside, Conn. $1.00.

However dear, your sorrows rest
Upon you, like a burial stone.
Upturn it! Rise! Their grave's unblest,
The terrors of the past have flown.

Its memories in you must die,
Its shadows must depart from you,
Your doubts, your fears are all a lie,
Only this wondrous thought is true.

. . . . .

Behind your flesh, and mind and blood
Nothing there is to live and do,
There is no man, there is no god,
There is not anything but you.

Think, think! What every age and land
Thought an eternal mystery,
What seers could never understand
And saints and sages could not see,

From you, the chained, reviled outcast,
From you the brute inert and dumb,
Shall, through your wakened thought at last,
The message of to-morrow come.

'Twill come, a dazzling shaft of light,
Of truth, to save and to redeem,
And—whether Love or Dynamite—
Shall blaze the pathway to your dream.

"The Republic" is his most dramatic and lyrical poem. It describes the rise and fall of the French Revolution, and the revolutionary impulse is summed up in the lines:

Not hers the fear to hesitate
When shame and misery cry out—
Love has no patience, truth no doubt,
And right and justice cannot wait.

"The Walker," one of his most remarkable poems and which he wrote while in jail, treats of the prisoner tortured by the longing for freedom, not the larger freedom, but the actual, miserable little freedom of getting outside the locked door, a freedom without which he cannot remain sane and live. His poem takes its place beside Wilde's "Ballad of Reading Gaol," and is more real, more subjective, and yet at least as impassioned. It is written in the Whitman style. "The Funeral" is as beautiful as anything Whitman ever wrote, and "The Cage," a companion poem to "The Walker," also equals Whitman's best. Here he attacks law and tradition, he opposes the future to the past, he contrasts the exuberant youth of the three in the cage with the age-old judges who

sit over them, and he tells how "from the peaceful abodes of men rose majestic and fierce, the anthem of human labor to the fatherly justice of the sun."

"The Funeral" is not long and may be quoted in full:

> I saw a funeral go by this morning, a black hearse driven by one black horse climbing slowly the silent street, the street unsouled and grief-stricken by the gray omens of the coming first snow.
>
> No carriages followed the black hearse, no mourners walked behind it, no flowers were on the coffin, and my heart, my mad heart that divines everything, told me that no one was weeping in the great city.
>
> I followed it with my unseeing eyes and then I turned to my love who stood by me at the window (always with me, always by me shall be my love) and I wanted to kiss her to dispel the anguish of the gray morning and of the silent street and of the black hearse.
>
> But my love held me away with her hand and said: "Nay, kiss me not now and speak not of our love, but let us go and follow that hearse, and throw some earth into the grave for that is our forgotten brother that died yesterday."
>
> And I said to my love: "Aye, my love, let us go and mourn for him, our unknown brother, so that some day someone shall also walk behind our biers. At least one, at least one. . . ."
>
> But my love answered again: "Nay, what will it matter to us then? We shall be two in the coffin. Let us go and mourn for him, just for him, only for the sake of him, only for the sake of sorrow and death and tears.
>
> "For we have cursed and fought and hated enough, my love, and it will do us good to weep."
>
> And we followed the lonely hearse up the silent street, the street unsouled and grief-stricken by the gray omens of the coming first snow. And we looked not at each other, and we did not speak.

"The Prisoner's Bench" is marked by a seething yet suppressed passion and by "the unerasable sneer," to which he refers in "The Praise of Spring," and which flashes out surprisingly in the last stanza of "The Republic", and the last line of "On the Common"; his indictment of society, his whole philosophy, and his gentle, all inclusive and still uncompromising personality are expressed in those few lines.

> Through here all wrecks of the tempestuous mains
> Of life have washed away the tides of time.
> Tatters of flesh and souls, furies and pains,
> Horrors and passions awful or sublime,
> All passed here to their doom. Nothing remains
> Of all the tasteless dregs of sin and crime
> But stains of tears, and stains of blood and stains
> Of the inn's vomit and the brothel's grime.

> And now we, too, must sit here, Joe. Don't dust
> These boards on which our wretched brothers fell,
> They are clean, there's no reason for disgust
> For the fat millionaire's revolting stench
> In not here, nor the preacher's saintly smell,
> And the judge never sat upon this bench.

"The Praise of Spring" is a love-poem, and like the other love-poems in the book, it shows how the love of a revolutionist is only another aspect, the most vital aspect, of his revolutionism. His Beloved is inevitably his Comrade, who feels and thinks, struggles and aspires and suffers as he does:—

> For the day I saw the first dandelion and the first daisy and I heard the first strident voice of the cricket, the little messengers that announced thee, that day I was alone no more.
>
> Another one was by my side, and she was young, and she was fair, and she was lost like me in the gateless labyrinth of life.
>
> Like me she had nursed her youth with the divine nectar of the tempests. Like me she was cruel with many angers and sad with many cares. Like me she understood the lofty virtues of hatred and the endless march onward to the gate that does not exist, with no other compass to guide our feet but our will to go.

The "Samnite Cradle Song" is to me more expressive of both Giovannitti the poet and Giovannitti the revolutionist than any other poem in the book. Death and hunger and despair—the husband had fallen in the king's war; God had killed the grandfather and sent the landslide—and the mother sings throughout the night to the baby in her arms who is tugging at her empty breasts:

> "The tale of my woe is as long as thy cry."

So rending is the new art of this poem that one sees all the misery of the world rise up and stalk before one, everybody that has ever been bereaved, shattered, hurt unto death, is included, is remembered.

It is a lullaby that is meant to awaken and not to put to sleep. At the end of the long night in which she sits huddled with the baby over the thought of her dead, the dawn appears, a light breaks—vengeance can be hers, and, through vengeance, restitution to her, to others. So the *attentat* takes shape in her mind, as it always must out of misery and death, out of individual suffering too great to be borne, so alone has it any meaning or value:

> Hush-a-by, lullaby, listen! Don't sleep!
> Lullaby, hush-a-by, mark well my word!
> Thou shalt grow big. Don't tremble! Don't fail!
> The holy wafer is but kneaded dough;
> The king is but flesh like the man with the hoe;
> The axe is of iron, the same as the sword;

This I do tell thee and this I do sing.
And if thou livest with sweat and with woe,
Grow like a man, not a saint, nor a knave;
Do not be good, but be strong and be brave,
With the fangs of a wolf and the faith of a dog.
Die not the death of a soldier or slave,
Like thy grandfather who died in a bog,
Like thy poor father who rots in the rain.
But for this womb that has borne thee in pain,
For these dry breasts thou hast tortured so long,
For the despair of my life, my lost hope,
And for this song of the dawn that I sing
Die like a man by the axe or the rope,
Spit on their God and stab our good king.

I like to think of those to whom the appearance of these poems is an event, of the men and women who will read and joy in them and take them to witness that the movement has attained its poet, that the movement has become so vital a part of the life of mankind that it writes itself into poetry. I like to think of the rank and file of the movement reading their Giovannitti, recalling through him voices that have striven to hymn the struggle as he, Gorky, "who chants a song of praise to the madness of the brave," Traubel, and others who are moved by the same forces. I like to think of the slender volume following our Legeres and Tannenbaums to the prisoner's bench, into the cage, and to jail, seeking them out where they sit immured despite their youth and their zeal.

Helen Keller says, "Many readers of the book will find themselves face to face with a baffling personality, with a poet quite unlike any other."

He is a young man who for ten years has edited and kept alive the organ of the Italian Socialist Federation, *Il Proletario*. He is not a member of the Socialist party or of any labor union, nor even of the Industrial Workers of the World, although he works with them. He is a Syndicalist, not an Anarchist, and he is a very able writer and a speaker of surpassing eloquence and force. He is an active propagandist, and he looks upon this and not upon the writing of poetry as his role in life. In his own words, "On his forehead are the scars of the fierce affrays, on his lips the bitter wrinkles furrowed by the long, unerasable sneers, on his wrists the marks of torn and broken fetters and chains, and the shadows of crossed darknesses have remained in his eyes."

Book Reviews

Boycotts and the Labor Struggle, by Harry W. Laidler. John Lane Company, New York. $2.00.

Any one who fails to see the very great importance of this book has only to read the lengthy and weighty review in the New York *Times*, evidently written by some leading corporation lawyer or conservative professor. In other countries the subject may be less important. In America the boycott has played a part scarcely less important than the strike itself.

The *Times* says:

> In the anthracite strike of 1902 the strikers threatened the storekeepers who sold the necessaries of life to the "scabs"; they compelled a school board to dismiss a school-mistress because her brother, not living with her, worked contrary to the wish of the strikers; they caused the dismissal of a drug clerk because his father worked. Other similar acts were too numerous to specify. The commission which settled the strike upon the appointment of President Roosevelt declared the acts in support of this boycott were "cruel and cowardly" and "outside the pale of civilized war."

The practical method and original thought of Laidler's book can be shown in connection with the very cases the *Times* mentions. These would ordinarily be called cases of secondary boycott. Laidler, basing his definition upon innumerable court decisions and discussions, makes the following highly important distinctions:

> A *secondary* boycott may be defined as a combination of workmen to *induce* or *persuade* third parties to cease business relations with those against whom there is a grievance. A *compound* boycott appears when the workmen use *coercive* and *intimidating* measures in preventing third parties from dealing with the boycotted firms.
>
> *Compound* boycotts are of two kinds—those involving *threats of pecuniary injury* to the parties approached, and those involving *threats of actual physical force and violence.*

Compound secondary boycotts involving threats of pecuniary injury are as significant and prominent a feature in the revolutionary movement in America as strikes themselves. They may be somewhat less important to the labor unions, but as they represent a common ground of action on the part of unionists and the great body of consumers, in the end they may prove even more important to the mass movement as a whole.

At least if we judge by the feeling in the conservative press

we cannot overestimate the value of this weapon. The *Times* says:

> The ancient boycott is oftentimes sentence of poverty and death.
>
> The plea for the boycott is a proposal to end popular government by dispensing with the rule of the majority whenever any minority will not accept it.

Like the strike, the boycott may be used by an oppressed *minority*—provided it is a numerous one. Both strike and boycott may be used by the laboring masses, even when the aristocracy of labor remains on the other side, as now more and more frequently happens.

There is no question that Laidler's work is the authority on this subject and will remain so for years. It will also be the international authority, as the movement is far more developed here than in any other country. W. E. W.

A History of Socialism, by Thomas Kirkup. Fifth edition, revised and largely rewritten, by Edward R. Pease. The Macmillan Co., London and New York. $1.50.

Socialism and Democracy in Europe, by Samuel P. Orth. Henry Holt & Co., New York. $1.50.

Thomas Kirkup's "History of Socialism," never acceptable as an adequate study of the subject, is less so in its "revised" edition. Mr. Pease's mind is obsessed with a rabid anti-Marxism and a blind faith in the Fabian Society. "I am convinced," he says, "that historians in the future will recognize, as indeed they are beginning to realize to-day, that the successor to Karl Marx in the leadership of Socialist thought belongs to Sidney Webb."

Mr. Pease's bias is obvious in his comment on Roosevelt Progressivism. Approving the Socialist party's opportunistic platform declaration on land, he says: "If American Socialists approach problems in this spirit we may hope for the evolution in due course of a genuine American Socialism. Hitherto the nearest approach to this has been the policy of ex-President Roosevelt and his followers, described by the excellent title of 'National Conservation,' embodying the truly Collectivist demand that the national resources of the country should be preserved from private greed for the use of the moment." This is not only a flashlight on Fabian principles and tactics, but illustrates the bias of the revisions made in Kirkup's book.

Mr. Orth's book also is a biased study. He starts out to prove that Socialism in Europe is now a conservative force, a bourgeois radical movement. In order to prove his point Mr. Orth neglects almost entirely the revolutionary wing of European Socialism. Syndicalism he virtually dismisses as "the extreme pessimism of the laboring class!"

Although Socialists repudiate Briand and Millerand, Mr. Orth still calls them Socialists. Immediately after saying, "Aristide Briand, the first Socialist prime minister in European history," Mr. Orth says, "His former comrades had long since this disowned." This is not even consistent.

Mr. Orth criticizes Socialist theory without understanding it. Marxism eludes his grasp. The significance of Socialism in all its aspects is unknown to him; only the conservative parliamentary phase rouses his interest. Nevertheless, although neglecting the revolutionary phase, Mr. Orth proves conclusively that the control of the European movement is conservative. One of the best features of this book is its appendix, which gathers in convenient form many documents of rare value. LOUIS C. FRAINA.

Starving America, by Alfred W. McCann. George H. Doran Co., New York. $1.50.

Poisoned and denatured foods which are sold everywhere in open market are to blame for much of our national ill-health and very many deaths, says Mr. Alfred W. McCann in "Starving America." Among the poisons which commonly menace us—one government experiment station found twenty-seven harmful chemicals used 721 times in testing 3,900 samples of food—is, for example, sulphurous acid which is used in "silver" prunes, apricots, peaches, pears, mushrooms, and all molasses except Barbados. Dr. Wiley, when in the Department of Chemistry at Washington, denounced sulphurous acid as seriously injurious; it affects the kidneys and reduces the number of blood corpuscles. Pneumonia, kidney and heart disease and tuberculosis are indirectly due to other poisons, which do not at once affect the health, but by reducing the power of resistance gradually undermine the constitution and pave the way to infection from chance germs, which in a healthy body would do no injury.

A harm equal to the poisoning of foods is denaturing them or depriving them of important mineral constituents, which are necessary aids in the digestion and assimilation of foods and the elimina-

tion of waste materials. The usual milling of wheat is a good example of this denaturing process. Three-fourths of the potassium content of the wheat is taken out in the process of refinement necessary to make flour white. It is potassium which makes the heart and arteries resilient. When it is not present in sufficient quantity in the body, the arteries harden, the heart is affected and apoplexy is a possible result. Many of the salts valuable to the body economy are found in fresh vegetables and only careful cooking prevents their loss, as they are soluble in water. For this reason potatoes, spinach and other fresh vegetables should be cooked in so little water that none is thrown away before serving them.

Mr. McCann declares bitterly that the wholesale poisoning of manufactured foods is only possible "on the ground that the national health is of less importance than the national wealth." The wealth of the few individuals who profit by the sale of poisoned foods can hardly be styled "national wealth." He has stumbled casually upon the two causes of all the flagrant defects in manufactured foods. The first, that they are made for profit and not for use, he states plainly; the second, that they are made to suit a "theory-of-the-leisure-class" taste, he vaguely suggests, without, of course, using Veblen's phraseology.

Mr. McCann's book is interesting in two ways: socially as a study of conditions in the food industry, and as showing the protection afforded business in even criminal transactions which involve the life and death of thousands every year, and individually as regards one's own food and the relation it bears to health.

G. P.

A Socialist Digest

WHITHER IS THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY TENDING?

Some interesting estimates of the recent evolution and present situation of the British Labor Party were evoked by its annual conference in London. There is no longer any disposition to find excuses.

The *New Statesman* says that after the conference "things remain as they were," and proceeds to describe how things were —and are—with the Labor M. P.'s:

> They realized only too vividly that forty members could neither dominate a legislature of 670 nor coerce a Cabinet sitting by a national mandate and a majority of a hundred.

But the fact that they could accomplish little does not excuse them for having attempted nothing—i. e., nothing of a distinctive character:

> The Labor members fail to convey, either to Parliament or to the public, any distinctive note. Absorbed in the day by day exigencies of a House of Commons dominated by a Liberal Cabinet, they do not succeed in expressing any definite or consistent policy for which the Labor party stands, or by which its utterances can be marked off from the equally fervent aspirations about social reform which have become the commonplaces of Liberals and Unionists alike. It is true that the Labor members cannot pass bills, and cannot even get them discussed; but there is a widespread feeling, not by any means confined to the opponents of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's leadership, that not enough energy, not enough ingenuity and not enough persistency have been shown in utilizing all the opportunities that present themselves to formulate and promulgate a distinctive and definite policy of immediately practicable reforms.

The *Nation*, a Lloyd George organ, passes a very similar criticism:

> The general tenor of the Conference went to establish three points. The first is that while Labor men have an excellent set of political principles, not by any means confined to purely industrial questions, they have at present no practical, co-

herent policy which a Parliamentary Labor party, were it numerically strong enough, could pass on Parliament with any hope of success. The second point is that the present interest and enthusiasm of labor lie far less in the field of politics than in the active and incessant warfare of an acute order that is being conducted over the whole area of industry. The third point, and one which Mr. MacDonald pressed as far as he dared, is that the Government measures which occupied virtually all the time of the House of Commons were measures that are substantially approved by Labor. The Socialist leaders, of course, know well that the vast majority of trade unionists are supporters of Home Rule, Welsh Disestablishment and of almost all the other items of the Radical programme, for though for purposes of economic tactics they have joined the Labor party, they remain in conviction ordinary English and Scottish Radicals.

The *Neue Zeit* gives the following summary of the Conference from the pen of Sachse:

> Referendums of the unions up to the present have shown that the great mass of the organized workers regard the continued existence of the Labor party either with indifference or as undesirable. The bye-election of Chesterfield showed the world upon what uncertain foundations the whole structure of the Labor party rests. The other bye-elections of the year in which the party took part, it is true, did not give unfavorable results. But, although the Labor party undertakes the struggle only in districts where there is promise of success, their candidates in each instance won only the third place. The conclusion cannot be avoided that the Labor party in the contest against two opponents at the present time can not count upon victories nor even upon keeping their former seats. . . . In Parliament itself, the Labor Group has lost in importance and influence, while its prestige among the people and the laboring masses has certainly not increased. And yet, no one can deny that a mighty awakening is going on among the British laboring masses, that they are learning to understand their situation, that they are becoming conscious of their power and are showing determination to use it in their own interest. And in spite of this we see a decline rather than a rise in the independent parliamentary power and determination of the working class.
>
> That is the situation. There is scarcely any difference of opinion about it. How is it to be remedied? This is the question which tormented the delegates at the Conference. MacDonald, the chairman, who opened the discussion, avoided going into questions of principle. He pointed to the great difficulties with which a labor group of forty members had to reckon. . . . If the group was attacked because it didn't declare war on the Liberal Government, that was a very unlogical procedure on the part of those very persons who are always declaring that there is no real difference between Conservatives and Liberals. If this is the case, what is the use of driving one Government out of office in order to set up another, at the same time undertaking the expense, trouble and dangers of a new election. Isn't it better in this case for the group to get along with the Government of the day and to try to force as much as possible from it?
>
> The critics—and they represented beyond doubt an overwhelming majority of the Conference—were not satisfied with this argument. The tactics of the party up to the present, they claimed, have been undermining the very foundations of the Labor Party. The workers have seen no sufficient differences between Liberalism and the Labor Party, and so place no high value on the party's continued existence. The task of the Labor Group should have been, by means of its position and behavior in the House of Commons, to convince the workers that a strong and independent political labor party is as indispensable as the economic organization.
>
> The whole discussion followed along these lines," concludes the *Neue Zeit* article. "Nothing very positive came of it all. The report of the members of Parliament was accepted without opposition and everything remained as it was. The Conference couldn't discover an immediate way out of its difficulties and it is not the habit of English conventions to go back to the general problems in order to see if in this way a better result might be reached.

But it must not be supposed that the Conference did nothing. It adopted, this time without discussion, the Socialist resolution demanding the abolition of class rule—though it still refuses to require the minority to sign such a statement. It adopted the Socialist proposal for a land tax to be used in nationalizing the land. It demanded a governmental investigation of the question of governmental fixing of prices, and it held a long and exceedingly illuminating debate on the subject of proportional representation.

INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM IN GERMANY

The discussion as to what is the best form of labor union organization from a Socialist standpoint is also being carried on actively in Germany.

The *Neue Zeit*, for example, has had eight articles in recent numbers proposing everything from industrial unions to a highly centralized federation of all unions. The article by Emil Kloth is, perhaps, the most valuable.

Industrial Unions, in the American sense, we are told, do not exist at all in Germany. In the largest establishments, like the Krupp Works and the General Electric Company, this writer

admits, they would be highly desirable, though they would be altogether impracticable.

> In the Krupp Works, in spite of the welfare institutions of this firm, five to six thousand workers change their positions every year. Now, should wood-workers who quit Krupps to-day to enter a furniture factory to-morrow leave the metal workers' union and join the wood-workers' union? Or should the printers who to-day are working in a printing establishment, then spend a few months with Krupp, then work on a passenger steamer, belong successively to the printers' union, the metal workers' union and the transport workers' union? I regard that as impossible. According to all appearances there is no possibility of this kind of industrial organization becoming the rule among German unions within any period that we can foresee.

This quotation shows the German situation in a few words. The Metal-Workers' Union and the Wood-Workers' Union are both very broad-gauge and democratic federations, consisting of hundreds of related trades and including a great many semi-skilled and unskilled workers. But they are not, in any sense of the word, industrial unions. They are rather to be classed with our building trades or metal trades federations.

Indeed, the German unions are definitely on record against any effort to hasten the formation even of this form of organization, and decided in 1906 that all such efforts would only increase existing difficulties between the unions. The resolution, moreover, declares for the trade union form of organization, against the industrial form, which was especially demanded at the same Congress by the municipal workers. Kloth, however, denies that this policy is a survival of the guild or craft spirit. It resulted less from craft elements than from genuine modern "interests," which in many ways demand "a federation of trade groups" with a certain measure of autonomy:

> The larger the union has become (the writer here refers to the German Federation of Trades), the more trades it has absorbed, the more will the fear arise among those trades, though it may be a very groundless fear, that their peculiar and special interests will not receive sufficient consideration. In wage discussions, for example, it is often necessary to determine upon a different wage principle or complicated wage scales for different branches of an industry. As a matter of fact, this process seldom takes place without compromise at the cost of those trades which were formerly better paid and in favor of the worst paid. And in such cases the fear can very easily arise that this or that trade may not be properly considered, or might be too poorly treated. This has absolutely nothing to do with guild (or craft) tendencies. Then, from such causes, arises the desire for the special representation of such branches, yes, often even for the splitting up of the union."

It is highly significant that the Germans recognize that the real trouble is between the better paid and the poorer paid workers, and not between craftsmen and non-craftsmen.

Kloth also admits that the German labor unions have not been able to elevate wages as fast as the rise in prices, and that therefore they have not been able to prevent the deterioration of the *real* wages even of the organized workers. He says that the rises in wages have been made nugatory by the rises in prices and in rents *which followed.* This seems beyond question to be putting the cart before the horse, for the unions have been complaining for many years of the rise in prices and of their inability to increase wages at the same rate. In either case, however, the labor unions have failed to improve the real condition of the workers, though there can be no question that conditions would have been still worse had no unions been in existence.

What, then, is the remedy, if industrial unionism and even a higher degree of centralization of the federation of unions is rejected? A national strike fund has been proposed, and this idea will probably be accepted. Also a further democratization of the unions is suggested and will probably be carried out. It has been claimed that the present controversies among the German unions have been due to a conflict between the masses and the leaders, but this conflict in turn is probably entirely due to deeper economic causes, for certainly the better paid groups usually support the leaders, while the less skilled oppose them.

It is also proposed to make a more strenuous campaign to organize the unskilled, but this proposal begs the question, which is how this can be effectively accomplished with the present form of organization. At the present little more than one-third of the employees of metal industries and wood-working industries are organized, less than one-third in the building trades, less than one-fourth in mining, and less than one-fifth in clothing. At the same time the Employers' Associations have more than twice as many workmen under them as do the unions in the mining and textile industries, while they have a far larger number in the metal industry and an equally large number in the clothing and building trades. Only in wood-working, apparently, are the employees better organized.

Richard Woldt calls attention to these facts and suggests more radical labor union tactics, a matter of equal importance certainly with the form of organization. He points out that the present

tendency is for labor struggles to be carried on on a larger and larger scale until they tend to represent the working class against the employing class, and says that there must be new tactics to correspond with this new situation.

Under present conditions, we are told, when a union strikes or threatens to strike, it must consider three questions:

First—Is the moment favorable?

Second—There must be a full knowledge of the strength of both sides.

Third—It must be known whether the conditions are favorable for hitting the employers in their most sensitive point and "crippling" them.

The first condition would, apparently, mean that there would be no time limit to labor contracts, in order that the laborers might be able to strike at any time. The second condition would mean to strike when the employer is busiest and occupied with the largest orders. That is, strikes would not depend upon the needs of the workers, but upon the prosperity of the employers. Strikes made necessary by the increased cost of living might be called "beggars' strikes." Those undertaken because of the prosperity of the employer are strikes of soldiers who in planning sieges concentrate their attention on wealthy rather than on poor cities.

The third point also suggests the warlike spirit. Strikes mean that war has been declared. Their purpose is not to raise wages. The raise of wages has already been asked for and refused. The purpose of the strike is "to cripple the employer."

So far the writer in the *Neue Zeit*. But it may be pointed out that these militant tactics are those of such industrial unions as are dominated by unskilled workers. No unions controlled by the skilled workers, whether they are industrial or not, will consent to this militant policy—as Kloth showed in the words already quoted. Such a policy, moreover, leads, as Woldt says, to a warfare of all employers against the whole working class—or we should prefer to say, against laboring masses, since the aristocracy of labor will nearly always be found giving support to the other side, according to Kloth's own statements.

WHAT IS THE NEGRO QUESTION?

What is the Negro question? Is it a Negro question, or is it a white question? Is it in fact due simply to the hostility of *a part of the whites* to the Negro?

The latter view is taken by the *Independent*. In a leading editorial in a recent issue, it comes to the conclusion that the trouble is simply "that there are those—and many—who do not wish them [the Negroes] to rise above the servile class." The *Independent* goes on to say:

> It insults them to see a Negro trying to be as good as they are. The lowest education, or none at all, is enough for a servant, a peasant class. Accordingly they begrudge more than the barest elements of education, and they will not deal with them except as servants or inferiors. Their aspiration for the ballot is intolerable. It is enough that they till the rented soil or do menial work in cities.

To these prejudiced whites the Negro question appears simply as the question of "How shall we keep the 'Nigger' down when he wants to rise?"

> In a third of the states in which slavery used to exist, laws have been passed with the definite purpose of preventing Negroes from voting, and other laws keep them in a subordinate position.

That this now highly conservative weekly should devote its leading editorial to such a view of the Negro question, is an indication that possibly the political tide which has so long set against the Negro, is about to turn in his favor. One hardly expects the *Independent* to be fully aware of the underlying economic causes of Negro subjection. The situation is, in fact, attributed to ignorance and lack of Christianity, and a facile solution is suggested:

> Why is it that this "Negro question" continues to disturb us? It is because those who try to keep the Negro in subjection are ignorant of Negroes, and of human nature. They believe Negroes are naturally inferior to white people. . . . In short, the way to solve the Negro question is to do equal justice, to be simply Christian, to love instead of to hate. It is very easy, as easy as to open one's hand.

That our treatment of the Negroes is neither humane nor intelligent will be readily admitted, but why are they singled out for our worst inhumanity and stupidity? Not because they are black, nor yet because they were slaves, but chiefly because they are the unskilled laborers of a large and backward agricultural section. Their treatment is not much worse than that of the Russian, Hungarian, or Prussian peasants, as Booker Washington has pointed out.

It is to be feared that the "un-Christian" selfishness of the ruling classes of the South, including its white farmers and skilled laborers, is likely to continue, but their stupidity may be on the verge of gradual removal. For it is now generally admitted in the South that efficient laborers pay better than inefficient ones, and that efficiency requires a decent living and above all industrial education for the Negroes.

Up to the present the hope even for industrial education has been miserably poor—for it would cost more than common school education, and Booker Washington has called our attention, in the *Outlook*, to the extraordinarily backward condition of the Southern schools:

> Sixty-four per cent. of the colored children in Mississippi attended no public school during the year 1912. In Hinds County the average salary of colored teachers during that year was about $16 a month for five months.
>
> South Carolina is another Southern State which is backward in Negro education. According to official reports, in district 9, Beaufort County, of this State, there was expended on the white children enrolled in the public school in 1911, $127.30 per capita, and on the colored children enrolled in the same district $2.74 per capita, or forty-six times as much on the white children as on the colored children.
>
> In district 10, Charleston County, there was expended $202 for each white child, $3.12 for the colored. . . . In South Carolina the average length of the school term for the colored people, outside the cities and large towns, is from two to four months.
>
> Take, for example, Wilcox County, Alabama. For the education of the white children there was spent in 1912 $33,000, or $17 per capita; for the education of the 10,000 black children there was spent $3,750, or 37 cents per capita. According to the report of the State Superintendent of Education of Alabama, there are 328,024 colored children in Alabama. Of this number 190,000 did not enter any school at all during the last year, and 90,000 of those entering were in school only from two to three months. Thus it is seen that in the single State of Alabama there are almost 200,000 colored children who apparently are growing up in ignorance, notwithstanding all that has been done and is being done.

Senator Vardaman is even leading a movement to make these conditions worse—by refusing to allow any money taken from white taxpayers to be spent on Negro schools. But the demand for efficient colored workers for the South's growing industries is bound to turn the tide. Already federal financial aid has been extended to her agricultural education, while a commission is to report to Congress in June on federal aid to vocational schools. And since the middle classes have discovered the beauties of graduated income and inheritance taxes directed against the rich, such subsidies in relief of local taxpayers will become increasingly popular.

There are other signs that the tide has turned. Segregation of the races in the governmental departments at Washington, which was increasing throughout 1913, has now diminished somewhat, while President Wilson has actually defied a large group of Southern Senators by re-appointing a colored judge in the city of Washington. This leads us to expect that he may yet do something for the Negro's education—for he is under a solemn pledge to that effect—a pledge which the public may have forgotten. It was written to a leading colored bishop, Alexander Walters, in October, 1912, and asked the colored people to count on him for "absolute fair dealing" and for "everything by which he could assist in advancing the interests of their race in the United States."

But the opposition is always more radical than the government. When the Progressive national convention abandoned the Negro's voting rights in the Southern states in 1912, the uproar was so great that people did not notice that Mr. Roosevelt, in an effort to compensate for this backward step, took the Negro's side on practically all other phases of the so-called Negro problem. And now he goes a step farther and points out how well the hated "social equality" and even intermarriage work—in Brazil:

> The differece between the United States and Brazil is the tendency of Brazil to absorb the Negro. My observation leads me to believe that in "absorb" I have used exactly the right expression to describe this process. It is the Negro who is being absorbed and not the Negro who is absorbing the white man. . . . Even in the higher ranks there is apparently no prejudice whatever against marrying a man or girl who is, say, seven-eighths white, the remaining quantity of black blood being treated as a negligible element.

He even quotes, with apparent approval, the following remarks of a Brazilian statesman:

> We treat the Negro with entire respect, and he responds to the treatment. If a Negro shows capacity and integrity, he receives the same reward that a white man would receive. He has therefore every incentive to rise. In the upper ranks of society there is no intermarriage with the Negro of pure or nearly pure blood; but such intermarriage is frequent in the lower ranks, especially between the Negro and many classes of immigrants.
>
> The pure Negro is constantly growing less and less in numbers, and after two or more crosses of the white blood the

Negro blood tends to disappear, so far as the physical, mental and moral traits of the race are concerned.

The South is not going to change its mind about these questions, nor is Mr. Roosevelt going to try to change it. But his letter should go far to put a check to the Negrophobe propaganda carried on by Southerners in the North. Above all, it indicates that Mr. Roosevelt is moving. And his next move, apparently, is to demand that when the exceptional Negro in the South *does* qualify as a voter—against all the literacy, property, poll-tax, and other tests—he shall be allowed to vote. This seems as clearly to be his next step to gain Northern Negro voters as some plan for educating the Southern Negroes is Wilson's next step. And both are highly important, for they will mark the first positive gains to the race as a whole that have resulted from the Negro's possession of the ballot.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LABOR LEGISLATION

Every spring there are published the annual proceedings of various social science associations of this country. This year—another sign of the times—they were all more or less radical in tendency.

One of the most significant of the presidential addresses was that of Professor W. F. Willoughby, of Princeton, before the American Association for Labor Legislation. He declared that "the determination of the fundamental conditions under which industry should be carried on, and labor performed, is, or should be, a prime function of the state."

He pointed out that the greatest Liberal Party of the world, that of Great Britain, had made a complete *volte face* on this question:

> To-day it stands no less emphatically for the new conception of the state as an agency whose full power should be exerted for the betterment of the material interests of the people.
>
> It has been the fashion to characterize this change as one from individualism to collectivism or even Socialism. Collectivistic it certainly is if by that we mean the recognition of social rights and duties and the use of social or collective action to meet them. That it is anti-individualistic in the sense of laying little, or less, emphasis upon the desirability of individual freedom and initiative is wholly incorrect. Modern liberalism, in the United States as well as in England, looks to state action as the means, and the only practical means, now in sight, of giving to the individual, all individuals, not merely a small economically strong class, real freedom.

Professor Willoughby is disposed to call this view social individualism rather than collectivism, but he claims that this individualism is to be secured only by the state recognizing that affirmative action is necessary on its part:

> Our philosophy rests upon the dual postulate that there is a minimum of economic independence and comfort that must obtain if an individual is to be measurably free, and that this minimum can only be secured by the state. The refusal by the state to determine the minimum conditions of health, security and comfort which the public conscience demands as the birthright of all, its refusal to prevent the exploitation of the weak and helpless through excessive hours of labor or the payment of inadequate compensation, and its refusal to ensure that due provision will be made, through insurance institutions, or otherwise, against the four great contingencies threatening the economic security of the individual—accident, sickness, old age and inability to find work, means its failure to meet that duty which it is the prime function of a constitutional government to perform; viz., the protection of the individual against oppression and the guaranteeing to him of the *fullest possible* enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Professor Willoughby does not give the chief ground for this industrial efficiency programme, namely, its tendency to increase the incomes of the ruling classes. But he does mention another ruling-class motive that is scarcely less important:

> We believe that in seeking to secure that children shall not be employed during their tender years, that women shall not be permitted to perform work unsuitable to their strength, that men shall not be made to work excessive hours nor be subjected to conditions detrimental to their health or security, that in the case of all classes compensation shall be such as to permit of proper nourishment and protection, that opportunities shall be afforded for rational recreation and the development of their faculties, that facilities shall be provided for general and technical training, that security shall exist for their support and that of those dependent upon them when they are incapacitated for labor through no fault of their own. . . . we are seeking to have done only that which, apart from all other considerations, is absolutely essential if our nation is to conserve and increase its national power and hold its own in the great world contest for supremacy.

This motive is not merely important—it is one which makes practically certain the actual carrying out of this programme of labor legislation by the ruling classes of every country.

AMERICAN ECONOMISTS ON SYNDICALISM

A lengthy discussion of the I. W. W., in which John Graham Brooks, Roger W. Babson and Professor R. F. Hoxie, of the University of Chicago, took part, was the feature of the annual meeting of the American Economic Association.

Professor Hoxie adduced not only his views, but the personal experiences upon which they were founded:

> A few months since, moved by a desire to get at the truth underlying the flood of literature on this subject, I tried to make an honest, first-hand investigation of the I. W. W. I attended its convention, ate, drank and talked with its members, soaked myself in its factional discussion, haunted its headquarters, fraternized with its officers and leaders, delved in its literature and history. The outcome of this investigation went to show:
>
> First, that the syndicalistic character of the I. W. W. is not altogether authenticated by the facts. The I. W. W. is a flat failure, and, far from being the grim, brooding power which it has been pictured, is a body pathetically weak in membership, without consistent leadership, organically chaotic, and torn by apparent irreconcilable internal conflict resulting from a discrepancy of fundamental ideals.

While the great importance Professor Hoxie gives to numbers, unity and organization led him to a low estimate of the strength of the I. W. W., he makes some highly important remarks about its morality and its supposed tendency to violence:

> How then about union violence and predation? Do they show any necessary affinity between unionism and syndicalism? In order to answer this question correctly let us look for a moment at the most usual occasion for deliberate violence and predation on the part of old line unionists. It is a fact that almost any body of union men, whatever their principles and ordinary methods, and for that matter almost any body of workers, will tend to resort to violence and perhaps predation if they are face to face with systematic and long-continued aggression or are brought up against a blank wall of resistance to demands for the absolute essentials of a safe and decent existence, *provided there is no relief in sight through law or public opinion.* But the same is true of any body of men with red blood in their veins, or of women for that matter.

Hoxie also points out that the I. W. W. means neither industrial unionism, which flourishes in several A. F. of L. unions, nor Syndicalism, and it is highly gratifying that these important truths are becoming generally recognized:

> There is no syndicalist problem of consequence in this country. We shall have none of consequence, I believe, unless and until the great organic American labor movement finds its way barred to empirical advance. It is now feeling its way toward the organizing of the unskilled, and will doubtless organize them as fast as the psychology of the situation will permit.

Roger W. Babson, an influential financial writer and member of the Executive Committee of the Association, made some suggestive statements as to the relation of the middle classes to "syndicalism." He hoped the middle classes could use the two labor groups against one another. And we know the A. F. of L. has been used against the I. W. W., but we do not know of any important case of the other kind—for the reason that the I. W. W. does not co-operate with capital, while the A. F. of L. does. Babson continues:

> It is in the interests of the great middle group to have the irresponsible rich in the inner circle worried as much as possible. You can't raise money enough to bribe them; the law won't let us hang them; and between us the most effective treatment is to watch and worry them.
>
> Now the syndicalists are doing this "to the queen's taste." To the extent that these poor, ignorant syndicalists are worrying irresponsible wealth, the less time these men in the "charmed circle" will have to devise means for taking advantage of honest producers of labor, capital and enterprise. This includes all the many engaged in creative work whether as loaners or borrowers, employers or workers, preachers or teachers.
>
> There cannot long be two captains to the ship, as the American Federation of Labor pretends to believe, and as some good altruists who have spoken this morning apparently do believe at this moment.
>
> Joint control is all very well to talk about, and a step in the right direction; but sooner or later there must be a real fight between inherited capital and creative ability. To-day inherited capital rules; but it is in the interest of those in the middle group to have the aristocracy of inherited wealth dethroned, and an aristocracy of creative ability installed in its place. This is the fight of the syndicalists.
>
> Don't fear. The syndicalists will never win any more than did poor old John Brown and his men sixty years ago; but like John Brown and his noble band, they, the syndicalists, may be blazing the way so that some day your children and mine will be judged according to what they really are and by what they do and not according to how many stock certificates they have inherited from a great-grandfather.

The I. W. W. as a stimulant to produce capitalistic righteousness —this is a new and entertaining idea.

THE REAL INTERVENTION IN MEXICO

For the most sympathetic editorial treatment of the popular movement in Mexico, we have to turn to the London *Nation*. Our Socialist press has often been neutral or even hostile towards the Liberals, whom it has called "anarchists." Two British Socialist papers, the *New Age* and the *New Statesman*, are antagonistic even to the constitutionalists and lean strongly towards Huerta. The Radical *Nation* says:

> It would be absurd to question the heroic disinterestedness of Señor Magon and his little group of Socialists, who proved their devotion by facing torture, starvation, disease, and sudden death in the prisons of Diaz. There is at least a leaven of idealism on the rebel side, and there can be none among the Huertaists. The urgent tasks of any reforming government are to create a system of national education, and to destroy the system of peon-slavery. This latter task the rebels have already begun to carry out in the provinces which they hold, and the confusion caused by their assaults on the sacredness of landed property will be a transient evil if it ends, as it promises to end, in the restoration of peasant ownership.

We can see from the last statement that the Magonistas, or Liberals are rather revolutionary agrarians than anything else. But in Russia and elsewhere many of these have called themselves Socialists. And the Socialists are usually with such a movement, for it promises to establish a small capitalist democracy—a basis for Socialism, and it also furnishes a revolutionary tradition. It seems surprising that we should be less advanced than the British Radicals—especially in view of the tragic condition of the working people and peasants of our neighbor, Mexico.

An editorial in *Collier's Weekly* takes much the same point of view as the London *Nation*:

> In helping us to misunderstand Mexico, our newspapers tell us that Castillo is a Socialist, Zapata a guerrilla fighter, and so on, but all this is much too complex. The truth is far simpler. One of the more enterprising journals got an interview with Castillo, and this is what he said:
>
> "My chief was and is Zapata, the only leader who has fought consistently and loyally for more than five years for the vision which I follow—land for the people.
>
> "No, we shall not confiscate the land; the government shall buy it from the owner and resell it to the people. I do not care what kind of government we have, or if we have none; I don't care who is President. If I die now, this revolution will go on, the great revolution of the future, which nothing can stop until the people win."
>
> If the popular leaders in Mexico are after as high a goal as this, it will be well worth while to disregard the wails of the money lenders and to let them fight it out. There is no greater dream under heaven than that of a free people in a free land.

The *Nation* as definitely renounces the "concessionaires" as do Wilson and Bryan (the opposite position to that of the *New Statesman*, quoted in the April number of the NEW REVIEW):

> A British subject who adventures life and property in the search for riches in a semi-civilized country, where disturbance is chronic, does so at his own risk. The profits are commonly great, and it is for him to balance them against the danger. This country is no more bound to intervene when life has been lost, than when investments are in peril. We have, indeed, a shrewd suspicion that much of the outcry on both sides of the Atlantic over the Benton case is, in reality, an indirect way of obtaining intervention on behalf of the capital that is sunk in Mexico.

Not only this, but the Lloyd George organ suggests a definite and practicable remedy:

> With patience, the opportunity of influencing events will come. Sooner or later a Mexican Government will be forced to borrow, and it will find itself unable to borrow without the recognition of the United States. At such a moment terms can be made, and clearly the only terms that would offer much hope for Mexico are the terms that would be proposed to Turkey or to China in such a case—the engagement of foreign advisers and instructors for a period of years. Force is becoming an obsolete weapon in the modern world, and finance, adroitly used, is a humane substitute. But for its effective use, the creditor States must be unanimous. In such an intervention, the United States would properly lead; but their action ought not to be isolated, and it ought to be above all suspicion of complicity with grasping trusts and predatory concessionaires.

Indeed, it is difficult to see how any other remedy for international ills is likely, *under capitalism*, except the intenvention of enterprising and therefore *comparatively* far-sighted and humane international financiers.

THE EFFECT OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN STRIKE ON BRITISH SOCIALISM

The value of the strike as a revolutionary weapon has immensely risen in the minds of British Laborites and pure and simple political Socialists. The *New Statesman,* for example, says:

> They could not have provided the workers of the world with a clearer demonstration of the truths that "martial law" is merely a euphemism for "no law," and that the struggle between Labor and Capital is ultimately a question of force.

The South African situation has actually brought the *New Statesman* to several revolutionary and so-called "Syndicalist" positions. It even combines the general strike and the intermittent strike to form the ultra-revolutionary intermittent general strike:

> The general strike is over, but over after such a demonstration of labor solidarity as no country has ever witnessed before, and over without any damage, moral, physical or pecuniary, having been inflicted on the men. To have found such a force arrayed against them must have flattered rather than broken their sense of power; and to have surrendered to it without disorder, without giving a single excuse for violence, is more of a triumph than a defeat. Doubtless new tactics will be necessary in future, but why should they be difficult to devise? If the men come out again for a few days in a month's time, will General Botha again mobilize the military forces of the country? And yet again, a few weeks later perhaps, each time at an expenditure of hundreds of thousands of pounds sterling? It might, indeed, be a bloodless war, but that we fancy is hardly what General Botha and the mine owners want.

The idea of the *political* revolutionists—an appeal to superior force—is abandoned by the *New Statesman* for the idea of the economic revolutionists—an aggressive attack on the pocketbook:

> The merits, then, of the method, as a method, even when applied to South Africa, are doubtful. But in South Africa the conditions are more favorable to the employment of force against labor than, perhaps, anywhere else in the world; for there the wage-earning white proletariat is, we believe, in a permanent minority in the community, and can never hope to gain control of the political organs of government. In this country and, indeed, practically everywhere else, the wage-earners have the power of numbers overwhelmingly on their side. Any attempt on the part of the property-owning classes to employ force against them could only in the long run—and not a very long run—end in one way; and the end would be quite unnecessarily sudden and unpleasant. . . . . The capitalist classes of Great Britain are in too small a minority to dream of indulging at present in such luxuries as the suppression of strikes by martial law.

The *New Statesman* even advocates—as a defense against counter-revolution—"sabotage"!

> And there are other possibilities. We do not in the least believe that the recent strike had a consciously "Syndicalist" intent. No doubt there are Syndicalists in the Transvaal, just as there are Syndicalists in this country; but we do not imagine their proportion or their influence in the movement is greater there than here. Syndicalism is a useful word when strikes are to be suppressed by force, and that is probably the only excuse for its employment in connection with the Johannesburg dispute. Let us assume, however, that the accusation is just and that the philosophy of Syndicalism has actually captured the bulk of the South Africa wage-earners. In that case we may expect the natural Syndicalist reply to such methods as proclamations of martial law—namely, sabotage. The possibilities of sabotage on railways and in mines are practically unlimited, and may easily prove far more expensive to the owners than any consequences of the strike which General Botha has succeeded in suppressing.

THE REVOLUTION OF THE BRITISH ARISTOCRACY

The incipient rebellion of Great Britain's army officers is not the first sign of the desperate position in which her landed aristocracy and plutocracy finds itself in face of the middle-class and trade union attack led by Lloyd George and J. R. MacDonald. The proposal by the British Tory press that the principles of the South African Czarism established by Botha and Smuts might also be applied in Great Britain was scarcely of less significance.

In an editorial, the London *Nation* discusses under the title "Force as a Remedy," the expressed intention of the British reactionaries to adopt Botha's South African remedy in case of a possible revolt of labor in Great Britain:

> With this example in mind, whenever we are faced with a great national strike, like that of the railway dispute of 1911 or the miners' strike of 1912, we shall hear voices urging us to imitate General Botha, to break up the organization, to arrest the leaders, and to make meetings impossible. The inference will be that, if the policy is successfully carried out, the strike will melt away as that in South Africa has done. Against violence in the abstract there is no antipathy in the present mood of the governing classes of this country. It is all a matter of times and places, or rather, of persons and classes. The action of the Botha Government is a demonstration of the ease with which the whole system of constitutional

law, with its guarantee of certain fundamental liberties for British subjects, can be discarded by a few resolute men, who believe that they have the "directive classes" at their back. In this respect, conditions in England are perhaps not so different from those in South Africa as might be desired. All our constitutional lawyers have been drawn from the directing classes. All our constitutional maxims have been built up with their approval. The attitude of these classes to the general democratising of the constitution was not wholly unfriendly as long as they believed that they could tame democracy by admitting it. They were willing—at least the more liberal minds among them were willing—that their power should be tempered at the same time that its basis was enlarged. They conceived that the social order, as a whole, with all its immense inequalities in the distribution of property, would be in the main safer with the admission of all classes to at least a nominal voice in government, and therefore they preached the duty of maintaining the unbroken tradition of English loyalty to law, order and the forms of the constitution. But in the last few years, these people have seen freedom broadening rather more rapidly than in the past, and they have begun to doubt whether they can tame democracy. The control of the machine may, they fear, be taken out of their hands. It is within the limits of possibility that there should arise a democratic party, and that it should control the State. With this fear in their minds, the directive classes, and those that speak for them, have become shaken in their view as to the virtues of the British Constitution and as to the supreme duty of political loyalty. Their conceptions of political obligation have undergone a change. They are not sure that force may not be a remedy, for the time may come when law and government, and all that belongs to constitutionalism, will be on the side of those classes whom in the past they have half feared and half patronized. As long as the constitution was in their hands, there was for them nothing so sacred as the constitution. Now that it threatens to pass out of their hands, their reverence for it is very greatly abated.

In short, an aristocratic revolution against the democracy!

A GENERAL STRIKE AGAINST COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

The recent general strike in New Zealand has just been reviewed in two authoritative articles in the *New Statesman* by Edward Tregear, late permanent head of the Labor Department and the leading initiator of the compulsory arbitration law.

This strike has an exceptional international interest, inasmuch as it was against the compulsory arbitration law (the model which

other countries have followed)—and also because it was conducted in defiance of the more skilled workers, whose union and political party alike favored the law. For the more skilled workers have a smaller but separate labor union federation and a separate party. Moreover, as Tregear points out:

> There is a common likeness in these industrial events and a growing similarity in the methods of repression which connect them all round the world. Colorado, Dublin, Vancouver, Johannesburg and Wellington—they are all, with little points of local difference, "sisters under their skins".

Tregear's story has, indeed, a familiar ring:

> The strike of November, 1913, had its center at Wellington, the capital of the colony. There the water-front had been entirely captured by the striking Watersiders' Union. In the town itself there were no signs of disturbance; the electric trams ran as usual, the picture theatres were crowded, and the ordinary business of a thriving city was apparently uninterrupted. Almost invisibly; however, with a celerity which betokened careful preparation beforehand, a large body of mounted men from the country districts was concentrated on the town. These had been recruited by wild stories that the produce of the farms and runs were being "held up" at the port, that the boxes of butter were being destroyed, the wool bales cut open and contents thrown into the harbor, etc., etc. It is needless to say that such was not the case; there was no "sabotage", and the only violence shown up to that time had been by strike pickets toward those who tried to work cargo. It is only fair, however, to say that great loss and misfortune were imminent for farmers if the perishable products of their toil could not be loaded on vessels and exported. It was, therefore, very natural that they should be indignant against those whom they considered as "dogs in the manger", preventing the shipment of goods, if (and it is a large "if") it is certain that there was no other way to open the port than by using force against the "wharfies". That compulsion should be put upon shipping companies to pay fair wages and thus get the ships loaded did not occur to the farmers, who are fleeced ten times more by the companies than by the wharf laborers. Stimulated, too, were the riders from the wilds by the shrieks of the capitalistic Press, which foresaw endless columns of exciting paragraphs and leaders on the enormities of revolutionaries and the deliverance of the city from a mob-rule that never existed.
>
> In the very first week of the dispute the Government or the local authorities could have put the butter, wool, etc., on board the ships if they had said to the Watersiders: "We will see that you are paid fair wages to do the work, and, if the shipping companies will not load the ship, *we will*, and charge them the cost". Instead of that course being taken, the support of embattled "Law and Order" was thrown on the side of the exploiters to aid them to "sweat" their men and break

the power of Unionism. Against the law of the country, which said that industrial registration should be voluntary under the Act, the men were forced to submit to that phantasmal law or starve. Now they return to work, thousands of missionaries of discontent; sullen, knocked about, jailed, but each a ferment, each a nucleus of disaffection against the existing social system, and each a pioneer toward better things.

UNEMPLOYMENT

There are three chief forms of unemployment. "Permanent underemployed labor", says the London *New Statesman*, "is a more far-reaching cause of social degradation than even the ravages of cyclical and seasonal depression of trade". The two chief remedies, it suggests, are a minimum wage fixed by a public authority and compulsory unemployment insurance. The *New Statesman* continues:

> It is satisfactory to find a shipowner like Mr. Lawrence Holt laying down the principle that dock "labor cannot be expected to hold itself at the regular service of the trade unless it is guaranteed a regular adequate means of livelihood". It follows from this that the employers of casual labor must pay for as large a reserve of labor as they choose to maintain. Otherwise they are being subsidized, not to say pauperized, by the community, which has to provide in one way or another for the temporarily discarded workers.

Thus the writer, probably Sidney Webb, puts the employers of underemployed labor in the same class with the sweated trades—a highly important conclusion, if applied, for instance, to the purposeful underemployment of our textile industries.

But it is equally worth while to note that the *New Statesman* does not wish to deal with unskilled labor as a whole, but to cut off sections of it and give these sections favored treatment, thus classing them practically with the skilled, the aristocracy of labor, and preventing revolutionary mass-movements:

> On the other hand, it is not only useless, but positively harmful to increase the hourly wage of dock laborers, without increasing both the opportunity and the obligation of regular work. For the larger hourly rate is apt to mean for the docker not a larger income, but less work. Under present conditions the weekly income tends always to approximate to a customary standard of living—and a very low standard of living at that. To secure a real improvement the entrance to the occupation must be restricted. As soon as a ring is drawn around each casual labor market by an efficient system of registration, then it will be both possible and incumbent upon the Government to contrive that in one way or another every man within that ring is able to earn an annual living wage, distributed in approximately equal weekly payments. . . . The closing of the ranks of the existing armies of casual laborers is the key to the situation, and we would urge the dockers to make this the first plank in their programme. Many of the notable successes of Trade Union action have been based on a restricted entry to the trade secured and controlled by the unions concerned. But the unskilled casual laborer requires State assistance in this matter just as the sweated worker requires State assistance in the matter of wages. There are then two rights which the dockers should demand from the Government: First, the right to limit the number of their competitors; and second, the right to be paid for service in the reserve as well as for service in the active ranks.

The greatest problems of underemployment, however, those of agriculture and outdoor construction (which are also seasonal), would scarcely be reached by this method.

IS LABOR LOSING GROUND—AND WHY?

Some statistics on the relative rise of wages and the cost of living in England and Germany—statistics which can be paralleled for other countries, including our own—raise the question as to the value both of trade unions and of political parties in the worker's struggle.

The figures, which appear in the Berlin *Vorwaerts* and the London *Nation*, appear to prove conclusively the frequent assertion that the cost of living has risen faster than wages in recent years.

The *Vorwaerts'* figures are those gathered by Dr. C. Tyszka from official sources. In Prussia, money wages rose from 1900 to 1912 by 16.7 per cent, while the cost of living rose 35.8 per cent. Thus *real* wages fell 19.1 per cent. The same statistician shows that real wages have fallen greatly in England during the same period, though not so greatly as in Prussia.

But the important fact is not that real wages are falling. They might be rising slowly, and yet not be keeping up with the increasing productivity of labor, in which case labor would be getting a smaller and smaller proportion of the national income year by year. Stephen Reynolds points this out in the *Nation*, and draws the moral that neither Labor Party nor labor unions are winning out. The same conclusion applies to the Social Democratic Party and labor unions in Germany (unless indeed, the skilled workers may be gaining at the expense of the unskilled). Referring to the glaring inequalities of income in Great Britain, Reynolds writes:

> As to wages. . . . It is again a commonplace—except to those who have to bear the brunt of it—that the worker

of recent years has been losing ground both relatively and positively. In spite of trade unions and the Labor Party, not only has the rise in money wages failed altogether to keep pace with enhanced profits: *real* wages, on account of a stiff rise in the price of common necessities, have actually fallen. It may be that without the trade unions and the Labor Party, either or both, real wages would have fallen still further. The fact remains that both have failed in what they set out to do, namely, make the poor richer.

The relevancy here, however, of the figures lies not in detailed exactitude—a few per cent. more or less—nor yet very much in the inequalities of wealth that they reveal, but in the fact that such inequalities tend to become, and are becoming, relatively greater. Either, on the whole, we are socially climbing uphill, or else we are slithering down; there lies the point: for the pyschologies of the two processes are radically different. And, apparently, it is downhill we go. Incomes become more, not less, unequal—on a fast-rising standard of life. As we have seen, wages not only tend towards the current subsistence level; they keep below it, a toll on life itself making good the shortage.

These figures raise the question as to how much good labor unions and labor parties do the working class—they do not settle it, but they give us something to think about.

THE INDUSTRIAL INVESTIGATION

The personnel of the Industrial Relations Commission is far from radical. Of the nine members three represent the employers, and the three labor members are either conservatives or reactionaries. The chairman, Frank P. Walsh, however, talks like a radical, and if his promises are kept the investigation will be about all that Socialists could desire. Here are some of the matters he says the commission will investigate:

> What is the relation of wages to the cost of production? How do wages compare with dividends in representative industries? Is cheap labor really cheap, or is the better paid labor cheapest in the long run?
>
> Living wage has come to be as much of a catchword as infant industries and pauper labor of Europe. What is a living, anyway? I know what it is for me, and that's all. Progress has made many new pleasures and privileges, and these must be shared equitably. *There is neither sense nor justice in the calm assumption that the refinements and beauties of life are only capable of being enjoyed by a certain upper class, and the mass of people have no higher aspirations than a full belly, a warm back and a sheltered head.* Is the employer using the many new inventions for mutual benefit, or is he concerned only with his own profits?

THE APPROACHING END OF THE UNSCRAMBLING

Every one of Wilson's "Five Brother" bills for restoring competition seems to be on the verge of complete emasculation. The comments of the New York *Evening Post's* Washington correspondent sum up the situation. As to the "rule of reason" by which the Oil and Tobacco Trusts were dissolved and so greatly benefited, he says:

> There has been no suggestion to interfere with the so-called "rule of reason" The President believes that it cannot be done in the nature of things, because the rule of reason is in itself not susceptible of definition.

He then takes up the other bills in the same spirit. His comment on "holding companies" typifies the whole situation:

> In his special message to Congress making the recommendations for trust legislation, the President submitted to Congress for its consideration the question whether private owners of capital stock shall be suffered to be themselves in effect holding companies, and an endeavor was made to ascertain whether the holding-company bill, to be framed, would provide for including cases of that sort. Mr. Wilson acknowledged that there was difficulty, and this violent hypothesis was suggested as showing one of the difficulties in drafting a law to cover such cases.
>
> Suppose one man held the majority of stock in two companies that were of the same business and that were independently organized and had been independently developed. The same person would control by ownership, by perfectly legitimate and bona-fide ownership of the stock, the chief power in both corporations. Of course, the owner could put in directors, even if he did not put the same person in the two corporations, who could virtually set aside competition between the two companies by dividing territory, or resorting to any of the ordinary devices for destroying competition.
>
> That is the thing that is difficult to deal with, according to the President, because there is no desire to stop the free right to buy stock. The difficult thing is to say how to forbid without interfering with perfectly legitimate business.

THE NEW REVIEW

CONTENTS FOR JUNE, 1914

Published Monthly by the New Review Publishing Association
80 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY.

ALEXANDER FRASER, President — MAX HEIDELBERG, Treasurer — LOUIS C. FRAINA, Secretary

Subscription $1.00 a year in United States and Mexico; six months, $0.50. $1.20 in Canada and $1.50 in foreign countries. Single copies, 10 cents. In bundles of 5 or more, 6 cents a copy.

Entered at the New York post-office as second-class mail matter.

A LETTER FROM A "CONVICT AND SOME OTHER THINGS

Benjamin J. Legere, the Little Falls strike leader now languishing in Auburn prison, a "convict" because of fidelity to his class, writes us as follows:

"During the long months I've been locked away in this Bastille I've derived much solace from The NEW REVIEW as it comes to me monthly. It is one of the most valuable periodicals in our revolutionary literature and I hope to see it grow to be ever more useful. In two months more I expect to be back among my comrades in the struggle, and then I hope to be able to render some service with the rest of you to place The NEW REVIEW in a position to do its work of education among an ever-increasing number of the adherents of our great cause."

That is the spirit which has sustained and encouraged The NEW REVIEW; *that* is the spirit which sustains the revolutionary movement; and *that is the spirit which will place* The NEW REVIEW *upon a self-supporting basis.*

Robert Rives La Monte, prominent Socialist author and lecturer, has consented to join our Board of Editors. La Monte's articles have been a valuable feature of The NEW REVIEW; and his support will be a pillar of strength to us.

Among those whose contributions will appear in early issues are Prof. Charles A. Beard, of Columbia University, author of "An Economic Interpretation of the United States Constitution" and other recent and valuable contributions to political science; and Prof. Jacques Loeb, the world-renowned biologist of Rockefeller Institute.

MEANING AND NECESSITY OF "CONTRIBUTING SUBSCRIBERS."

Wm. J. Robinson, in accepting membership in our Advisory Council and sending us a substantial donation, writes:

"I would earnestly recommend the creation of a class of 'Contributing Subscribers,' who would be willing to pay a dollar a month for one year, or as long as the NEW REVIEW may be in need of outside support. If you get 200 such contributors the NEW REVIEW has some foundation."

The suggestion is a very good one. Nor need we limit the subscribers to 200: the more money we receive the more circulation work we can do.

We shall with each *monthly* payment of $1.00 *send you two six-months' subscription cards,* which you can dispose of from month to month to friends or acquaintances.

UP MUST GO OUR CIRCULATION.

The NEW REVIEW must depend for support upon its friends until our circulation is large enough to make us self-supporting, and the plans now maturing promise to bring that about soon *with your help.*

We cannot succeed without *your* support—*you* are the arbiter of our destiny!

There are three ways you can help us in our circulation plans:

1.—If you are a member of a Socialist local, get the local to order a bundle of NEW REVIEWS monthly—if only for free distribution among the members. It'll pay! (Bundle orders six cents a copy, non-returnable.)

2.—Send in the names of friends and acquaintances, Socialist locals, economic and sociologic clubs, etc., for us to circularize.

3.—Best of all, *get your friends to subscribe. One subscription from each of you would double our circulation,* and start us on the way to Easy Street. You can get *four* yearly or *eight* six-months' subscription cards *for three dollars.* Cards are very easy to sell—and you supply us with much needed ready cash.

Give the lie to the Capitalist contention that "Socialist co-operation is the negation of co-operation" by co-operating with the NEW REVIEW!

We need good live agents everywhere. Everywhere the NEW REVIEW is being highly praised and given splendid publicity. All we need are agents to capitalize this praise and publicity. Write us. There is great earning capacity in our magazine for individuals and revolutionary locals.

LOUIS C. FRAINA,
Business Manager.

The New Review

Vol. II. **JUNE, 1914** **No. 6**

THE KEY TO THE MEXICAN PROBLEM

BY CHARLES A. BEARD

Contempt for other countries and scorn for their incredible follies are two characteristics that have always accompanied the development of nationalism. In the seventeenth century, when the English Whigs were laboring with might and main to establish parliamentary supremacy and had to execute one king and drive out another in order to accomplish that high purpose, Torcy, Louis XIV's cynical minister, remarked with ill-disguised amusement on the inherent disability of the Anglo-Saxon to conduct himself with decency and self-respect. The half-century of turmoil in the British Islands was looked upon by less-informed continentals as a battle of kites and crows arising from a temperamental opposition to ordered and settled social life. The Frenchman, who then laughed at the Englishman's expense, of course prided himself upon his own good sense and innate devotion to proprieties under the beneficent rule of the Grand Monarch.

Long afterward, for reasons similar to those which had disturbed England, the land of Torcy and Louis XIV was torn with civil discord which ran a course almost identical with that across the Channel. The English had executed Charles I. The French beheaded Louis XVI. The English had tried a Commonwealth, the French set up a Republic. The English had instituted a Protectorate. The French experimented with a Consulate. The despotism of Cromwell was matched by that of the Corsican adventurer. The English had welcomed their restored and flattered Charles II. The French endured their Louis XVIII. The English had driven out James II, the Stuart who forgot and learned nothing. The French ousted Charles X, the Bourbon who, like James II, forgot and learned nothing. And for William III, there was a bourgeois Louis Philippe.

Strange as it may seem, the French contest for parliamentary