

OCTOBER 1913

Ten Cents

# *The* **New Review**

A-MONTHLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

## CONTENTS

August Bebel . . . . .	President Wilson and Mexico . . . . .	William J. Gaynor . . . . .	H. S.
Socialist Party and Republican Bloc in France . . . . .	<i>Paul Louis</i>		
The Chinese Question . . . . .	<i>Theodore Rothstein</i>		
Socialism and the Municipalities . . . . .	<i>Henry L. Slobodin</i>		
Lobbying and Class Rule . . . . .	<i>Louis C. Fraina</i>		
I Buried My Love . . . . .	<i>Louise W. Kneeland</i>		
Story of the Putumayo Atrocities IV. The <i>Truth</i> Exposures . . . . .	<i>W. E. Hardenburg</i>		
The American Civil War . . . . .	<i>Karl Marx</i>		
The Eternal Masculine . . . . .	<i>Harry Kemp</i>		
The Novels of Daniel Carson Goodman . . . . .	<i>André Tridon</i>		
We . . . . .	<i>Olga von Zellen</i>		

---

150 Nassau Street

New York

# The New Review

Published Monthly  
by the

New Review Publishing Association

150 Nassau Street, New York City

Alexander Fraser, *President*  
Bertha W. Howe, *Treasurer*  
Robert M. Lackey, *Secretary*

Herman Simpson, . . . . . *Editor*

### SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

One Year, . . . \$1.00    Six Months . . . \$ .50  
Canada, . . . . . 1.20    Foreign . . . . . 1.50  
Single Copies, 10 cents

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

## FRIENDS of the NEW REVIEW

in New York and vicinity will be glad to learn of the formation of a League of Volunteers for the purpose of extending the circulation and influence of the NEW REVIEW through various activities. ☐ A meeting of the League will take place on Wednesday, Oct. 8, at 8.15 P. M., at the office of the New Review, 150 Nassau St., New York. All our friends are cordially invited to attend.

# The New Review

Vol. I.

OCTOBER, 1913

No. 21

## August Bebel

The German Social Democracy is the greatest and most powerful of all Socialist parties. In many ways, and particularly in the happy union of theory and practice, it has come to be regarded as the model Socialist party, the one which other Socialist parties strive to imitate and to approach, though with indifferent success. But it has also been the most fortunate of Socialist parties. It did not have to overcome the traditions of a successive series of Socialist sects, as in France, or of a conservative trade union movement, as in England and the United States. It was not obliged to combat the popular delusion of a democracy in which there were supposed to be no class divisions; the theory and the practice of the class struggle found a ready soil in a country in which the existence of social classes was an undisputed fact, acknowledged alike by the government, the men of science and the popular mind. Nor did it have to overcome the tremendous obstacle of a heterogeneous working class, of diverse traditions, varied moral and intellectual standards, and many tongues; excepting the three border provinces of Posen, Alsace-Lorraine and Schleswig-Holstein, the population of Germany is predominantly and almost exclusively German in speech, thought and historical tradition. Such political corruption as is prevalent among us and is accepted almost as an unavoidable evil, even in the labor movement, is hardly known in Germany; thus even in the worst days of the anti-Socialist laws, the Socialists were accorded an honest count in the elections. The German Social Democracy was also fortunate in the time of its appearance upon the historical scene. Born but a few years before the political unification of Germany and having effected its own internal unity a few years after, the Social Democracy grew and developed with the immense growth and

## OUR STANDING OFFERS

	Regular Price	Our Price
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	
The Larger Aspects of Socialism. By Wm. English Walling	1.50	\$2.00
	\$2.50	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	
Socialism As It Is. By Wm. English Walling	2.00	\$2.40
	\$3.00	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	
The Masses, 1 year	1.00	\$1.50
	\$2.00	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	
The Inter. Socialist Review 1 year	1.00	\$1.50
	\$2.00	
The New Review, 1 year	\$1.00	
"Comrade Yetta." By Albert Edwards	1.35	\$1.90
	\$2.35	

The BUNDLE RATE of the New Review  
is 6c. per copy

## NEW REVIEW PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION

Kindly Mention the NEW REVIEW When Writing to Advertisers.

## Become a Shareholder

IN OUR PUBLISHING BUSINESS  
NOT TO MAKE MONEY

BUT

## TO MAKE SOCIALISTS

The publication fund of the NEW REVIEW has been raised from the sales of shares. Many men and women prominent in the Socialist movement are stockholders. They have contributed liberally in order to start the enterprise. Additional capital is required to continue the publication until it is self-supporting. Several thousands dollars worth of stock is yet to be sold. Common shares are \$100 each and preferred shares \$10 each. You may become a part owner of the NEW REVIEW by purchasing one or more shares of either class. Payments may be made in installments.

development of industrialism and large city life in the German empire.

But the German Social Democracy also enjoyed an unequalled good fortune in the persons of its chosen spokesmen and leaders. At its cradle stood such intellectual giants as Marx and Engels and Lassalle, and the impress of their genius upon the party has become indelible. It is mainly owing to these great men, though of course their efforts were favored by the high intellectual life of Germany, that the Socialist movement has come to mean the Unity of Science and the Working Class. And the immediate disciples and successors of these men, Liebknecht, Bebel, Auer, Singer, Kautsky, Mehring, Clara Zetkin, and many others, have boldly held aloft the proud banner and maintained unimpaired the high traditions of the founders of German Socialism.

What is it that gave Bebel his immense influence and pre-eminent position not only in the German but also in the International Socialist movement? It is very natural for those who were in intimate contact with Bebel to speak now of his fine personal traits. It is natural for the many thousands who listened to the sound of his voice and were persuaded by his arguments to speak of his great oratorical powers; he is said to have been the only real orator in the Reichstag—at least, that was Bismarck's opinion—and notwithstanding his oratorical ability he was in no way shallow; a most unusual thing, which has not happened since Demosthenes, as Engels said. And particularly is it natural for German workingmen to take pride in Bebel as one of themselves, the ideal workingman, who, though he had risen to power and fame, ever remained one of them, faithful to the class that had unbounded faith in him, faithful to his beginning, to his very end. But to those who have not known Bebel personally or been within reach of his voice, to the Socialist millions in all countries, it is not Bebel's personality or his oratory or his proletarian origin that has endeared him in life and made his fame imperishable in death, but it is the same qualities of heart and mind and the same services to the working class that he shared in common with all his great associates and predecessors: Revolutionary aspiration coupled with practical, revolutionary and revolutionizing activity; steadfast adherence to the ideal and goal of the movement, while utilizing every means to immediate advancement, economic, political and intellectual; viewing the movement as a whole through all its varied aspects and activities and necessary historical stages and limitations; and with all this, endless labor and endless patience.

Perhaps Bebel's greatest achievement was his mastery of Socialist parliamentary policy. In this respect, indeed, he greatly excelled Liebknecht, who never felt quite at home in the humdrum of parliamentary routine. But Bebel never became a victim of that "parliamentary cretinism" which imagines that the fate of nations and of humanity is moulded by parliamentary eloquence and is decided by parliamentary votes, that "parliamentary cretinism" upon which Marx ever poured the vials of his wrath and scorn. Bebel well knew that all bourgeois parliaments are, from the standpoint of the working class, smitten with an incurable impotency and barrenness. At the convention of Dresden, in 1903, he expressed the experience of a lifetime in the following words:

All legislation, whether in the German Reichstag or in the parliaments of other countries, is so wretched, so inadequate and so blundering, that when to-day a law is adopted, to-morrow all the world sees that it must again be altered. . . . Why is it so? Because the class antagonisms grow ever more acute, so that finally only half laws are made, because it is no longer possible to make whole laws. . . . I have often asked myself: In this situation is the parliamentary work worth the trouble and the labor, the time and the money? In many respects we do in the Reichstag mere treadmill toil. But of course I am too eager for the fight to yield to this mood, and so I say to myself: There's no help for it; it's got to be gnawed through and cut through! We must do what we can, but we must not deceive ourselves concerning the situation! And I say this to you so that you will not believe that because we now have eighty-one men in the Reichstag therefore we can accomplish wonders.

To Bebel parliamentary and electoral activity was never much more than a means to rouse the dormant masses and bring them to a realization of what they are and what they can be. It is to the masses themselves and their intelligent activity that Bebel looked to save the masses. Hence his own attitude in parliament was eminently revolutionary. While trying to wrest from the bourgeois parties whatever little reforms could be wrested from them, he never tried to curry favor with them or to win their good opinion. At a time when the whole country was intoxicated with victory and conquest, he and Liebknecht, representatives of a small and insignificant minority, condemned the war and the conquest and proclaimed their fraternity with the foully maligned victims of the Paris Commune. For this "treachery to the fatherland" the Iron Chancellor condemned them to a long term of imprisonment. But they lived to see their implacable enemy hurled from power, and their party, which he aimed to stifle in a river of blood, become the strongest party in the empire. That heroic attitude of Bebel and of Liebknecht was, in one sense, the decisive act of their lives. It was decisive of the entire future course of the German Social Democracy. It signified that the

newly born party of labor was radically different from all bourgeois parties, whether agrarian-conservative, or capitalist-liberal, or middle class-democratic. It established the fact that the new party, in order to attain supreme power in society, must develop according to laws of its own and must break completely with the ideas of the ruling classes. That act of bold defiance at the moment of extreme peril kept away from the Social Democracy for many years thereafter all those who were hungering after the flesh pots of governmental favors, all those who were eager to obtain immediate little "practical" successes and thereby draw large numbers to the party, all those who were anxious to "arrive." Ever since then the German Social Democracy has had to be revolutionary, or cease to be.

Bebel himself understood thoroughly the real cause of his unparalleled popularity. In 1903, at the Dresden convention, which marked the height of his power and influence, he spoke as follows:

And now I shall disclose a secret to those whom it concerns, if indeed it be a secret. My opponents always say, There is old Bebel, there is nothing to be done, he has the masses behind him. But why has he the masses behind him? Because everybody must say, he has made many a mistake, done many a foolish thing, permitted himself sometimes to be carried away by his temperament, but even in his folly he was always an honest man. Yes, even with his mistakes he believed he was serving the party. And if you, whom it concerns, wish to have the same influence, go and do likewise. I am sorry to have to utter these boastful words. But when one has been the object of personal attacks as I have been, then one must speak out, unveil before you the mystery of Sais, and inform you why things are so. It is so because at all times I honestly represented the Social Democratic standpoint, because even now I am in accord with the masses from whom I have sprung.

Bebel's achievements as a Socialist party leader do not, however, exhaust the list of his services to humanity. He was also a pioneer in the cause of woman's emancipation. This, indeed, is his peculiar distinction among Socialists, and by his book on "Woman and Socialism," which has been published in over fifty editions and in nearly all civilized tongues, he has furthered immensely both the cause of woman and the cause of Socialism, and linked the two indissolubly in the minds of millions. And if to-day all Socialists, with a few insignificant exceptions, regard the emancipation of woman, her economic, social and political equality with man, as equal in importance with the emancipation of the working class from wage slavery, it is due in the main to August Bebel, the foremost champion of woman's emancipation from age-long inferiority and thralldom.

## President Wilson and Mexico

None but the press coolies of American and European high finance will withhold admiration from President Wilson for his firm and unyielding attitude toward the assassin and usurper who now lords it over the larger portion of Mexico. The President's immovable determination to refuse recognition to the government of Huerta and his band of cutthroats may not be good politics from the standpoint of "dollar diplomacy," but it is very good politics from the standpoint of common morality, and in the long run even from the standpoint of the speculators and financiers who are so greedy and impatient to devour and exploit the immense natural resources of Mexico and the other Caribbean countries. Capital is proverbially timid. It eschews turmoil and confusion. It needs the protecting hand of a strong government to perform its economic functions and historic role. It needs order and tranquility. But the bloody Huerta and his accomplices in crime have demonstrated their incapacity to establish a stable and orderly government in Mexico.

A stable and orderly government is in fact the sole aim and purpose of President Wilson's Mexican policy. It is with a view to this, and to this alone, that he sought to bring about the voluntary elimination of Huerta from the coming Presidential election, an armistice among the contending factions, their agreement to abide by the results of the election, and a "regular" election. The establishment of constitutional government in Mexico is the only purpose avowed by the President.

We are perfectly ready to admit the unselfishness of the President's purpose, but we cannot possibly see how he can accomplish it. He may succeed in overcoming the resistance of Huerta. By refusing to Huerta's government the diplomatic recognition and financial assistance of the United States, he may succeed in making his position untenable and in compelling his withdrawal. In fact, signs are not wanting to indicate that since the reading of Wilson's message in Congress, Huerta's position is being slowly but effectively undermined. The stepping out of Reyes from the Ministry of Justice and of Urrutia from the Ministry of the Interior, the refusal of European financiers to advance any further considerable sums of money upon the big loan recently concluded, the refusal of the Liberal members of the House of Representatives to comply with the

appointment of Eduardo Tamariz as Minister of Public Instruction—these and other facts of a similar nature would seem to warrant the conclusion that the days of the present tyrant of Mexico are numbered. But is there any reasonable ground for the conclusion that, Huerta out of the way, a stable constitutional government will be possible in Mexico? None whatever.

The present political chaos in Mexico—and substantially the same may be asserted of all the other Caribbean republics—is the direct outcome of its chaotic social and economic conditions. Over four-fifths of the population of Mexico are, in whole or in part, of Indian blood. About two millions of the descendants of ancient Indian tribes are to this day ignorant of the Spanish language. The Constitution prohibits all distinctions of race, and some of the Presidents of Mexico have been of Indian stock, but the race as a whole is held in subjection and peonage. The tribal lands that have descended to them from time immemorial have been largely stolen from them and converted into vast estates, which they are forced to cultivate for the profit of the new masters. Slavery, like distinction of race, is legally prohibited, but the law compels the debtor and his descendants after him to render labor in payment of the debt, and the wages paid to the peons are so miserable that they can never get out of debt. Moreover, the landlords alone keep books, they are also the judges and sole depositories of political power. Thus the peon can never free himself from his debt slavery, which his children inherit after him.

The bulk of Mexican lands is said to be held by ten thousand families. Some idea of the conditions of landholding in Mexico may be obtained from the following statement in the "Statesman's Year Book" for 1907: "In the five years 1900-04, 572 titles to lands were issued embracing an area of 2,423,979 hectares." As one hectare equals 2.47 acres, this gives an average of 11,330 acres to each allotment. But in fact these lands, stolen from the Indians, are generally given away to those who already own lands. Estates of 12,000,000 acres are not uncommon. The State of Morelos, in which the followers of Zapata have been so strong, is declared on good authority to be owned by twenty-eight men. The landholders of this state were recently reported to have made a loan of three million pesos to Huerta on condition that he drive Zapata out of the state and restore former conditions on the estates (New York *Evening Post*, Sept. 2). Huerta seems to have carried out his

promise, with the result that the Zapatistas have concentrated in the neighboring State of Guerrero (*Regeneracion*, Sept. 13), for conditions as to landholding are everywhere the same and the Indians everywhere have grown desperate. "Divide the lands!" is the cry of the Mexican masses. A ranch formerly owned by Felix Diaz and confiscated by the Constitutionalists was to be divided among the poorer classes on Aug. 30 (*Evening Post*, Aug. 29), but a few days later we learn that the Yaqui Indians have alarmed their allies, the Sonora Constitutionalists, by demanding that the insurgent government return to them forthwith all the lands that were taken from them by Porfirio Diaz. The demand of the Yaquis came in the form of an ultimatum: "Return our lands or fight!" (*Evening Post*, Sept. 2). The Yaquis are an agricultural people, of the noblest Indian type. To get some idea of the treacheries and unspeakable cruelties perpetrated upon them, one must read John Kenneth Turner's "Barbarous Mexico." For thirty years campaigns of extermination were waged against them under all sorts of pretexts, and thousands were sold into slavery as far south as Yucatan. But the lands seized from them were apportioned not only among influential Mexicans, but also among Americans and other foreigners. The wily old tyrant and his clique of Cientificos thus aimed to secure the aid of the American capitalists and government. Is President Wilson now prepared to permit the loss of these lands owned by Americans?

President Wilson's "constitutional" remedy will not help Mexico, will not restore order and tranquility to that distracted country. Porfirio Diaz maintained order by means of a most atrocious tyranny, which finally became unbearable even to large sections of the ruling class of Mexico. But constitutional government of a republican, not to say of a democratic, type has become impossible in Mexico until such time as the lands are restored to the Mexican people, that is to say, chiefly to the Indians. The social equilibrium of Mexico has been profoundly shaken and there is only one way of restoring it. Mexico is predominantly an agricultural country. In a population of 13,606,000 in 1900 there were only twenty-one cities with populations ranging above 25,000, and only two of these had a population of over 100,000. There are no industries to absorb the expropriated population. They must remain tillers of the soil, and they refuse to labor as slaves on the lands of their fathers.

There can be no settled government in Mexico, there can

be no enduring peace until the land question has been solved, until the expropriators have been expropriated, European and American as well as Mexican. It is this which makes the Mexican problem so difficult of solution, for it is not merely an internal problem, but has also international bearings. Is the Wilson-Bryan Administration prepared to keep its hands off while the lands of American citizens are being taken away from them? Can it do this in spite of pressure by our own capitalists and by European governments?

A plutocratic administration in Washington would know definitely the line of action prescribed for it. Whether it intervened with military force or not, it would lend every possible assistance to the ruling classes of Mexico to restore order and stifle in blood the aspirations of the Mexican masses. Peace might thus be established, even though the peace of the desert. A proletarian administration in Washington would pursue the very opposite course and would lend every possible assistance to the peasant rebels, for revolutionary governments are just as propagandistic as conservative or reactionary ones. But what will be the final decision of the present Democratic Administration? That it cannot actively aid the peasant rebels is certain. Even if it could overcome its ingrained middle class scruples, its respect for the "sacred rights" of property acquired according to the forms of law, the Southern leaders of the Democratic party, who are now playing first fiddle in Washington, would interpose their weighty veto. To the Southern leaders the Mexican question is one of race as well as of property relations. Thus Senator Bacon of Georgia, chairman of the Senate committee on foreign affairs, blames the whites of Mexico for the present situation of their country. The white men of Mexico, he says, "are sitting back in personal security and letting brigands, because they are nothing more, enlist all the revolutionary, anarchistic elements in that country, people who like the license of war and plunder and ravage under the forms of war; and it is nothing in the world but brigandage. They are perfectly willing that their country should be tramped and marked from one end to the other by these irresponsible bandits, and they sit back in security in their clubs, in their city residences and on their estates. . . . Order can be restored and good government can be maintained in Mexico whenever the white men of Mexico are ready to risk their lives for that purpose." For the "poor whites" of Mexico are not at all eager to fight for those of their color who own city residences and country estates and

belong to clubs, and the government must recruit the army with convicts and poor, friendless captives, who take to their heels at the first opportunity. Well, this being the view of the leading spokesman of the Administration's foreign policy, it would be absurd to expect from it any sympathy with the agrarian revolters. The best that we can hope for is that it will adhere to its announced intention of keeping its hands off. However, the President has bound himself to this policy only so long as Huerta remains in power. But what will be his course if Huerta finally steps aside, permits somebody else to be "constitutionally" elected (by whom?), and the agrarian revolt continues in undiminished vigor? President Wilson may be compelled to find an answer to this knotty question very soon, for a "constitutional" election of a new President of Mexico may, after all, be held on the 26th day of this month of October.

---

### William J. Gaynor

In the few days that have passed since the death of William J. Gaynor, much has been written about his remarkable life and character. All the obvious and obtrusive traits of the man have been dwelt upon—his unusual intellectual attainments and force of character, his moral courage and fierce energy, his rude manners and fondness for street urchins, his love of books and of long walks. Of the meaning of his life as a whole we find nowhere even a faint indication. And yet the career of William J. Gaynor has a very definite meaning, and confined though it was within the limits of the great city it sheds a vivid light upon an important phase of the public life of America.

Let us briefly recapitulate the leading events of this career. Gaynor begins his public life with an attack upon the petty political gangs of both old parties in the town of Flatbush, now a part of Brooklyn and the Greater City. In combination with other young bourgeois reformers he fights and smashes the big political machine of Hugh J. McLaughlin, Democratic boss of Brooklyn. He sends to the penitentiary John Y. McKane, the petty boss of a small community, but whose election frauds decided the fate of at least one Presidential election. Thus far Gaynor has been nothing more than a bourgeois "good government" reformer, though acting with the zeal and determination of a Cromwellian major-general. But in 1896, when all his reforming

bourgeois associates broke away from the Democratic party, we find him espousing the cause of Bryan right in the "enemy's country." Plainly, we are dealing here with an unusual type of bourgeois reformer, one who not only fights the bosses and political machines in order to put an end to what the *New York Times* calls their "assessments," but who also is not afraid to resort to what the *Times* is pleased to call "confiscation." The peculiar proclivities of the man also showed themselves during his long term as a judge of the Supreme Court, when he became noted for some "radical" decisions, and even more so for his never-ending attacks upon the violence, arbitrariness and despotism of the police. His name was frequently brought up in the conventions of the Democratic party for nomination as Mayor, Governor and even Vice-President, but it was as frequently dropped, partly because he was considered too radical by the timid and stupid conservatives, partly because he was feared by the political bosses, partly because he had left the Roman Catholic Church and had been divorced by his first wife. Thus he paid the penalty for his intellectual independence and for refusing to bend the knee to the Baal of pharisaism and Mrs. Grundy. Finally, in 1909, his espousal of the cause of young John Duffy, a poor victim of police tyranny, led to his nomination for Mayor of New York, at first by independent organizations, then by Tammany Hall. In the ensuing campaign he attacked with equal vehemence the Traction Trust and that arch-pharisee of municipal politics, R. Fulton Cutting, who as president of the Citizens' Union traded the confidence of his dupes for Tammany lucre.

Gaynor's short career as Mayor gave him a national reputation. Those who are supposed to know affirm that his administration was the best New York had had in decades. He certainly knew how to lop off some useless offices, with or without the express permission of the law, but that he went, or could go, or wished to go far in this direction is, to say the least, highly doubtful. He tried to put a stop to the indiscriminate clubbing and arresting of citizens by the police, and this was perhaps his greatest service to the community. Strikers, of course, continued to be the victims of police brutality, and the strike of the municipal garbage gatherers was put down with a firm hand as "sedition." No police arbitrariness toward the individual citizen, but capitalist order must be maintained against the workers in revolt. To the traction magnates the city was handed over bag and baggage, as indeed what else could the Mayor do?

For the Traction Trust is the great banks, which dominate cities, states and nations. No bourgeois mayor could cope successfully with the immense power of high finance, which can be overthrown only by a social revolution.

After this sketch of his career, is it still necessary to characterize Gaynor? He was a pioneer of bourgeois conservatism. At a time when the open looting of the community by political rings and bosses was as widely tolerated and connived at as the infinitely more extensive looting by financiers, railroads and industrial companies, Gaynor took up arms against the "primitive accumulation" in its most flagrant forms. His support of Bryan was a protest against the "illegitimate" accumulation of wealth "by trick and device, by means of public franchises and of laws devised for aggrandizement of the few at the expense of the many," and he asked whether the "comparatively few" who had amassed "inflated fortunes" by these methods were not the real "anarchists, the endangerers of our institutions and social order." He abhorred the lawless tyranny of the police because it led to contempt for the law and hatred of the public authorities, but he let loose the police upon strikers, and particularly striking municipal employees, because they violated the fundamental law of capitalist society—the legitimate exploitation of the many by the few. At the same time he was far too enlightened to join in the hue and cry against the red flag of Socialism, the meaning of which he explained to an astonished city, and criticised the courts for interposing a barrier against factory legislation. In many respects he was a pioneer of that forward movement of the American bourgeoisie which has resulted in the advent of the Progressive party and in the present Wilson-Bryan Administration. But he never was an imperialist and militarist like Roosevelt, and his mind was more open to an understanding of the primary needs of the working class, even to its existence as a working class, than is the case with either Wilson or Bryan. All in all, with all his personal failings and the inevitable limitations of his age and his class, he towered head and shoulders not only above the common run of politicians, but even above most of the much better known leaders of the great parties of capital.

H. S.

## Socialist Party and Republican Bloc in France

By PAUL LOUIS (Paris)

The question of the relations between the Socialist party and the diverse factions of the anti-Socialistic Republicans is, one may say, a permanent issue in France. It never entirely disappears from view, but there are moments when it is of especial interest to the public, and particularly the proletariat. At the present moment it again occupies our interest to a rather unusual degree.

In the radical wing of the Republican party, the governing party, there have always been men who, either from personal conviction or electoral expediency, have looked with favor on making advances to the Socialists. Likewise among the Socialists there have always been some who for identical reasons were inclined to accept concessions from the Republicans. At the present writing, those "on both sides of the barricade," to adopt a favorite expression of M. Clémenceau, who have constantly preached this alliance, are renewing the assault. In their opinion the circumstances are too favorable to let them slip by without at least an attempt to exploit them in the interest of their pet notion.

How is this renewed enthusiasm to be explained? What are the objections so often and so victoriously raised against this policy of entangling alliances, so decisively condemned by past experience?

It is well known that France, in addition to the Socialist, the Radical, and the Moderate Republican parties (the last, moreover, nominally divided into two wings), has also several factions which we ordinarily refer to as the obsolete, the reactionary parties. Here we find, for instance, the Clericals "of popular action" who occasionally profess reconciliation with the republican form of government. No one is any longer fooled by such professions. The past has shown that this group is of a distinctly "confessional" character, blindly following the dictates of the Holy See, and ready to support with eagerness any monarchistic venture. Then come the monarchists proper with one or two labels, the Royalists with their dream of the Duke of Orleans on the throne—with or without a parliament—and the Bonapartists nursing their ideal of a Caesarian restoration. Neither the Bonapartists nor the Royalists—nor, for that matter, the Clericals themselves,—form a serious menace to

progress, for none of them has any deep roots in the masses. The French people has not yet forgotten that the Bourbons came back in 1814-15 in the baggage wagons of the foreigners, and that in 1848 the Orleanist monarchy succumbed because it denied universal suffrage. It still remembers that the First Empire led to Waterloo, the Second to Sedan, in each case bringing territorial losses. Clericalism never gains enthusiastic adhesion in a country whose culture is essentially secular and whose innate scepticism protects it from the domination of the priest.

But these three parties (Bonapartist, Orleanist, Clerical), powerless and almost inoffensive in themselves, become dangerous when, quite outside of their own circles, restricted both in electoral power and in influence, they obtain more or less effective support. They become actually prominent when they lend the assistance of their organizations to the "Tricolor" Republicans, as Marx called them, that is, to those Republicans who use all their wits to counteract the proletarian propaganda and to maintain the privileges and the influence of the bourgeoisie. That is where we find ourselves at present: the Republican party has formed a new alliance with the retrograde "obsolete" factions; the fusing element has been a common fear, a common hatred of Socialism and Syndicalism.

It is now exactly eight years since the political and social reaction, bold enough now to dispense with all hypocrisy and disguise, has been in complete control of France. It took possession of the country the moment all the old divisions of opinion fell on the apparent, if not the definitive, settlement of the religious question. The mass of the Republican party changed front: the religious problem gave way to the social question. The resulting divisions in the French people did not correspond necessarily to those of yore. Proletarians and bourgeois, especially petty bourgeois, had been able to march shoulder to shoulder in the fight to free laic society from Roman tutelage, to abolish the church budgets, to drive out the congregations, and give back the schools to purposes of education. Now, however, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie were to part company. The proletariat was determined to shake off the shackles of bourgeois domination. The bourgeoisie had climbed into power in the middle of the nineteenth century and the consolidation of the parliamentary system was the monument to its triumph. It was not willing to see itself dethroned by the working masses. In its own defence the bourgeoisie resumed



the tactics that had succeeded in 1848, and in 1871 after the temporary triumph of the Commune. It attempted to fuse all conflicting factions, Free-Thinkers and Clericals, Monarchists and Republicans. The issue was to preserve the present social order against those who were determined to erect a new one on its ruins.

This coalition, of course, was not a perfect one. I mean that it was not inherently permanent and defections were constantly taking place beneath an apparently unified surface. I mean also that a certain number of advanced Republicans, although anti-Socialistic at heart, refused to follow to the extreme those conservative Republicans who were bent on combining all the forces hostile to Socialism. Such men, tossed back and forth between the Socialists and their opponents, were trying to mix oil and water. They succeeded only in leaving the path unobstructed to the forces of repression and reaction.

I cannot rehearse all the details of the struggle during these past eight years. Whether the cabinets were headed by Clémenceau, by Briand, by Caillaux or by Barthou, these years have been featured by repeated acts of oppression on the working class as a whole, by reiterated threats and by brutal acts against the syndicats (labor unions), by an exaltation of Nationalism and Imperialism which tended toward deafening every anguished cry from the multitudes in the uproar of chauvinistic acclamation, by the defeat of reforms solemnly promised, whether of fiscal or of labor improvement, by the undertaking of foreign expansion such as the Morocco enterprise. In every case the working class, organized either politically or economically, has tenaciously given blow for blow, always bent on increasing its offensive power. The figures of membership which the Socialist party and the Federation of Labor now present, bear eloquent witness to the fact that the struggle has not been all in vain.

But while this offensive movement was gaining in momentum, governmental repression, sustained by the Moderates, by the Radical majority, by the Clerical and Monarchical coalition, became more and more severe.

I have already laid bare in the *NEW REVIEW* the forces that conspired to effect the election of M. Raymond Poincaré to the Presidency of the Republic. That election had as a direct result the forming of the Barthou Cabinet, which adopted as its fundamental program the re-establishment of the three years' military service. This meant the substitution of the idea of the "pro-

fessional army" for that of the "national army" such as the Socialists have been demanding, including also all the material and moral evils which the increase of militarism entails. Naturally objection was raised in the working class and in the working class alone. The numberless meetings organized in Paris and in the provinces by the Socialists and the unions, the vast petitions set in circulation, especially the unrest developing in the barracks against a policy which confined the soldiers under the colors for another year, brought the will of the public authorities to an orgasm of violence. A bill was introduced in parliament to suppress the General Federation of Labor (C. G. T.) and to subject to constant restraint and menace the trade and industrial unions, by authorizing the government to intervene in the mechanism and administration of such organizations. This was the most violent, the most bare-faced intrusion that could well be imagined into the existence of proletarian organization; it was an attack on liberty fit to inflame every friend of liberty. To facilitate the work that would follow the passage of this law, the government organized a general system of arbitrary arrests among the secretaries of the unions.

Premier Barthou, who had charge of all this repressive activity, was all the more vigorous against organized labor in that the proletariat represented the only power capable of thwarting his policy of retrogression. He was especially anxious to fix public attention on the war he had begun on the C. G. T. and the allied groups, in order the better to divert attention from the financial crisis, that old bugbear which haunts every strongly militarized state in Europe, but which is nowhere else so conspicuous as in France. The cost of colonialism, imperialism and militarism is so enormous in France, it has increased so astoundingly in recent years, that the annual deficit rises to 700 millions of francs (about \$140,000,000), while the normal revenue reaches 4,700 millions (about \$940,000,000). Furthermore these 700 millions take no account of the exceptional provisions for armaments which must be made in answer to similar expenditures covered in Germany by an extraordinary war tax. Of course, the French government can have recourse to loans, but its bonds are already 17 francs below par and to borrow is always a confession of embarrassment. In any event, the deficit will reappear the following year with no less amplitude. Doubtless the Barthou government, like that of Germany, can fall back on the stored up wealth of the bourgeoisie, but revenue has been traditionally raised in France by indirect, never by

direct contribution; with the result that, all practical solutions of the problem having been put aside or postponed, the deficit remains and grows ever larger. The repressive policy of the present cabinet is thus a device to excuse, through its energy against the foes of the social order, its ineptitude, its sloth in the face of financial disaster. The upper and middle bourgeoisie has fallen blindly into line. The official republic is just as violent in its opposition to the proletariat as was in former years the Empire or the Monarchy of July. The obsolete factions have been unable to contain their joy at the prevalence of this absolutism, this Caesarism operating under the label of democracy. That is why new life has been given to the idea of a reconstruction of the Republican "bloc", which would bring together the Socialists and the Radicals who still proclaim their fidelity to their ancient doctrines, their belief in a government of the people, by the people, for the people.

This "bloc" was actually in operation from 1899 to 1905. It lasted from the advent to power of Waldeck-Rousseau down to the time when the Socialist party accomplished its unity. It is worth while to glance at a few episodes of the history of Socialism in France.

When, toward the end of 1898, nationalistic jingoism was threatening republican institutions in France and there was some ground for fearing a *coup d'état* by the generals of the army, the Socialist organizations, traditionally disunited and in five discordant factions, formed a vigilance committee which became one of mutual co-operation to take any measures necessary to defend public liberty. Some months later, in June, 1899, the Waldeck-Rousseau cabinet was formed of members from the different republican groups. The portfolio of commerce was entrusted to an eleventh-hour Socialist, M. Millerand. Precisely because the Socialists had always been divided, they had never considered the question of participating in the executive authority of a capitalistic regime, but it at once became obvious that such participation was incompatible with the principles of International Socialism. The advent of M. Millerand to the cabinet provoked a great crisis in the party. One faction of the Socialists followed him. Others, notably the Guesdists and the Blanquists, declared the alliance broken and reserved their liberty of action; and in fact, whenever the government sided against the working class by sending troops to interfere in strikes, they attacked the government without mercy. To justify their attitude, the "ministerial" Socialists pointed to

the perils that threatened free institutions, the necessity of quelling Clericals and Caesarians, the possibility of obtaining, when opportunity offered, reforms for the working class. The anti-ministerials retorted that the bourgeois government, whether or not a Socialist were part of it, would always be driven to proletarian repression, that by such collusion Socialism would lose its reputation, abolish its reason for existence and proclaim its own treason in letting itself be spattered with the blood of repressed workers.

One group of Socialists not only clung to its policy of participation in power, but when M. Millerand retired, it became more ministerial still under M. Combes, who succeeded to the premiership of Waldeck-Rousseau. The Republican "bloc", that is to say, the alliance of this faction with the other groups hostile to the Church and the monarchists, had been consolidated. It was no longer a question simply of crushing Caesarism, already vanquished and reduced to impotence; it was a question rather of sustaining a policy of secularization, which was to begin with the dissolution of the congregations and end with the separation of Church and State. The uncompromising Socialists, those faithful to Socialist doctrine, did not deny their support to this policy, but they held that such conditional and intermittent support did not prevent them from attacking the Combes ministry whenever it entered the fight against the working class. The Socialists who had earned the title of "reformists" had concluded with the radicals an almost permanent compact, which found expression in the Delegation of the Lefts. This Delegation of the Lefts was a committee to which all the groups participating in the bloc sent representatives with full authority, and this caucus determined the policy of the whole bloc. Since the government accepted the suggestions of this committee, where in fact it found only friends, this Delegation came in the last analysis to direct the whole governmental policy. The trend taken by Reformist Socialism in such an atmosphere is obvious. It was at this time that a Socialist favorable to the bloc became vice-president of the Chamber, thanks to Radical votes.

Looking back over ten years, it becomes apparent that the bloc has done absolutely nothing for the working class. The proletariat was harassed under the Combes ministry as under those before it. The only result has been that the policy of certain Socialists has aroused in labor union circles a feeling of distrust that has produced a lasting fissure in the party. More-

over, if the bloc brought half of the Socialists in France into better relations with the Republican bourgeoisie, it in reality created between that half and the rest of the Socialists an abysmal gap. Socialism now gave the spectacle of lamentable discord. The most painful polemics began between its members. The accusations that were passed back and forth effectually sterilized all propaganda. Increase in Socialist party membership came to an end. The time had come for the abolition of the Republican bloc and the formation of the Socialist bloc, that is, of Socialist unity. This was the labor accomplished by the international congress of Amsterdam in August, 1904, and the national congress of Paris a few months later.

It is not my intention to repeat here the historic debates that characterized these two assemblies. It is well known that the congress of Amsterdam condemned the French Reformists and all alliances with the bourgeois parties, at the same time sustaining the principle of the class struggle. The French Reformists had the alternative of yielding or of leaving the International. With great loyalty they adopted the former course. The unity program adopted at the Paris congress did not, of course, exclude the policy of the Reformists, but it proclaimed the hostility of Socialism to the present State. There was uniformity of sentiment on the following points: 1, Socialism must offer permanent and fundamental opposition to the bourgeoisie; 2, the struggle of Socialism is a class struggle; 3, the Socialist deputies in parliament must reject compromise and form a solid block against all the bourgeois factions of whatever color. This was the end of the Republican bloc, and in fact, before the solemn adoption of the unity platform, the bloc had been shattered, dismembered by the pressure of circumstances.

This, nevertheless, is the bloc that some would like to resurrect at present. Last April a cautious and timid movement in this direction was begun in the ranks of the Radicals and among certain ones of the Socialists. One can easily understand the desire of certain Radical leaders to return to this antiquated policy, of which the best thing that can be said is that it no longer corresponds to the present need. Their problem, of course, is simply to overthrow the persons now in power and then to carry out in their places an exactly similar program. Conspicuous among such men is M. Caillaux, who was President of the Council in 1909 and who, a faithful follower of his predecessors, continued their policy of repression against the labor unions. It is unfair to ask of a Premier of bourgeois convictions

to desert the defence of the bourgeoisie and blaze the trail for advancing Socialism. M. Caillaux, for that matter, is neither better nor worse than those before and after him. He is simply the "business man." His conception of the "affairs of France" is limited to financial matters to be run with a view to the prosperity of High Finance. He was, as he still is, at the head of various private interests of some magnitude and his official authority would be a splendid asset to these interests. Other ex-ministers, such as M. Messimy, are in favor of the bloc. M. Messimy was one of those who tried to fix on the Socialists and Syndicalists the responsibility for the propaganda in favor of army desertions. One should not interpret the interest of such men in the bloc as an intellectual evolution on their part resulting in sympathy for our ideas. They are looking simply for a return to power up any ladder that happens to be convenient.

Add to this the fact that the legislative elections take place in May, 1914, that is, within a few months. Already the candidates are selected. In 1910 many Radicals got their places only with the support of more or less Socialist votes. These men would like to be sure of retaining this support as a means to keeping their seats. They hope that the restoration of the bloc would free them, even in the primaries, from all Socialist competition.

These men would be the real, in fact the only, beneficiaries of the proposed coalition. Their enthusiasm for it is quite intelligible.

But why should any Socialist ever think of joining in such a scheme? There are some, who as a matter of doctrine believe that Socialism will never get anywhere on its own feet, and in consequence, that it ought to avail itself of any crutch useful to its cause. They assert that at the present moment the Radical party is divided into ministerials, in favor of proletarian repression, and anti-ministerials, hostile to such repression. Why not join hands with the latter? This statement has a poor foundation of fact. The anti-ministerials of to-day are the ministerials of yesterday, when they scrupulously followed the present policies of repression. Other Socialists, again, have a direct personal interest in a renewed alliance. They are the deputies who in 1910 were elected with the aid of Radical votes, and as candidates hope again to win over a certain portion of the petty bourgeoisie. But surely these personal considerations are secondary, even admitting out of fairness that such partisans

of the alliance with the bourgeoisie really have at heart the progress of the working class. This bloc is none the less a combination to be avoided, as it is in fact ridiculed by the majority of the party.

Here are, in brief, the reasons against it:

1. The doctrine of International Socialism has not varied. It still rests on the principle of the class struggle, and the moment this principle is admitted no permanent pact can be made between the Socialist party and the parties of social conservatism. It is true that in certain countries the Socialists have come to an understanding with the Radicals to bring about some common measures. Such, for example, was the case in Belgium where Socialists and Liberals combined to effect educational reform and universal suffrage. The same situation is about to arise in Holland, where the same problems are in the foreground. But in neither of these cases did the Socialist party so compromise itself as to paralyze its opposition to the social system of capitalist domination. That is why, in Germany, while the Radicals were voting for the increase of armaments, the Social-Democrats fought it to the last ditch. The temporary and specially conditioned fusions concluded in Germany, Belgium and Holland in no way constitute deviations from the attitude necessarily imposed by the essence of the Socialist movement. In France, on the contrary, they ask of the Socialists who participate in the bloc support for such and such government measures. The Socialists would have to assume responsibility for these measures and they would be forced by a rigorous destiny to take a position against the working class. We must bear in mind that in France, at the present time, the social question is the only criterion for the classification of parties. In this respect France occupies a unique position in Europe, for everywhere else political or religious questions share the spot light with the social question.

2. The formation of the bloc could be brought about only at the expense of Socialist unity. It is clear that if to-morrow a majority could be scraped together in favor of a return to alliances with the Radicals, a multitude of elements, at once the most earnest and active in the party, would bolt and form another organization which could more justly claim the title of International. Unity has won its spurs. No one is going to think seriously of deserting it.

3. In past years when the Socialists lent their support for longer or shorter terms to the bourgeois Republicans, it was

because the democratic form of government was threatened by—in a sense—external dangers. Bonapartist Caesarism or Monarchical Clericalism was delivering most disturbing attacks on the Republic. Socialism accordingly was conscious of the fact that it can be only republican in form, that in harmony with the brilliant demonstration of Marx, social antagonisms are best developed in a republic. It therefore stood ready with its disinterested assistance to put to rout the champions of an obsolete past. Its assistance unfortunately was doubtless only too disinterested, for its courtesy was only too often repaid with atrocious acts of repression aimed at the proletariat.

To-day, however, the danger is not external, but internal. To-day we find these same Republicans in alliance with the Bonapartists and the Catholics to defend the capitalist system, to repress the workers and keep them in subjection. It is these same Republicans now in power who, under the cover of republican forms and picking up all the weapons of Caesarism, are redoubling tyrannical aggressions against the unions and are everywhere enkindling an arrogant and fictitious nationalism. One cannot imagine an issue on which the two parties could unite.

If perchance there be among the Radicals a few far-sighted men with decency enough to repudiate the treacherous violence of their party and with some enlightenment in the direction of social transformation, they are quite free to give their support to the Socialist candidates, to choose our candidates in preference to those of our opponents. We meanwhile will keep clear of all entanglements.

To contract an alliance with one or another of the bourgeois factions would be to betray the proletariat by playing the cat-paw in certain jobs which the Socialist conscience repudiates. It would be to paralyze for the future all Socialist growth. The examples of the past are before us. As long as the old bloc subsisted, the Socialists who had a part in it were always confronted by two alternatives: either to break the alliance or to approve and justify measures of coercion against their striking brothers. If Socialism were to renew such contracts, impossible of execution, it would not only be acting with fraudulent disloyalty, but it would also discredit itself with the proletariat. It would be mating with individualistic anarchism and would lose all efficiency for long years to come.

Let the Republican bourgeois make any promises they see fit. French Socialism, with good sense born of bitter experience, will reject any advances towards an alliance with them.

## The Chinese Question

By THEODORE ROTHSTEIN (London)

The brief struggle in China between the North and the South has, it seems, ended in a victory for the former. This could have been expected. The revolt broke out without preparation as the result of the impatient action of a deposed Governor, while the North had had its forces well organized by Yuan-Shih-kai with the help of foreign money. It is, indeed, stated that when the southerners proclaimed their rebellion Yuan-Shih-kai raised his hands to the sky thanking the gods for thus giving him the desired opportunity for crushing the enemy before he had completed his preparations.

The defeat of the southern Republicans means a good deal not only to China, but also to the world at large and, more particularly, to the people of the United States. It is an event fraught with very wide and far-reaching possibilities and therefore merits the attention of every student of international politics.

From a *formal* point of view it is but an episode in the perennial struggle between Peking and the provinces, which has for many generations distinguished the domestic history of China. The struggle itself, however, has always been something more than a mere struggle between the centralist tendencies of the capital and the autonomous or particularist aspirations of the provinces, as is commonly represented. Underlying the centralist tendencies of Peking was always the cupidity of a government and its bureaucracy dependent upon the provinces for supplies. Underlying the autonomous aspirations of the provinces was always the desire of the local administration not to pay over to Peking more than was absolutely necessary. For China has never—not even in the halcyon days of the Manchu rule—been a centralized State, though it had a central government, and what was to the advantage of Peking as the seat of the central government, of the court, the Mandarins, the highest civil and military bureaucracy, was detrimental to the provinces as the abode of the local administration and local gentry. Of course, the local provincial administration itself was largely recruited from the same elements which ruled at Peking and would, therefore, sometimes simply share the spoils with them. But more often than not the local bureaucrats would succeed, in the absence of all machinery of central control, in winning for them-

selves a large measure of independence, and then they would make common cause with the powerful local gentry and local rich bourgeoisie and offer resistance to the financial and other encroachments of Peking. This explains the almost incessant troubles and provincial revolts which form such a salient feature of Chinese history.

The advent of international capital—first commercial, then money lenders', and lastly industrial and railway capital—not only intensified this struggle between the capital city and the provinces, but also added to it a new feature. It was in the interest of international capital to strengthen the hands of the central government, that is, of Peking, for only a strong government could guarantee the safety and the profits of the invested capital. In addition, every transaction (mostly entered upon by the Chinese government under compulsion) with international finance imposed upon the government a new burden in the shape of various payments, which in their turn constituted a new cause for claims upon the provincial treasuries. The opposition of the provinces to the capital city, therefore, was bound not only to grow more determined, but also to assume a patriotic and nationalist hue as directed against a government which lends itself to the machinations of foreign capitalists as their tool, to the detriment of China's own economic and political interests. As the government of the Manchus happened itself to be one of foreign conquerors, this provincial or "Young China" nationalist movement became gradually anti-dynastic and ultimately assumed the dimensions of a revolution and led to the overthrow of the monarchy and the proclamation of the republic.

Formally, then, the revolution of the end of 1911 was a victory of provincial nationalism over the foreign-backed centralized bureaucracy of the capital. This nationalism, however, was incidental, and so was the accompanying republicanism. Both were lent to the movement by the intellectuals who had received their education abroad—chiefly in the United States—and were readily assumed by it, as commonly happens in such situations, as the ideological form of protest. In its *essence* this victory of provincialism was a victory of the provincial gentry and bourgeoisie over the parasitic element in the capital that was eating at the marrow of their bones and sapping the foundations of their development by the introduction of foreign rivals. And as the capital is situated in the north while the centre of gravity of China's economic development lies in the south,

the struggle and the revolution assumed the form of a fight between the North and the South.

This much must be understood of the revolution if the present counter-revolution is to be understood. A counter-revolution follows a revolution as the ebb follows the tide. It arises from a double circumstance. On the one hand, a revolution entails great losses upon property and its profits, and the propertied classes soon get tired and begin to long for order and for rest. Moreover, they begin to feel the alliance with the more democratic elements as more and more embarrassing and their desire to shake it off grows apace. On the other hand, the powers that were, which represent a certain social force and were taken by the revolution more or less unawares, begin to look around and gradually to recuperate their strength. An approximation then takes place between these powers and the propertied classes on the basis of certain mutual concessions and of common opposition to the more democratic and still revolutionarily inclined elements, with the result that a counter-revolutionary movement sets in.

In all essentials this process has also taken place in China. The provincial gentry and bourgeoisie have achieved their object by ejecting the Monarchy and dynasty and by instituting a parliament in which, naturally, the provinces were bound to play the leading role. Their longing was now for peace and quiet work. But a revolutionary excitement cannot subside on the very next day after the revolution. The masses who have been set into motion long for something more than a mere parliament. They have a number of more or less vague desires which they want to see first satisfied. They had suffered long, and they want measures of relief as, indeed, were promised to them at the time of the revolution. The revolution itself has robbed them of their scanty means of subsistence, and they starve and cannot prevail upon themselves to return to the old "rut" as if nothing had happened. They, then, continue waiting, keeping their arms, threatening the faint-hearted and the treacherous, and very often make use of their power in an unauthorized fashion either to compel a quicker pace or to procure for themselves the necessities of life. It takes a very long time before these elements either settle down by themselves or (as is more often the case) are reduced to tranquility. In the first French revolution important factors in this respect were the revolutionary and the Napoleonic wars which drew these elements away to the battlefield. In the Russian revolution these elements, unable to assert

themselves, were broken up by the counter-revolution and driven to anarchy and "expropriation." In China they naturally frightened the propertied classes and inspired them with a longing for a "strong hand" to disband and to suppress them and thus to restore as quickly as possible "normal" conditions.

Luckily for them they had one quite close by, that of Yuan-Shih-kai. Yuan-Shih-kai had been one of the ablest administrators under the old régime. He, moreover, was a "modern" man and enjoyed the confidence of Europe, that is, of European finance and diplomacy. As such he was disliked by the Manchus, though he had once saved them from constitutional reforms and restored their autocratic powers. When the revolutionary tide began to rise high, the Manchus in their need summoned him from his exile and entrusted him with the task of coping with the danger. The circumstances, however, were different from those of 1898. The Manchus were now really discredited, and the revolutionary forces were very strong. Yuan-Shih-kai consulted his friends, the Europeans, and they dissuaded him from attempting to fight the revolution. "Naturally fearing," as the London *Times* Peking correspondent afterwards frankly admitted, "that any support given to the cause of the Monarchy would lead to destruction of their property by the Republicans, to the killing of Europeans in the interior, and to a general cessation of trade, they (the foreign mercantile communities at the treaty ports, and notably the great British firms at Shanghai) brought all their influence to bear against Yuan and the Monarchy." As Yuan still hesitated which way to turn, the financiers declined "at the last critical moment to supply Yuan with the funds which would, no doubt, have saved the Throne in December." Thereupon Yuan threw in his lot with the Republicans and induced the Manchus to abdicate voluntarily, lest worse should befall them.

Yuan, then, was by the very course of events designated as the strong man. He was, as said, a modern man enjoying the confidence of Europe, and he spared the country unnecessary bloodshed and disturbance by quietly cutting short the resistance of the Manchus. At the same time he showed himself sufficiently pliable and opportunist to abjure his old monarchist principles and to recognize the republic. The propertied classes were therefore very satisfied. They prevailed with the more democratic elements who gravitated towards Dr. Sun-Yat-sen upon electing Yuan as President and tacitly entrusted him with the task of winding up the revolution. He was the man to do it

because his sympathies naturally lay with the propertied classes and his republicanism was strongly lined with reactionary sympathies.

The task, however, apart from desire and ability, required some considerable material means—faithful agents, a faithful and well-trained army, and above all, money not only to satisfy the urgent clamour of the turbulent elements, to pay off their armed forces, to set up a new administration and generally to bring order into the chaos, as the phrase goes, but also to obtain those very agents and army who were to lend their material support to this work of liquidation. But money could only be got from international finance, and international finance, though ready to advance it, insisted on attaching to their assistance certain conditions which were too hard even for Yuan in the given circumstances. The financiers, having formed with the aid of their respective governments a monopolist combination consisting of certain chosen banking houses of England, France, Germany, and the United States, with the subsequent addition of Russia and Japan, insisted upon the establishment of an international control over not only the service, but also the *expenditure* of the loan so as to preclude a re-organization of the armed forces of China, which might become dangerous to Russia and even to other States who had a finger in the Chinese pie and were anxious to keep it there. Even to the propertied classes, eager as they were to get rid of the revolution, these conditions seemed onerous inasmuch as they again introduced, and that with a vengeance, the foreigner into the economic and political life of China. It seemed absurd and cruel that the revolution, after having gained a victory over the enemy, should with its own hand restore the very thing against which it had fought and won! A whole year the negotiations dragged on without coming to a definite conclusion, until both parties became weary of the situation—the financiers of being kept waiting so long for the coupon, and the gentry and bourgeoisie of the constant dangers to which their property and trade were exposed at the hands of the irreconcilables. The financiers then yielded something of their demands by eliminating a few of the more objectionable features of the projected international control, and the other party accepted the bargain. “By obtaining the loan,” wrote the Peking correspondent of the *Times*, “Yuan had his hands immensely strengthened against the revolutionists.” Indeed, to strengthen the hand of Yuan-

Shih-kai was the main object on the part of the Powers in inducing their respective financiers to abate their terms.

And now began the struggle with the revolutionists. They formed the majority both in the National Assembly and the Senate and would not listen to the persuasions of Yuan and his Ministers to sanction the loan. The loan, then, had to be concluded over their heads in violation of the constitution. Was Yuan to dare it? A few illegal arrests and executions as well as assassinations, carried out among the leaders of the revolutionary party, the Kuomintang, by order of Yuan and his agents served as a method of testing the strength of the opposition. The high-handed acts called forth a great outburst of indignation both in Parliament and in the revolutionary press, but nothing happened. Thereupon Yuan, taking the bit into his mouth, signed the loan contract and obtained his money. The *Times*, which had all along championed the cause of Yuan and the financiers, wrote with great cynicism: “It is only very simple persons who will suppose that a reputed violation of constitutional propriety in the conclusion of the loan is the real ground for the wrath of the Kuomintang. The true reason why they are angry is because their adversary will now get hold of money, and because they realize how greatly that will strengthen his hands, whether their struggle with him is to be settled in, or out of, the constitutional assembly. Sufficient cash may powerfully assist his efforts to convert his present small minority in that body into a majority, or, should the contest have to be settled in another fashion, it will enable him to pay the soldiers.” The *Times* was perfectly right. Yuan at once set to work to buy over to his side the army and the parliamentary majority, and his arbitrary acts having provoked the unguarded action in Kiangsi before the revolutionists had been ready for fight, he easily crushed the ensuing rebellion. The *Times*, commenting upon the end of the revolt, referred to its own predictions and said: “As was observed in an article in the *Times* of July 21, it was the recent loan which placed Yuan in a position to command the allegiance, for the time being, of the troops.”

Such, then, is the nature of the counter-revolution which has now ended in the defeat of the revolutionists. Formally it was still a struggle between the North and the South, but neither the North nor the South were any longer precisely the same as they were before. Now it was an alliance between the bureaucracy, civil and military, of the North and the bourgeoisie of the South against the more democratic elements of the South. To China



this spells disaster. Yuan will have to justify the alliance in the eyes of the bourgeoisie by keeping his dictatorial powers within bounds and using them, mainly, if not solely, in her interests. Possibly he may be sincerely animated with the intention of doing it and believes in his capacity to do it. Apart, however, from the fact that he may prove to lack the necessary ability for the task, his attempts to pursue such a policy will put him into opposition to the financiers and the Powers, whose sole purpose is to exploit in China their own interests, and who have in the administration of the country a publicly recognized status. Should Yuan, when placed in this position, side with the Powers, the bourgeoisie will be up in arms, Yuan will be thrown back upon the old bureaucracy or even the Monarchy and once more a struggle will break out which may or may not lead to another revolution, or else to a restoration of the Manchus. Should Yuan, on the other hand, side with the bourgeoisie, then the danger will come from the Powers, who will certainly intervene. In fact, the intervention of the Powers is almost certain either way because they have the legal right to do so, and every commotion may endanger the loaned capital. Immediately on the conclusion of the loan the Peking correspondent of the *Times* wrote: "It cannot be ignored that the revolutionary leaders are able, when they choose, to set in motion again some of the forces that made the revolution successful. . . . The investor in China stock need not, however, pay much attention to the internal situation. His money is practically guaranteed by five powerful governments, who, when the need arises, will ensure that the foreign debt shall be charged upon the undeveloped but vast resources of the country." And when the revolt did actually break out the *Times*, weighing the chances, said: "Even supposing the insurgents do succeed, it does not appear likely that holders of China's debt would suffer permanently, for the services of the loans depend chiefly on the revenues of the Maritime Customs, and there are safeguards for the due collection and proper employment of these in the shape of *the intervention of the Powers.*" Never was the future in store for China so brutally and frankly revealed as in these words of the foremost organ of British finance. They foreshadowed another international expedition after the manner of 1900, which this time will either end in the complete subjugation of China or else in a world war.

One cannot get away from the impression that immense and populous as she is, China is moving towards a future which is

prepared by modern Imperialist expansion and greed for all countries which have been late in their economic and political development. And here the interesting question, already indicated at the beginning, arises: What position is the United States going to take up when the time arrives for settling what will be called the Chinese problem? Hitherto the United States policy towards China was full of good intentions, but vitiated by colossal impotence. At first, that is after the war between China and Japan, when everybody was rushing to extort from the defenceless Empire what he could—a piece of territory, a loan, a railway concession, and so forth, American financiers, too, appeared at Peking and obtained a couple of railway concessions. The great deroute which followed upon the war with Spain taught the American financiers that they were not yet in a position to rival their European brethren, and one of the concessions was allowed to pass into European hands, while another was simply left in abeyance. The Boxers' revolt found America ready to co-operate with Europe against China, and an American contingent took part in the expedition, and America drew her share of the "indemnity" then imposed upon the Chinese government. But even at that time American diplomacy was already in favor of maintaining the "open door" in, and the integrity of, China as being most conducive to the economic interests of the United States. It knew well that if and when it came to creating financial and trading monopolies in China or to staking out individual claims in the shape of zones of influence and the like, the United States, with her lop-sided strategical position and lack of army and navy, would stand but a poor chance against the rivalries of the stronger European States. Hence it advocated a free field and no favor and looked askance at the efforts of Russia, Japan, and other Powers to establish their exclusive rights in various parts of the Chinese Empire. In accordance with this policy it co-operated in the conclusion of the treaty of Portsmouth, which pledged Russia and Japan to respect the integrity and independence of China and even to evacuate Manchuria, and it protested against the Chinese-Japanese agreement of September 4, 1909, which gave to Japan certain exclusive mining rights in southern Manchuria. It was as a part of the same policy that the United States government remitted in 1907 a portion of the Boxer indemnity due to it on the condition that one hundred Chinese young men should go every year to complete their studies in American universities and other high schools. None of these



efforts, however, availed against the cupidity of the Powers. In spite of the treaty of Portsmouth, Manchuria has not been evacuated to this day either by Russia or by Japan, Korea has been annexed, numerous railway and mining monopolies have been established in various parts, and Mongolia and Tibet have been made practically independent of China. The reason for this is quite simple: treaties have no value unless protected by force, and as neither China nor the United States has been in a position to fight for them, they were tacitly set aside. The seal to this impotence of American diplomacy was set by the incident connected with the appointing in the autumn of 1909 of Mr. Crane to the post of Minister to China. The idea of the State Department was that Mr. Crane while in Peking should take the Chinese Government under his protection and prevent a repetition of such suicidal treaties as that of September 4 of that year. Mr. Crane did not hesitate openly to proclaim his mission to the world and caused an article to be published by a Chicago paper setting forth the intimate views of the State Department on the subject of Japan and China. Japan at once protested, and Mr. Crane was recalled just at the moment when he was about to sail from San Francisco.

It was then that the Washington State Department conceived a new plan. It was evidently futile to oppose the policy of the aggressive Powers from outside. Would it not be better for the United States to associate itself with the other Powers and then to work its policy from inside? That meant internationalization of all the financial business in China—equal shares and equal rights for everybody, and the possibility of a restraining influence on the others by America. This was a very naive plan, and the first attempt to apply it proved a ghastly failure. In December, 1910, State Secretary Knox offered Russia and Japan nothing more nor less than the neutralization or, rather, internationalization of the Manchurian railways, and the reply he got, and swallowed down, was a flat refusal. Nothing daunted, Mr. Knox made another attempt. The financiers of England, Germany, and France having taken up the concession which had been granted to the Americans fifteen years previously, Mr. Knox invited J. P. Morgan to claim the right of participation in the undertaking, and this after some scuffle having been granted, J. P. Morgan and associates obtained from the Chinese government a contract for a large currency loan and in their turn "internationalized" it. This was the origin of the famous Four Powers' Syndicate,

which after the revolution undertook to float for the new republican government a re-organization loan of \$300,000,000. So sure was the State Department of the effectiveness of international association (which now obtained the exclusive financial and railway rights in China) as a means of holding the greedy European Powers in check and thus saving for China her independence and territorial integrity, that when Russia and Japan in their turn demanded a voice in the financing of China America immediately responded with an invitation to join the syndicate, although she knew well that these Powers were not after "financing" China, as they had no money at all, but after controlling the terms on which this financing was going to proceed. An inside experience of one year, however, sufficed to prove to the American diplomacy the futility of its cunning schemes, and on March 18 of the present year President Wilson issued a statement announcing the withdrawal of the American group from the business. Thus again the American policy was defeated.

It is evident that neither from the outside nor from the inside has the American State Department at present the means of imposing upon the European governments and finance the open door—"the door of friendship and mutual advantage," as President Wilson put it in his statement. It is possible—nay, it is probable that the State Department had an idea of supplementing this withdrawal from the financial concert by action. At least Mr. Straight, on behalf of the American financial group, observed in his open letter to the public, dated March 19, that "the new government had decided that it was advisable for the United States to seek ways and means for relieving China from her financial difficulties other than the Six-Power loan." If this was really the idea of the State Department, an idea of breaking down the monopoly of the now Five Powers' Syndicate by competition, the subsequent absence of all action in this direction proves that the idea was speedily abandoned. Indeed, however independent the American government may feel, it knows it cannot with impunity quarrel with the five governments which stand behind the syndicate. The same impotence which brought about the failure of the previous policies must condemn to sterility any other policy directed to the same end so long as American diplomacy confines itself to verbal protests divorced from real force.

But this is precisely a condition which must soon change. The construction of the Panama Canal will not only multiply and

intensify the commercial and financial interests which the United States has in the China market, but also materially strengthen American diplomacy in giving effect to its policy. In other words, the Panama Canal will give both a moral and material impetus to American Imperialism in China and impart to it a much more confident spirit. This means that the United States will not stand aside when the Chinese Question is raised by the five Powers. Whether it joins the partners in the work of spoliation or partition, or opposes it, it will mean conflict and war and a series of complications of vital importance to the American people. For that reason the present events in China are of particular interest to it. The American Socialists have to watch them very closely and take their measures in advance so as to counteract the dangerous agitation which is certain to take place in due time for an armed intervention in the affairs across the Pacific.

---

## Socialism and the Municipalities

By HENRY L. SLOBODIN

I attach more importance to the Socialist municipal campaigns than do many other Socialists. I do so because I believe that much more can be achieved for Socialism with a proletariat enlightened, well-housed, well-fed and well-clad, than with the proletariat ignorant, degraded and abiding in economic misery. And it is through the municipality more than through any other agency that the living conditions of the proletariat can and will be improved.

The economic elevation of the working class means more power. But there are other reasons equally weighty, that will make the municipality an important factor in the social revolution.

All the great revolutions of the past centered in and around the cities. I have not in mind ancient history when city and state were synonymous concepts. Nor the medieval time when the rise of the cities led to the overthrow of feudalism. I refer to modern history. The French revolution was a series of municipal uprisings. The same may be said of the revolutions of

1848 and the recent Russian and Chinese revolutions. Certainly, it was a struggle of classes, but territorially and politically, the revolt found in the municipality the most fertile ground.

I see no reason to believe that it will be different in the future. On the contrary, the political emancipation of the municipality is approaching fast. Particularly in this country. What between concentration of political power in the Federal government on one hand and the development of municipal self-government on the other, the state as a political entity is bound to shrink and shrivel. Be that as it may, there can be no doubt that the political self-determination of the municipalities is at hand.

Economically, the municipality seems to lead an existence which is almost parasitic. Yet appearances are misleading. The municipality pays in kind, that is in labor, for all the labor which it consumes. It does depend upon the country for its raw material. The country could starve a city in short time. It would not be so, if the city were in control of the supply of the raw material. To achieve this end, the cities are now reaching out to control the supply of food stuffs and other raw material. These attempts are now in their infancy and weak. But they are bound to grow until the municipalities will be freed economically as well. To elaborate on this phase of the problem would involve us in a theoretical discussion.

To those who still have faith in the social revolution as a coming event and as a present factor in the uplifting of the working class, it must be obvious that the success of the revolution will depend much more on the number of the municipalities controlled by the social revolution and the degree of the control than on the number of revolutionary representatives in Congress.

There is another reason, not of as far-reaching but of more immediate moment, why I view the municipal campaigns with deep interest.

Long before the Socialists will have in Congress a representation of any controlling effect, they will be in control of hundreds, aye, thousands of municipalities, wherein they will have an opportunity to demonstrate their revolutionary reconstructive energies and abilities. Without any choice in the matter on their part, the Socialists will be put in a position where they will be compelled to repel the attacks of the capitalist state on Socialist municipalities. This will make the entire policy of Socialist propaganda pro-municipal. And to carry on such a propaganda effectively, the Socialists will have to develop a municipal program of which the present Socialist program is a very weak beginning.

If there is anything worthy of note in our present municipal program and activity, it is the lack of ideas, initiative and audacity. So far the Socialist municipal activities have been a very weak imitation of the reformists. After we captured Milwaukee, we set out to "Milwaukeeize" the rest of the country. We raised a dust and hue and cry that blinded and deafened no one but ourselves. After we recovered our sight and hearing, we saw and heard that we failed to "Milwaukeeize" even Milwaukee. No one in particular is to be blamed for that. But we must discourage the huzzah and dust-raising campaigns. The work is much more solid and hard.

Let us set to work with an earnest will.

---

## Lobbying and Class Rule

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

The righteous spirit, like God Almighty, is here, there, and everywhere. Its wonders pass all understanding. Its all-pervasive power is omnipotent; and if the cynic doubts, behold, even politics is being transformed. Norman Hapgood, bursting with ethical conceit, leads the Fusion cohorts against Tammany in the name of the "ethical spirit in politics"; and what matters it that the Fusion Committee set a new high record of vulgar, dirty politics? The politicians are truly inspiring in their righteous pose condemning governmental ungodliness and corruption,—doubtlessly obedient to a guilty impulse. Men steeped in political evil are cleansing themselves white in the blood of the lamb of righteous politics. A veteran scalawag such as "Col." Martin M. Mulhall pillories himself and his employers as unscrupulous and systematic corruptionists; and does so in the interest of righteous politics—making good his righteous claims by selling his shame for \$10,000.

Capitalist government in America now seems to be one damned investigation after another. And to show the progress of civilization, there are no Cassandras moaning through the shame of the exposures, but cunning knaves exploiting the righteous spirit for the conquest of political place and pelf.

When President Wilson issued his broadside against the "insidious lobby" working to defeat his tariff bill, the Senate in a fit of moral indignation started an investigation. The investigation hadn't proceeded far when overwhelming evidence led Senator James A. Reed, chief cross-examiner of the committee, to issue this statement concerning the activity of "the Interests":

"One—They have opposed the election of men known to be opposed to their plans and desires.

"Two—They have secretly given aid and support, financial and moral, to those who have been subservient to their interests

"Three—They have carefully and secretly affected public sentiment through carefully prepared news matter sent out through press bureaus and otherwise disseminated through the press of the country.

"Four—With great skill, they have carried on a propaganda with their business connections and by this means sought to influence the votes of Congressmen.

"Five—They have maintained lobbyists in Washington whose business it has been not only to undertake to direct a course of legislation and to oppose all inimical legislation, but to undertake to control the election of the committees of Congress.

"Six—In one instance, at least, one of these interests, the woolen manufacturers, succeeded in having appointed, as confidential clerk of the Republican members of the finance committee of the Senate, the secretary of the Woolen Manufacturers' Association, who performed his work so satisfactorily that he was presented by his employers, the woolen manufacturers, with \$6,000."

The lobby interests "raised and expended, directly and indirectly, for the purpose of controlling public sentiment and affecting legislation, many thousands of dollars."

For a time, capitalist apologists found comfort in the belief that "the old-fashioned corporate representative who hung around legislative halls, armed with the all-powerful greenbacks," had disappeared. And then the Mulhall revelations showed that, while actual bribery may have declined, it was still practiced on an extensive scale.

The Mulhall exposure is a labyrinth of infamy and treachery. Its devious mazes lead from the manufacturers' offices to the legislative halls, bribing, corrupting, pulling legislative wires.

Mulhall, as the field agent of the National Association of Manufacturers, covertly bought the election of members of Congress obedient to its interests and fought those who were

recalcitrant; "made payments of money to legislators who voted on bills as the Association dictated"; bribed minor labor leaders who acted as spies and strikebreakers for the N. A. M.; and bought employees of the House. The N. A. M. organized an adjunct, a paper organization, the National Council for Industrial Defense, for the special purpose of molding legislation and breaking strikes. At one time, President Van Cleave proposed raising \$500,000 a year for three years to fight inimical legislation. The N. A. M. stands exposed as a widely ramified conspiracy against representative government, using the tremendous power of organized wealth in the interest of a capitalist clique. The vilest feature of all was not bribery, but the use of social influence, of political hopes, and the exploitation of ambitions and aspirations entertained by the men whom the National Association of Manufacturers wished to degrade into tools.

A novel and incriminating defense of the N. A. M. is that its officials were deceived by Mulhall. Undoubtedly; Mulhall's testimony and letters show that he systematically lied to his employers. But the N. A. M. officials believed these lies, employed and paid and encouraged Mulhall on the basis of these lies. The N. A. M. reveals itself not only as an organized band of criminals, but as a rabble of gullibles. Cheating is ingrained in the bourgeois; he cheats and is cheated. The bourgeois is a dealer in gold bricks, and is himself an easy victim thereof.

Bourgeois radicals have inveighed against the trust-plutocracy as, in a sense, the only source of governmental corruption. And now here is the N. A. M., composed of manufacturers not allied with the trust-plutocracy, and most of them in opposition thereto, revealing itself as unscrupulous in political knavery as the trust-plutocracy. The petty bourgeois inveighs in reality not against corruption, but against the material interests which the corruption promotes. He uses corruption whenever necessary and effective for his own material interests.

Lobbying and corruption are not class measures; they are clique measures in the interest of one capitalist clique against another clique, or of the individual capitalist.

Lobbying and corruption have their basis in the multiplicity of conflicting interests within the capitalist class, as in the tariff controversy; in the temporary necessity of bribing legislators in an emergency, as when public indignation flares up at an outrage and threatens calamitous action on the part of honest or weak-kneed legislators; in the impatient desire of capitalists to grab immediately an advantage which could be secured with-

out bribery in the course of economic evolution; in the individual capitalist seeking special privilege, as in the Allds' bribery case in the New York legislature; and in the cunning of legislators aware of how business interests may be imposed upon and cheated, as in the recent Stilwell scandal, *ditto*.

But corruption is no more a *necessary* condition of class rule than violence is a necessary condition of proletarian struggle. Both, in a measure, may be unavoidable, but they are not inherently necessary.

Corruption and the robbery of the public domain were big factors in building vast railway systems; corruption was a big factor in the formation and power of the trusts. Corruption thus plays an important part in plutocratic development; but that development would have been inevitable even without corruption, owing to the economic law of motion of capitalist society.

The United States Supreme Court was a mighty engine in the development of plutocracy. The Supreme Court has been remarkably responsive to plutocratic needs, setting the seal of its approval on some of the worst acts of economic brigandage. Two years ago the Supreme Court legislated the "Rule of Reason" into the Sherman anti-trust law; recently, it asserted, in the Minnesota rate decision, the supremacy of the federal government—both actions in the interest of plutocracy. Yet the Supreme Court has never been tainted with bribery. Social conditions, the spirit of the age, the inexorable logic of capitalist development, are the determining factors.

Government is necessarily government of the capitalists, and of the most powerful capitalists, the plutocracy. Economic power, and not corruption, determines control of government. Corruption helped to defeat Bryan and his middle class insurrection; but had Bryan triumphed, the economic facts and power would have restored the plutocracy to political supremacy.

Considering the multiplicity of investigations and the eagerness with which they are instituted, the innocent observer might conclude that things political were never as rotten as they are now, and that the future will see political purity enthroned. But the righteous spirit in politics is simply the last despairing protest of non-plutocratic capitalists against plutocratic power. When the recalcitrants shall have been bludgeoned into submission on the one hand by superior plutocratic economic power and on the other hand by a mighty Socialist movement, the righteous spirit will have become a phantom of the past. The

middle class, more than any other class, translates its economic interests into terms of religion and morality.

The Rome of Nero was vibrant with the moral protests of the dying Roman spirit of old; and historians conclude that Nero's reign marked the lowest depth of Roman infamy. Ferrero has shown, however, that conditions under succeeding emperors were even more rotten; but the old Roman spirit having been completely crushed, there were no more protests—the Roman Church acquiescing in and profiting by the infamy—and conditions retrospectively appear better. It now seems as if the United States would repeat that phenomenon.

Woodrow Wilson in the role of a Cato the Censor seeks to re-introduce the ideals and institutions of the Fathers. The ghosts of the old morality and democracy haunt plutocracy, but terrify it not at all. Roosevelt urges on his hosts at Armageddon; and impotent poetasters of reaction, such as Sylvester Viereck, hymn the Battle of the Lord. Behind the grotesque mask lurk and leer the petty bourgeois interests, which, once they make peace with the plutocracy, will profit by corruption and immorality.

---

## I BURIED MY LOVE

By LOUISE W. KNEELAND

I buried my love last night!  
 O, deep! deep!  
 The cold winds crept through the tangled grass,  
 The wild winds lifted the oozy mass,  
 And we laid him where never a foot may pass.  
 O, I buried my love last night, last night,  
 And his grave is so deep! so deep!

The sun rose radiant in the glassy sky,  
 The flowers they danced  
 And the birds sang sweet,  
 But over it all I heard a cry  
 That will ring in my ears till the river runs dry.  
 O, I buried my love last night, last night—  
 And his grave is so deep! so deep!  
 O, I buried my love last night, last night—  
 Why lies he so cold in his sleep?

---

## Story of the Putumayo Atrocities

By W. E. HARDENBURG

### IV.

#### The Truth Exposures

Arriving in London in July, 1909, I put my manuscript into shape and immediately began to seek a medium through which to make my facts public. This proved to be an exceedingly difficult task, for, owing to the extreme severity of the law of libel in England, even the great dailies refused to take the risks of incurring an action at the hands of what was considered a powerful London company, having a capital of a million pounds and an influential board of directors.

After having unsuccessfully visited many of the newspaper offices in Fleet Street and having vainly interviewed several of the leading publishers, I was at last directed to *Truth*, a well-known weekly, founded by Henry Labouchere, the noted English statesman and journalist. This periodical at once gave me a hearing, and, within a short time, the editor had secured such additional independent evidence as to satisfy him of the substantial accuracy of my information.

Accordingly, on Sept. 22, 1909, the first article on this subject appeared in *Truth*. It was primarily a reproduction of many of Saldana's articles in *La Felpa* and *La Sancion*, followed by an account of the experiences of Perkins and the writer in "The Devil's Paradise".

The results of this article were interesting. The first was a letter from the Peruvian Amazon Company, of which the following was the essential portion:

"The Directors have no reason to believe that the atrocities referred to have in fact taken place, and indeed have grounds for considering that they have been purposely misstated for indirect objects. Whatever the facts, however, may be, the Board of this Company are under no responsibility for them, as they were not in office at the times of the alleged occurrences."

A couple of hours later a communication containing the following statements reached the editor from the Peruvian Legation:

"This Legation categorically denies that the acts you describe, and which are severely punished by our laws, could have taken place without the knowledge of my Government on the

Putumayo River, where Peru has authorities appointed directly by the Supreme Government, and where a strong military garrison is likewise maintained.

"The quotations referred to of the two local papers, *La Felpa* and *La Sancion*, should not be given the least credit, as both these papers were started by the same editor for dishonest purposes, and for that reason were so shortlived. These facts are well known at Iquitos, and my Government is aware that of late some individuals were trying to obtain from persons of bad character false declarations for blackmailing purposes.

"I must therefore repudiate in the most deliberate manner the accusation contained in the said article and based on the malicious information supplied to you, and I protest most emphatically against references therein made that soldiers of the Peruvian Army could be capable of committing the acts of inhumanity described by Mr. Hardenburg."

It will be noted that in each of these letters veiled suggestions are made to convey the idea that I had attempted to blackmail the company. It will also be remembered that the same accusation was made in regard to Saldana. Later on other parties were similarly accused. It may be stated that these insinuations, although unsupported by the slightest attempt at proof, together with a continued disclaimer of responsibility, were the sole reply of the directors to the series of monstrous crimes we had revealed. And, considering that the Peruvian Amazon Company took over "The Devil's Paradise" from the Arana Company in October, 1907—a date prior to the murder of the Colombians and to many of the atrocities committed upon the Indians—the insincerity of this disclaimer is evident.

The categorical denial of the Peruvian Charge d'Affaires that the crimes were committed without the knowledge of his Government was a denial of a statement that had never been made. In fact, Saldana made it perfectly clear that they were committed, not only with the knowledge, but also with the active assistance of the Peruvian Government. This was further proven by the publication in the next issue of *Truth* of the following extract from a Protocol signed at Lima on April 21, 1909, by plenipotentiaries on behalf of the Presidents of Peru and Colombia:

"The Governments of Peru and Colombia express their sentiments of deepest sorrow for the events that took place last year in the region of the Putumayo, and in token of mutual concord agree to constitute by means of a special convention (to be

agreed upon within the term of three months after this agreement is in force) an international commission to investigate and determine the deeds which took place in that region, giving account of its labors by means of a report. If the two Governments do not agree upon the responsibilities incurred for the said deeds, the affair shall be submitted to arbitration. As soon as those responsible and culpable for the said deeds are determined, they shall suffer the pains that the law prescribes after the corresponding judicial process is concluded. In addition to this, those who have suffered material damage shall be indemnified in an equitable manner, as well as the families of the victims of all punishable deeds."

Incidentally, this clause also shows how successful Arana had been in his bold scheme to push the responsibility for the murder of the Colombians upon the Peruvian Government.

The statements of the Charge d'Affaires with reference to Saldana, as we have seen in a preceding article, were, of course, nothing less than absolute falsehoods. The eagerness of this individual to serve the threatened interests of his masters is easily explained, for, as certain of the South American republics do not pay their representatives any salaries, other means of procuring a livelihood must be found.

Subsequent issues of *Truth* contained numerous extracts from the statements procured by me during my investigations in Iquitos. In order to show how completely they corroborated those of Saldana, portions of which appeared in a previous article, a few extracts are here given. The following is from a declaration made by Daniel Collantes and signed by him before Arnaldo Guichard, notary public at Iquitos, on May 18, 1909:

"Martinéngui ordered a commission to set out for the houses of some neighboring Indians and exterminate them, with their women and children, as they had failed to bring in the amount of rubber that he had ordered. This order was strictly carried out, for the commission returned in a few days, bringing along with them fingers, ears and several heads of the unfortunate victims to prove to the chief that they had executed his orders."

This is from the statement of Celestino Lopez, signed before Federico M. Pizarro, notary public at Iquitos, on May 24, 1909.

"In May, 1908, I went to Morelia, and had hardly reached this section, when I witnessed the cruel flagellation of seven Indians for the usual crime—that of not delivering enough rubber to satisfy the ambitions of the 'civilizers'. Two of these victims were mere boys."

The following is from a letter to the writer from M. F. Camacho, dated Iquitos, February 20, 1909:

"Upon the day of my arrival at Abisinia, which I entered in company with Abelardo Agüero, its chief, and as we were approaching the house, several cadaverous looking dogs rushed out to meet us. Upon seeing them, Agüero asked if there was no meat for them, and, being answered in the negative, he hurried to the cell of the Indians, where several of these unfortunates, besides being in chains, were kept in stocks. Among them was a *capitán*, who held, clasped in his arms, the last of his children, for his wife and the rest of his offspring had already been murdered. Jerking the child away from him by main force, he was released from the stocks and unchained, was taken out to the yard and, after receiving a few rifle bullets, was cut to pieces with machetes and, although still alive, was thrown to the dogs. This deed, savage and criminal in the extreme, filled me with horror, and I protested against it—a protest to which the only answer was a laugh and the advice to follow this repugnant example if I wished a more remunerative post later."

The following extract is from the declaration of Joao Baptista Braga, dated October 8, 1908, at Constantinopolis and signed in the presence of a Brazilian officer, Lieut. J. R. Brazil:

"It would be an endless task to relate the innumerable crimes that I have seen committed during my stay in this section. Here, recently, in the month of July, the *capitán* known as Tiracahuaca and his wife were held prisoners in chains. When Jiménez—who had been temporarily absent—arrived, he had them brought into his presence, and told them that if their tribe did not appear within the space of eight days he would show them what he would do with them. The eight days passed, and as the tribe did not come, he ordered a can of kerosene to be poured over them, and then, striking a match, he set fire to these unfortunates, who fled to the forest uttering the most desperate cries. Naturally, upon seeing such an awful crime committed, I expressed my horror at it to Jiménez, who replied that if there were anybody who wished to protest against the order he gave, he would be served in the same manner, and that if the company kept him as chief, it was because he knew how to do his duty."

It would be useless to reproduce any more of these sickening statements, only a portion of which were even published in *Truth*. Enough have been cited to show the accuracy of the

charges brought against the "civilizing company", as Arana used cynically to call it.

The exposure of these abominations in *Truth* occasioned great interest, not only in England, but also in Peru. Here the subsidized press, under the influence of the "black gold" of the Putumayo, immediately took up the cudgels in defense of Arana and his butchers. But on the other hand, the great mass of the people read the accounts of the atrocities with horror, and one of the first results was the formation of a society, having for its object the protection of the Indians of all parts of Peru against the cruelties of their exploiters. Moreover, as the exposures were exciting such a strong interest in England and other financial and commercial centers, the Chamber of Deputies, probably realizing that this would be bad for business, felt moved to pass a few resolutions and to appoint a committee of investigation. But there the matter stopped for a long period.

In England, however, effective work was being done. Just prior to the *Truth* publications, the writer had succeeded in laying the facts of the case before the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society. This Society, whose object it is to protect the aborigines throughout the world from the brutalities of present-day capitalism, recognizing that the matter was one that came within its scope, took it up at once.

Accordingly, the Secretary of the Society wrote to the directors of the company, asking for a thorough investigation of the allegations. He received in reply an acknowledgment and a copy of the letter to the editor of *Truth*, quoted previously in this article. To this the Secretary of the Society made the following rejoinder:

"On behalf of the Committee of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, I am to point out that, as the company was incorporated in October, 1907, the responsibility of the present board would appear to have begun at that date, and not in December, 1908, when the shares were issued in this country; and further, that as two of the partners of the vendor firm are directors of the Peruvian Amazon Company, one of them being its managing director, my committee is unable to understand the disclaimer of all knowledge of anything that occurred previous to December, 1908.

"I beg to remind you that the charges made relate to the period subsequent to 1907, as well as before that date, and that there is no ground for thinking that the treatment of the native Indians has been in any way altered or improved up to the pres-



ent time. On the contrary, according to the statements made, the forcible and cruel methods employed constitute a necessary adjunct of the system by which the rubber is collected.

"I note from your letter that your directors have no reason to believe that the atrocities reported have, in fact, taken place. In view, however, of the circumstantial charges which have been made and published, and of the character and amount of the evidence which has been adduced as to the methods used in the collection of rubber in the territories of the company, my committee regrets to be unable to rest satisfied with the general assurance contained in your letter. The committee feels it a duty to repeat the request that a small deputation may wait upon the directors of the Peruvian Amazon Company in order to bring to their notice the nature of the information which they have received, and to urge upon them the necessity for a thorough enquiry by the company into the truth of the charges."

Even to a person unacquainted with all the facts of the case, it would seem that if the directors really had "no reason to believe that the atrocities have, in fact, taken place" or if they were really "under no responsibility for them," they would have welcomed the invitation so lucidly and pointedly set forth in the letter quoted above. But either the English directors were completely duped by Arana and Alarco, or else, desperate at the prospect of losing their blood-stained profits, they hoped to "get away with it" in the same manner as Arana and Alarco had previously done in Peru. Be this as it may, however, their reply to this letter was, under the circumstances, a monument of arrogant insolence. It was as follows:

.... "the Board are of opinion that no useful purpose would be served by the deputation which you suggest. The Board are taking steps to ensure that the company's business shall be carried on, as I said in my letter, on the best traditions of an English company."

But the panther of the Putumayo had made a mistake. Out of his native jungle, his methods were too crude. He had underestimated the resources and perseverance of the men opposed to him. For the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, seeing that nothing, apparently, was to be hoped for from the beneficiaries of the atrocities, immediately entered into communication with the English Foreign Office and laid the allegations before Sir Edward Grey, begging him to despatch a commissioner to the Putumayo.

As a result of this, in July, 1910, a British Consul, Mr.

Roger Casement, well known for his investigations into the Congo atrocities, was instructed to proceed to "The Devil's Paradise", his *locus standi* being secured on the grounds that a number of British subjects, negroes of Barbados, referred to in a previous article, had been employed by Arana as slave-drivers. That Mr. Casement was secured for this work was due to the endeavor of the Society.

By the time of Consul Casement's departure, the directors of the Peruvian Amazon Company had also decided to send out a commission of their own to accompany him, being doubtless forced to do so by the pressure of public opinion or the representations of the Foreign Office.

## The American Civil War

By KARL MARX

(Translated by Richard Perin)

[The following two articles appeared in the *Vienna Presse* on Oct. 25 and Nov. 7, 1861, as letters by Marx from London. They were recently reprinted in the *Vienna Kampf*, the monthly review of the Austrian Social Democracy, from which this translation has been made. We have not seen anything in the historical literature of the Civil War that equals or even approaches this contemporary exposition of its real significance and underlying causes in comprehensive compactness, insight, brilliancy, and force. Comrade N. Riasanoff, who writes in the *Kampf* an accompanying account of Marx's relations with the *Vienna Presse*, gives the following list of letters and articles, with the dates of publication, contributed by Marx from London, most of them dealing with American affairs. In 1861: The North American Civil War, Oct. 25; The Crisis in England, Nov. 5; Civil War in the United States, Nov. 7; Economic Footnotes, Nov. 8; Intervention in Mexico, Nov. 12; The Financial Situation in France, Nov. 23; Removal of Fremont, Nov. 26; The Trent Affair, Dec. 2; Anglo-American Differences, Dec. 3; The Principal Actors in the Trent Drama, Dec. 8; Editorial without heading (again on the Trent Affair), Dec. 11; A Libel Trial, Dec. 24; The Washington Cabinet and the Western Powers, Dec. 25; Newspaper Opinion and Popular Opinion, Dec. 31. In 1862: French Canards, Economical Consequences of the War, Jan. 4; A Pro-American Meeting, Jan. 5; On the History of the Suppressed Seward Telegram, Jan. 18; the Coup d'Etat of Lord John Russell, Jan. 21; A London Labor Meeting, Feb. 2; Opposition to Intervention, Feb. 4; Concerning the Cotton Crisis, Feb. 8; Debate on the Address in Parliament, Feb. 12; American Affairs, March 3; Friends of Secession in the House of Commons, Recognition of the American Blockade, March 12; (The American Civil War, March 26, and conclusion of this article, March 27, without a doubt written by Engels); An International Mirès Case, May 2; The English Press and the Fall of New Orleans, May 20; A Convention Against the Slave Trade, May 22; Editorial on the Situation in the American War Theatres (by Engels), May 30; English Humanity and America, June 20; Chinese Affairs, July 7; A Scandal, July 11; The Suppressed Debate on Mexico and the Alliance with France, July 20; A Criticism of Things American, Aug. 8; Abolitionist Manifestations in America, Aug. 30; A Garibaldi Meeting, Sept. 17; Labor Distress in England, Sept. 27; A Stormy Meeting, Oct. 3; A Garibaldi Meeting—Distress of Cotton Operatives, Oct. 4; Bread



Manufacture, Oct. 30; On the Situation in America, Nov. 10; The Removal of McClellan, Nov. 29; English Neutrality, The Situation in the South, Dec. 4.

The titles of these articles again show what we have already known, that wherever the battle of freedom was fought there Marx's great heart and mighty pen were enlisted, but no event of the time absorbed his interest and energy to the same extent as the Civil War in America. He served the cause of the North and of freedom with his pen and the meetings which he helped to organize among the workers of England, who starved because of the War, made it impossible for the ruling classes of England to take side openly with the Confederacy. The great service rendered by Marx to the Union was recognized by Lincoln in a letter addressed to the International.

The honor of American Socialism requires that these letters of Marx be collected, translated, and properly edited. They could be published first in the NEW REVIEW and then in a separate volume. It appears to us that this matter well deserves the attention of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, with whom Professor Beard, of Columbia University, would no doubt gladly co-operate as editor and commentator.—Ed. N. R.]

(*Die Presse*, Vienna, No. 293,  
Friday, Oct. 25, 1861.)  
London, October 20, 1861.

## I.

For months the leading London papers, both weekly and daily, have been repeating the same rigmarole in regard to the American civil war. While they insult the free states of the North, they anxiously defend themselves against any suspicion of sympathizing with the slave states of the South. They are, in fact, continually writing two leading articles—one in which they attack the North, and another in which they excuse their attacks upon the North. *Qui s'excuse, s'accuse.*

Their excuses are substantially as follows: The war between North and South is a tariff war. Moreover, the war is not one of principle; it does not affect the question of slavery and really turns upon the lust of the North for supremacy. Finally, even if right is on the side of the North, is it not a vain attempt to seek to subjugate by force of arms eight millions of Anglo-Saxons? Would not separation from the South free the North of all connection with Negro slavery and, with its twenty million inhabitants and its immense territory, assure it a higher and hitherto hardly dreamed of development? Therefore, should not the North welcome secession as a happy event, instead of seeking to prevent it by a bloody and ruinous civil war?

We shall examine, point by point, the pleas of the English press.

The war between North and South, so runs the first excuse, is a mere tariff war, a war between the system of protection and that of free trade, and England naturally favors free trade. Is the slave owner to enjoy the whole fruit of slave labor or is he to be cheated of a portion of it by the protectionists of

the North? That is the question at issue in this war. This brilliant discovery was reserved for the *Times*. The *Economist*, the *Examiner*, the *Saturday Review*, all developed the theme. It is characteristic of this discovery that it was not made in Charleston, but in London. In America everyone knew, of course, that a free trade tariff prevailed from 1846 to 1861 and that Representative Morill only carried his protective tariff through Congress in 1861, after the Rebellion had already broken out. Therefore secession did not occur because Congress had passed the Morill tariff, but at most the Morill tariff was passed by Congress because secession had taken place. When in 1831 South Carolina had its first secession fever, the protective tariff of 1828 did, it is true, serve as a pretext, but only as a pretext, as General Jackson declared at the time. This time, however, the old pretext has not, in fact, been repeated. At the secession convention of Montgomery all reference to the tariff question was avoided because the sugar cultivation of Louisiana, one of the most influential of the Southern states, rests entirely upon the protective tariff.

But, further pleads the London press, the war in the United States is nothing but a war for the maintenance by force of the Union. The Yankees cannot bring themselves to strike fifteen stars from their banner. They wish to cut a colossal figure before the world. Truly, it would have been different had war been made to abolish slavery! But the question of slavery, as the *Saturday Review* among others categorically declares, has nothing at all to do with this war.

It must first of all be remembered that the war was not begun by the North, but by the South. The North is on the defensive. For months it had calmly watched the secessionists appropriate the Union's forts, arsenals, shipyards, customs houses, cash, ships, insult its flag, capture detachments of its troops. The secessionists finally concluded to force the Union government from its passive attitude by means of an ostentatious act of war, and for this reason alone they proceeded to bombard Fort Sumter at Charleston. On April 11 (1861) their General Beauregard had learned at a conference with Major Anderson, the commanding officer of Fort Sumter, that the fort was provided with but three days' provisions and hence must surrender peacefully after that period. In order to anticipate this peaceful surrender, the secessionists early the next morning (April 12) began the bombardment which accomplished the fall of the place in a few hours. Hardly had this news been telegraphed

to Montgomery, the seat of the secession convention, than the Minister of War, Walter, publicly announced in the name of the new Confederacy: "No man can say where will end the war which began to-day!" At the same time he prophesied that "the flag of the Southern Confederacy will wave before May 1 from the dome of the old Capitol at Washington, and perhaps before long from Faneuil Hall in Boston as well." Not until then was the proclamation issued in which Lincoln called for 75,000 men to protect the Union. The bombardment of Fort Sumter prevented the only possible constitutional solution, namely, the calling of a general convention of the American people, as had been proposed by Lincoln in his inaugural address. To Lincoln there remained only the choice of fleeing from Washington, abandoning Maryland and Delaware, surrendering Kentucky, Missouri and Virginia, or of answering war by war.

The question in regard to the principle of the American civil war is answered by the battle cry with which the South broke the peace. Stephens, the Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy, declared in the secession convention that the essential distinction between the constitution newly concocted at Montgomery and the Constitution of Washington and Jefferson was this, that now for the first time slavery was recognized as an institution inherently good and as the foundation of the entire structure of the State, while the revolutionary fathers, imbued with the prejudices of the eighteenth century, had treated slavery as an evil thing imported from England and to be abolished in the course of time. Another champion of the South, Spratt, cried out: "For us it is a question of the foundation of a great slave republic." Therefore, although the North drew the sword only in defence of the Union, had not the South already declared that the continuance of slavery was no longer compatible with the continuance of the Union?

As the bombardment of Fort Sumter gave the signal for the opening of the war, the victory of the Republican party of the North, the election of Lincoln to the Presidency, had given the signal for secession. Lincoln was elected on November 6, 1860. On November 8, 1860, it was telegraphed from South Carolina: "Secession is regarded here as a settled matter." On November 10 the Legislature of Georgia considered plans of secession, and on November 13 a special secession of the Mississippi Legislature was called to take secession into consideration. But Lincoln's election itself was merely the result

of a split in the Democratic ranks. During the electoral campaign the Democratic party of the North concentrated its votes upon Douglas, the Democratic party of the South upon Breckinridge, and the Republican party owed its victory to this splitting of Democratic votes. On the one hand, what was the reason for the predominance of the Republican party in the North? And on the other hand, what was the cause of the split within the Democratic party, the members of which, North and South, had worked together for more than half a century?

The supremacy over the Union that the South, through its alliance with the Northern Democracy, had gradually usurped, reached its highest point under the Presidency of Buchanan. The last Continental Congress of 1787 and the first Constitutional Congress of 1789-90 had legally excluded slavery from all the territories of the Republic Northwest of the Ohio. (By territories are meant, as is well known, the colonies lying within the United States themselves which have not reached the number of inhabitants constitutionally\* prescribed for the formation of autonomous States.) The so-called Missouri Compromise (1820), in consequence of which Missouri entered the Union as a slave state, excluded slavery from all other territories north of latitude 36° 30' and west of the Missouri. Through this compromise the domain of slavery was extended by several longitudinal degrees, while on the other hand a very definite geographical limit appeared to have been placed upon its future extension. This geographical limit was in its turn broken down by the so-called Kansas-Nebraska Bill, the author of which was Stephen A. Douglas, at that time leader of the Northern Democracy. That bill, which passed both Houses of Congress, repealed the Missouri Compromise, placed slavery and free labor on an equal footing, ordered the Union government to treat the two with equal indifference, and left to the sovereignty of the people, that is, to the majority of the settlers, the decision whether or not slavery should be introduced into a territory. Thus, for the first time in the history of the United States, all geographical and legal limits to the extension of slavery in the territories were abolished. Under this new legislation the formerly free Territory of New Mexico, a territory five times larger than the State of New York, was transformed into a slave territory, and the area of slavery was extended from the border of the Mexican Republic to 38° N. lat. In 1859 New

\* This is an error. There is no constitutional provision in regard to this.—Ed. N. R.

Mexico received a slave code that rivalled in barbarism the codes of Texas and Alabama. However, with a population of about 100,000, New Mexico at that time had not fifty slaves, as is proved by the census of 1860. Hence it had been sufficient for the South to send over the line some adventurers with a few slaves and then, with the aid of the central government at Washington and its officers and agents in New Mexico, to drum together an ostensible popular assembly that forced slavery upon the territory and with it the supremacy of the slaveholders.

However, this easy method did not prove applicable in other territories. Therefore the South went a step further and appealed from the Congress to the Supreme Court of the United States. This court, composed of nine judges, five of whom were from the South, had for a long time been the most willing tool of the slaveholders. In 1857 it decided, in the celebrated Dred-Scott decision, that any American citizen had the right to take into any territory any property recognized by the Constitution. The Constitution recognizes slaves as property and obliges the Federal government to protect this property. Consequently slaves could, under the Constitution, be forced by their owners to work in the territories, and thus any individual slaveholder could introduce slavery into previously free territories against the will of the majority of the settlers. The territorial legislatures were denied the right to exclude slavery, and upon Congress as well as upon the Federal government was imposed the duty of protecting the pioneers of the slave system.

While the Missouri Compromise of 1820 had extended the geographic limits of slavery in the territories, while the Kansas-Nebraska Bill of 1854 had abolished all geographic limits and in their stead had set up a political barrier, the will of the majority of the settlers, the Supreme Court of the United States, by its decision of 1857, tore down even this political barrier and transformed all territories of the Republic, present and future, from colonies of free states into colonies of slavery.

At the same time the law for the extradition of runaway slaves, which had been made more stringent in 1850, was relentlessly put into execution in the Northern states during Buchanan's administration. To play slave catcher for the Southern slaveholders appeared to be the constitutional role of the North. On the other hand, in order to check as far as possible the colonization of the territories by free settlers, the slaveholders' party thwarted all so-called free soil measures—

that is to say regulations guaranteeing to the settlers, gratuitously, a certain amount of uncultivated government land.

In the foreign policy of the United States, as well as in the interior policy, the interests of the slaveholders were the controlling factor. In fact, Buchanan had attained to the dignity of the Presidency through the issuance of the Ostend Manifesto, in which the acquisition of Cuba, whether by robbery or force of arms, was proclaimed as the great end of national policy. Under his administration Northern Mexico was already divided among American land speculators, who were uneasily awaiting the signal to fall upon Chihuahua, Coahuila and Sonora. The incessant piratical expeditions of the filibusters against the States of Central America were also directed from the White House at Washington. In most intimate connection with this foreign policy, the manifest purpose of which was the acquisition of new territory for the extension of slavery and of the rule of the slaveholders, stood the reopening of the slave trade, secretly supported by the Federal government. Stephen A. Douglas himself declared on August 20, 1859, in the United States Senate: "During the last year more Negroes were imported from Africa than previously during any single year, even at the time when the slave trade was still legal. The number of the slaves imported during the last year was 15,000."

Armed propaganda of slavery abroad was the admitted aim of the national policy. The Union had in fact become the slave of the 300,000 slaveholders who ruled the South. This result had been brought about by a series of compromises, for which the South was indebted to its alliance with the Northern Democracy. All the attempts, periodically repeated, since 1817 to resist the ever growing encroachments of the slaveholders had dashed themselves in vain against this alliance. Finally there came a turning point.

Almost immediately after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, which abolished the geographic limits of slavery and made its introduction into new territories conditional upon the will of the majority of the settlers, armed emissaries of the slaveholders, border ruffians from Missouri and Kansas, with bowie knife in one hand and revolver in the other, rushed into Kansas and by the most incredible acts of cruelty sought to drive the settlers from the territory colonized by them. These raids were encouraged by the central government in Washington. The result was a tremendous reaction. Throughout the

North, but especially in the Northwest, an auxiliary organization was formed to support Kansas with men, weapons and money. From this auxiliary organization sprang the Republican party, which thus owes its birth to the struggle in Kansas. Since the attempt to transform Kansas into a slave territory by force of arms had failed, the South sought to accomplish the same result by means of political intrigues. Buchanan's administration, in particular, exerted its utmost energy to force Kansas, with a pro-slavery constitution imposed upon her, into the ranks of the United States as a slave state. Hence arose a new struggle, this time chiefly carried on in the Congress at Washington. Even Stephen A. Douglas, the leader of the Northern Democracy, now (1857-58) opposed the Administration and his allies of the South, for the reason that forcing a pro-slavery constitution upon a territory was in violation of the principle of "squatter sovereignty" laid down in the Kansas-Nebraska Bill of 1854. Douglas, a Senator from Illinois, a northwestern state, would of course have forfeited his entire influence had he desired to admit the right of the South to steal by force of arms or by acts of Congress territories colonized by the North. Thus the struggle over Kansas, which called the Republican party into life, at the same time caused the first split within the Democratic party.

The Republican party drew up its first platform for the Presidential election of 1856. Although its candidate, John Fremont, was not elected, the enormous number of votes cast for him proved, in any event, the rapid growth of the party, especially in the Northwest. In their second national convention (May 17, 1860) in preparation for the Presidential election, the Republicans adopted substantially the platform of 1856, with a few additions. Its substance was this: Not another foot of territory to be granted to slavery. The filibustering foreign policy must cease. The reopening of the slave trade is stigmatized. Finally, free soil laws must be passed to encourage free colonization.

The decisively important point in this program was that slavery should not be allowed a foot of new territory, but on the contrary, should be forever confined within the limits of the states in which it already existed legally. Slavery was thus to be formally fenced in; but the continual extension of territory and the continual spreading of slavery beyond its old limits is a vital matter for the slave states of the Union.

The cultivation by slaves of the South's export articles.

cotton, tobacco, sugar, etc., is only profitable so long as it is carried on with great gangs of slaves, on an immense scale and over broad areas of a naturally fertile soil requiring only simple labor. Intensive cultivation, which depends less upon the fertility of the soil than upon the outlay of capital and the intelligence and energy of labor, is not compatible with the nature of slavery. Hence the rapid transformation of states, such as Maryland and Virginia, which formerly employed slaves for the production of articles of export, into states that breed slaves for export into the more remote parts of the South. Even in South Carolina, where the slaves constitute four-sevenths of the population, the cultivation of cotton has for years been practically stationary owing to the impoverishment of the soil. Indeed, South Carolina has, by the force of circumstances, been transformed in part into a slave-breeding state, for it sells annually four million dollars' worth of slaves to the states of the extreme South and Southwest. As soon as this point is reached the acquisition of new territories becomes a necessity, so that a part of the slaveholders may, with their slaves, occupy new and fertile lands, and that there be created for those who remain behind a new market for slave-breeding, that is, for the sale of slaves. Thus, for example, there is no doubt that without the annexation to the United States of Louisiana, Missouri and Arkansas, slavery would long since have ceased to exist in Virginia and Maryland. At the secessionist convention of Montgomery one of the leaders of the South, Senator Toombs, formulated in a striking manner the economic law compelling the continual extension of the territory of slavery: "If no great growth of the slave territory takes place," said he, "fifteen years from now we shall have to allow the slaves to run away from the whites, or else the whites will have to run away from the slaves."

As is well known, the representation of the individual states in the House of Representatives depends upon the number of their respective populations. Since the population of the free states increases faster than that of the slave states, the Northern Representatives very rapidly came to outnumber those of the South. Hence the real seat of the political power of the South has shifted more and more to the United States Senate, in which each state, whether its population be large or small, is represented by two Senators. In order to maintain its influence in the Senate and through the Senate its supremacy over the United States, the South required a continuous formation of new slave

states. But this was only possible by the conquest of foreign lands, as in the case of Texas, or by transforming the territories belonging to the United States first into slave territories and then into slave states, as in the case of Missouri, Arkansas, etc. John Calhoun, whom the slaveholders admire as their statesman *par excellence*, declared in the Senate as early as February 19, 1847, that the Senate alone gave the balance of power into the hands of the South, that extension of the slave territory was necessary in order to preserve this equilibrium between South and North in the Senate, that therefore the attempts of the South to create new slave states by force were justified.

Finally, the number of actual slaveholders in the South does not exceed 300,000, a compact oligarchy confronted by many millions of so-called "poor whites," whose numbers are constantly increasing through concentration of land ownership and whose condition can be compared only with that of the Roman plebeians at the time of Rome's extreme decadence. Only by acquisition, and the prospect of acquisition, of new territories, as well as by filibustering raids, is it possible to harmonize the interests of these "poor whites" with those of the slaveholders, to turn their eager activity into harmless channels and to make them tactable with the hope of one day becoming slaveholders themselves.

Hence the constriction of slavery within its old domain would necessarily, according to economic law, lead to its gradual extinction, destroy politically the supremacy exercised by the slave states through the Senate, and finally expose the slaveholding oligarchy within its own states to the dangers threatening from the "poor whites." Therefore, with the principle that any further extension of slave territory must be legally prohibited, the Republicans struck at the very root of the supremacy of the slaveholders. Consequently, Republican victory in the elections was bound to force an open rupture between North and South. However, this electoral victory itself was, as mentioned above, conditioned by the split in the Democratic camp.

The struggle in Kansas had already brought about a split between the pro-slavery party and its ally, the Democracy of the North. The same quarrel broke out again in a more general form in the Presidential election of 1860. The Democracy of the North, with Douglas as its candidate, made the introduction of slavery into the territories dependent upon the will of the majority of the settlers. The slaveholders' party, with Breckinridge as its candidate, maintained that the Constitution

of the United States, as even the highest court had declared, carried slavery legally in its train; that slavery in and by itself was already legal in all territories and required no special naturalization. Thus while the Republicans aimed to prohibit any extension of slave territory, the Southern party claimed all territories of the Republic as its legally warranted domain. What they had sought to do in the case of Kansas, for example, namely, to force slavery upon a territory by means of the central government and against the will of the settlers themselves, they now set up as a law for all territories of the Union. Such a concession was beyond the power of the Democratic leaders to grant and would only have caused the desertion of their army to the Republican camp. On the other hand, Douglas' "squatter sovereignty" could not satisfy the slaveholders' party. What the latter was aiming at had to be accomplished in the next four years under the new President, could only be accomplished by means of the central government, and admitted of no further delay. The slaveholders had not overlooked the fact that a new power had arisen, the Northwest, whose population had nearly doubled between 1850 and 1860 and was now almost equal to the white population of the slave states—a power that neither by tradition, temperament, or mode of living was inclined to allow itself to be dragged from compromise to compromise in the manner of the old Northeastern states. The Union was now of value to the South only insofar as the former delivered over to it the Federal power as a means for carrying out the policy of slavery. If not, then it was better to break away now rather than to watch for four more years the development of the Republican party and the advance of the Northwest, and to begin the struggle under more unfavorable conditions. Therefore the slaveholders' party played *va banque!* When the Democracy of the North refused to continue to play the role of the "poor whites" of the South, the South, by splitting the voters, gave Lincoln the victory, and then it seized upon that victory as a pretext for drawing the sword from the scabbard.

As we see, the entire movement was and is based upon the question of slavery. Not in the sense whether or not the slaves within the existing slave states should be emancipated, but whether the twenty million freemen of the North should continue to submit to an oligarchy of 300,000 slaveholders; whether the immense territories of the Republic should become nurseries of free commonwealths or of slavery; finally whether the na-

tional policy of the Union should adopt as its slogan the armed propaganda of slavery throughout Mexico, Central and South America.

In another article we shall discuss the assertion of the London press that the North must welcome secession as the most favorable and only possible solution of the quarrel.

\* \* \*

*Die Presse*, Vienna, No. 306  
Thursday, November 7, 1861.

## II.\*

"Let him go, he is not worthy of your wrath." English statecraft is again and again calling upon the North to accept this advice of Leporello to Don Juan's forsaken sweetheart—recently once more through the mouth of Lord John Russell. The North should let the South go, thus it would free itself of all alliance with slavery, its original historical sin, and would lay the foundation for a new and higher development.

In fact, if the North and the South formed two independent countries, such as say England and Hanover, their separation would be no more difficult than was the separation of England and Hanover. But the "South" is neither a geographic region clearly defined from the North, nor a moral unit. It is not a country at all, but a battle cry.

The advice of an amicable separation presupposes that the Southern Confederacy, although it took the offensive in the civil war, is at least carrying it on for defensive purposes. It is believed that for the slaveholders' party it is merely a question of consolidating the regions in which it has hitherto been supreme into an independent group of states which are to be withdrawn from the sovereignty of the Union. Nothing could be more false. "The South needs its entire territory. It will and must have it." With this battle cry the secessionists fell upon Kentucky. By their "entire territory" they mean chiefly all the so-called border states, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri and Arkansas. In addition they claim the entire territory south of the line running from the northwestern corner of Missouri to the Pacific Ocean. Hence what the slaveholders call "the South" embraces more than three quarters of the former territory of the Union. A large part of the territory thus claimed is still

\* This article appears in abridged form in *Der Kampf*, a part of the detailed description of various Southern states being omitted.

in possession of the Union and must first be wrested from it. But the so-called border states, even those in the possession of the Confederacy, were never actual slave states. Rather they form that territory of the United States in which the system of slavery and the system of free labor exist side by side and are struggling for supremacy, the real battle ground between North and South, between slavery and freedom. Therefore, the war of the Southern Confederacy is not a war of defense, but a war of conquest for the extension and perpetuation of slavery.

The mountain chain that begins in Alabama and stretches northward to the Hudson River—the spinal column of the United States, as it were—divides the so-called South into three parts. The mountain country, formed by the Alleghany Mountains with their two parallel chains, the Cumberland range on the West and the Blue Mountains on the East, separates like a wedge the plains of the western coast of the Atlantic Ocean from the low-lying plains in the southern valleys of the Mississippi. The two plains, separated by the mountainous country, with their rice swamps and broad cotton plantations, form the real area of slavery. The long wedge projecting into the very heart of slavery, the mountain land with a corresponding free atmosphere, an invigorating climate and a soil rich in coal, salt, limestone, iron ore, gold, in short every raw material necessary to a many-sided industrial development, is even now free soil for the greater part. Because of its physical characteristics, the soil there can be successfully cultivated only by free owners of small farms. The slave system vegetates there only sporadically and has never taken root. In the greater part of the so-called border states the inhabitants of these highlands constitute the *elite* of the free population which, if only in the interest of self-preservation, has ranged itself with the North.

The attempts of the Confederacy to annex Missouri and Kentucky, for instance, against the will of those states proves the hollowness of the pretext that it is fighting for the rights of the individual states against the encroachments of the Union. To the individual states which it considers a part of the "South" it indeed accords the right to secede from the Union, but by no means the right to remain in the Union.

Even the real slave states, no matter to what extent war outside, military dictatorship within, and slavery everywhere may give them for the moment an appearance of harmony, are not lacking in antagonistic elements. A striking example is Texas, with 180,388 slaves among 601,039 inhabitants. The

law of 1845, under which Texas entered the United States as a slave state, gave it the right to form from its territory not only one but five states. Instead of two, the South would have won thereby ten new votes in the United States Senate, and an increase in the number of its Senatorial votes was at that time a grand aim of its policy. But from 1845 to 1860 the slaveholders found it impracticable to divide Texas, where the German population was a great factor, even into two states, without in the second state losing to the party of free labor the supremacy over the party of slavery. Excellent proof this of the powerful opposition to the slaveholders' oligarchy in Texas itself.

Georgia is the largest and most thickly populated of the slave states. In a population of 1,057,327, it has 462,230 slaves, almost half the population. Nevertheless the slaveholders' party has not yet succeeded in having the Constitution, imposed upon the South at Montgomery, ratified in Georgia by a general popular vote.

In the state convention of Louisiana, which met at New Orleans on March 22, 1861, Rosellius, the political veteran of the state, declared: "The Montgomery Constitution is no Constitution, but a conspiracy. It does not inaugurate a popular government, but a hateful and unlimited oligarchy. The people were not permitted to take part in this business. The convention of Montgomery dug the grave of political freedom and now we are invited to attend its interment."

The oligarchy of the 300,000 slaveholders utilized the convention of Montgomery not merely to proclaim the separation of the South from the North. They also exploited it for the purpose of revolutionizing the internal policy of the slave states, for the complete subjection of that portion of the white population which had still asserted some independence under the protection of the Union and its democratic Constitution. As early as 1856 to 1860, the political leaders of the slaveholders' party, jurists, moralists and theologians, had sought to prove, not so much that Negro slavery is justifiable, as that the color is immaterial and that the working class everywhere is naturally born to slavery.

Hence we see that the war of the Southern Confederacy is, in the real sense of the word, a war of conquest for the extension and perpetuation of slavery. The majority of the border states and the Territories are still in the possession of the Union, with which they have taken sides, first with the ballot, then

with arms. But the Confederacy considers them as part of the "South" and seeks to wrest them from the Union. In the border states which are at present occupied by the Confederacy, the relatively free mountain country is held in check by martial law. Within the real slave states themselves it is displacing the former democracy by an unrestrained oligarchy of 300,000 slaveholders.

Were the Southern Confederacy to abandon its plans of conquest, it would be relinquishing the object of secession and would seal its own death warrant. For the secession occurred only because within the Union the transformation of the border states and territories into slave states appeared to be no longer attainable. On the other hand, by a peaceful surrender of the disputed region to the Southern Confederacy the North would be yielding to the slave policy more than three quarters of the total territory of the United States. The North would lose the Gulf of Mexico entirely, the Atlantic Ocean, with the exception of the narrow strip between Penobscot Bay and Delaware Bay, and would cut itself off from the Pacific Ocean. Missouri, Kansas, New Mexico, Arkansas and Texas would draw California after them. The great agricultural states in the basin between the Rocky Mountains and the Alleghanies, in the valleys of the Mississippi, Missouri and Ohio, incapable of wresting the mouth of the Mississippi from the hands of the strong and hostile slave republic in the South, would be forced by their economic interests to secede from the North and to enter the Southern Confederacy. These Northwestern states would draw after them, in the same whirlpool of secession, all the Northern states situated further to the East, with the exception, say, of the New England states.

Hence there would take place, not a dissolution of the Union, but a reorganization thereof, a reorganization upon the basis of slavery under the acknowledged control of the slaveholding oligarchy. The plan of such a reorganization was proclaimed at the convention of Montgomery by the leading spokesmen of the South, and it explains that paragraph of the new constitution which leaves it open to any state of the old Union to join the new Confederacy. The slave system would spread over the entire Union like a pestilence. In the Northern states, where Negro slavery is practically impossible, the white working class would gradually be pushed down to the level of helots. This would be in complete harmony with the loudly proclaimed principle that only certain races are capable of liberty. And as



the real labor of the South falls to the lot of the Negro, so in the North it is the portion of the German and the Irishman, or their immediate descendants.

Therefore the present struggle between South and North is nothing but a struggle of two social systems, the system of slavery and the system of free labor. Because both systems can no longer exist in peace side by side upon the North American continent, therefore the fight broke out. It can only be ended through the victory of one system or the other.

If on the one hand the border states, the disputed regions in which the two systems have hitherto struggled for supremacy, are a thorn in the flesh of the South, it must on the other hand not be overlooked that in the course of the war up to this time they have formed the main weakness of the North. One portion of the slaveholders in these districts is feigning loyalty to the North at the command of the conspirators in the South; another portion of them found it actually compatible with its material interests and traditional ideas to side with the Union. Both have paralyzed the North to an equal extent. Anxiety to keep in good humor the "loyal" slaveholders of the border states, fear of throwing them into the arms of secession, in a word, tender consideration of the interests, prejudices and sensibilities of these questionable allies, has from the beginning of the war stricken the Union government with incurable weakness, forced it to half-measures, compelled it to dissemble concerning the principle involved in the war and to spare the most vulnerable point of its opponent, the root of the evil slavery itself.

---

### THE ETERNAL MASCULINE

By Harry Kemp

I have a girl in the East,  
A girl in the West,  
And between the two, God wot,  
I know not which is best.

I have a girl in the North,  
And one in the South—  
But the sweetest lass of all  
She bit blood from my mouth.

---

## The Novels of Daniel Carson Goodman

By ANDRE TRIDON

A literary critic should know personally the writers whose books he discusses. I wish I had known Goodman last year when I first read "Unclothed." Here was a book, badly slung together improbable at times, even ungrammatical in spots, half daring, half hypocritical, giving now the impression of autobiography, now of balderdash romance, and withal infinitely attractive.

Who was Goodman? No one knew then. His publisher did, of course, and one day I sent in my card. The great man was busy or said he was. I gave up my inquiry. I couldn't help resuming it, however, when "Hagar Revelly" appeared. I found out and I met Goodman and liked him fully as well as his books. A pleasant, unassuming young man of thirty or so; he does not look that old; he has none of the "author's" airs.

I now understand "Unclothed." Autobiography in part, balderdash in part; a young struggling author can never sell his best; the demand for balderdash signed by known or unknown literateurs is constant, and Goodman (he who never prostituted his pen may fling the first inkpot at him) wrote something that would sell. Only the fact that he had genius could not be entirely concealed from publisher and public.

You remember the story: A young physician who suddenly gave up medicine for literature (Goodman did) is peddling a manuscript novel of which he neglected to make carbon copies. While engaged in that unremunerative pastime he meets a pleasant female editor, Cleodore, with whom he starts a flirtation. One day, short of cash, he leaves his Ms. in a lunch room as security for a breakfast. The Ms. is lost through the carelessness of a woman employee called Loutie, and the young writer becomes completely disheartened; he drinks, brawls, bums and goes to live with Loutie. Then Loutie shakes him after finding out that he is still in love with Cleodore. Just then Cleodore hears that some one is trying to sell the lost manuscript and we leave her as she enters Lawrence Crendon's rooms. More improbability is lent to this improbable tale by the fact that the chapters of the book are presented alternately as excerpts from Cleodore's and Lawrence's diaries.



But as I said before, the book has a mighty appeal. The motives are human motives; from brain and flesh, not from a bourgeois ethereal code of ethics, are derived the decisions the characters take. Those people eat, drink, sleep and have sexual desires; they are normal. They do not experience a mental nausea when their body just feels normally animal. I cannot think of anyone among the young writers of to-day who takes this simple, honest view of life, to which Goodman was partly led by his medical studies. I say partly, for even great specialists, like the late Prince Morrow, refuse to consider the physiology of love as absolutely natural. Even as truthful a writer as Albert Edwards shows himself very New Englandish when it comes to the physical part of the affections.

Having sold one book, Goodman could dare more in the next one. He could eliminate much of the selling piffle which blights "Unclothed," but without which Goodman might yet be offering his Ms. to scary publishers. Thus he gave us "Hagar Revelly." This novel isn't perfect and we might as well point out at once its main imperfection. Goodman is not yet a master of atmosphere. His types live and act in a vacuum. They are not connected in any way with the buzzing, humming and throbbing of the circumambient world. Of course, many people, as Goodman remarked to me, never feel the bond that links them with all the other human atoms. Some do, however, and the author should. Also Goodman in a primitive attempt at characterization which Dickens and H. G. Wells themselves have not altogether spurned (not to mention authors of farce), has burdened his people with such given names as Hagar, Thatah, Rena, Eman, Queolla, etc., etc. Here, however, I cease to scoff and begin frankly to admire.

Hagar leaves an already broken up home when she discovers that her mother's lover seems to care for her and that this complication is a terrible blow to her mother. She goes to work in a large department store. Greenfield, the manager of the store, gradually falls in love with her and attempts to make her his mistress. Her extreme ignorance and naiveté save her in a passionate scene at his rooms; soon after, however, she gives herself to Herrick, who formerly boarded with her mother. A child is born to her in misery and destitution. Her sister Thatah takes the child with her. Hagar goes back to work and finally decides to be what Greenfield wished her to be. Like Lilly in the "Song of Songs," she is weak and loving and the first time Greenfield leaves her alone in the city she deceives him with a

casual acquaintance. Greenfield catches her, but gives her some money wherewith she goes to Paris for no special reason whatever.

Here she meets a man for whom she feels real love. She endeavors to conceal her past from him and sends for her sister who is to lend her a certain respectability. And then the man falls in love with her sister. Hagar in despair seeks nightly adventures on the Paris streets, fails to find them and wires to Greenfield, asking him to take her back. He does so and marries her.

This is only the main thread of the novel, but every one of the human types forming the background is delineated with masterly strokes: the weak and trashy Rena, Hagar's mother, with her weak and trashy lover, John Nealy, editorial assistant somewhere; Eman Revelly, Hagar's father, the musician, good and loving, but unfitted for the struggle that may mean success; and finally Thatah, a loyal, cold, matter-of-fact girl, with fits of reasonable enthusiasm, but a keen eye for whatever they may lead to.

Ida Tarbell delivered herself of a very absurd statement, which unfortunately was printed on the jacket of the novel: "Thatah had somewhere caught the meaning of the great fulfillment of life and she held herself sacred for its coming." Goodman, who is so straightforward, must suffer when he reads that endorsement, which may sell a few copies to the wrong people. No, the truth is that Thatah has no senses, while Hagar is passionate, and it's a pity Ida Tarbell could not have resigned herself to that truth.

This book reminds me strongly of the "Song of Songs." It is in fact the "Song of Songs" transplanted to American soil. Not that this implies in anyway plagiarism. Even if Goodman had followed chapter for chapter the Sudermann tale I would refuse to call that plagiarism. Plots have no importance whatever. Who cares for the plot of Hamlet? Hundreds of painters have copied the same spot in Barbizon. It is the treatment that counts. Goodman is original enough to treat any plot in an individual manner. His manner is impressive. He lets his people do things and never interferes; he does not analyze their psychology; he knows it. They themselves tell us about it in words and gestures. No author's speech.

We miss the big city in which the story unfolds itself. It does not hold the people, tower over them in this book as it does in real life. That, of course, requires experience, more ex-

perience than Goodman can have accumulated while writing his first two books. Zola mastered that trick better than anyone else except perhaps Hugo, and yet the two often failed to create the impression of the huge metropolis that breathes its will and whim into each of its denizens.

Goodman's third book will probably give us what we miss now. "Hagar Revelly" marks such a gigantic advance in every possible way, literary, artistic and intellectual upon "Unclothed," and Goodman seems to be so much in earnest that we must expect great achievements from him.

---

## WE

By OLGA VON ZELLEN

Oh, we are frail, we are frail, so frail, we women—  
Ours is the burden of an endless woe;  
Two-edged and sharp the sword of woe that cleaves us,  
Dark without light the bed we travail on,  
Dark without light the path that we have trodden,  
And darkly we keep upon the trodden way—  
Where there is neither pause nor end nor turning,  
Where there is nothing but the weary way.

Oh, we are frail, so frail, we women,  
Bearing the burden of a double woe. . . .  
Where is the light of love we saw advancing,  
Where is the hope our soul could rest upon  
When love should wake, should bloom and lift the burden,  
When He should come—unto the woman given—  
Sprung from the travail of a million years,  
A prince of peace to ease the bitter sorrow?  
Lost is the promise in a dreary sameness,  
Sunk 'neath a deeper weary woe. . . .

Oh, we are frail, like little children,  
Stretching our arms with a weary moan,  
Asking of him that never knew the burden,  
Asking of him that never knew the travail,  
Asking of him that hath but one need of us,  
Asking of him the comfort for our soul. . . .

---