

Statement of the Ownership, Management, etc.

of the NEW REVIEW, published monthly at 150 Nassau St., New York, N. Y., required by the Act of August 24, 1912.

Editorial Manager, Herman Simpson, 150 Nassau St., New York City.

Business Manager, Berkeley Tobey, 150 Nassau St., New York City.

Publishers, The New Review Publishing Assn., 150 Nassau St., New York City.

Owners (holding one per cent. or more of total amount of stock):

Richard P. Appleton, 76 4th St., Newark, N. J.; Jessie Ashley, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y.; Louis B. Boudin, 302 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Anna P. Boudin, 477 E. 10th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Maurice Blumlein, 103 Water St., New York, N. Y.; Morris Ber- man, 1212 Beverly Rd., Brooklyn, N. Y.; W. R. Cassile, 4643 James St., Philadelphia, Pa.; Thomas Crimmins, 1602 Summer St., Philadelphia, Pa.; A. Caspe, 210 E. Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Alexander Fraser, 413 First St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Bertha M. Fraser, 413 First St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Louis C. Fraina, 620 W. 182d St., New York, N. Y.; Felix Grendon, 218 W. 69th St., New York, N. Y.; Henry Harris, 1602 Summer St., Philadelphia, Pa.; Bertha W. Howe, Great Kills, S. I., N. Y.; Leo Hermann, 1208 49th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Louise W. Kneeland, 97c Park Pl., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Eleanor Kneeland, 970 Park Pl., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Hildergarde Kneeland, 970 Park Pl., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Philip L. Liebman, 302 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Robert M. Lackey, Box 272, Kingston, Jamaica, B. W. I.; Arthur A. Livingston, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; M. Michaelovsky, 235 W. 71st St., New York, N. Y.; Joseph Michael, 115 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Moses Oppenheimer, 301 E. 68th St., New York, N. Y.; Mary S. Oppenheimer, 301 E. 68th St., New York, N. Y.; George Oberdorfer, 2393 Eighth Ave., New York, N. Y.; Isaac Ortman, 106 Rivington St., New York, N. Y.; Charles Edward Russell, 1025 15th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.; Herman Simpson, 150 Nassau St., New York, N. Y.; J. G. Phelps Stokes, Stamford, Conn.; J. B. Segall, Orono, Maine; Ray Simpson, 203 W. 113th St., New York, N. Y.; Sarah S. Simp- son, 203 W. 113th St., New York, N. Y.; William English Walling, Cedarhurst, N. Y.

Known Bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders, holding one per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities:
NONE.

BERKELEY TOBEY,
Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 15th day of April, 1914.

(SEAL) ROBERT C. SHEPARD,
Notary Public, Kings County.

My commission expires March 30, 1915.

Certificate filed in New York County.

Post-Impressionism In Philosophy

"The Book of My Life" marks the first appearance in America of a new *genre*. It portrays the difference between love that is elusive and love that is real, and is the personal confession of an ego, strongly sug- gestive at times of the early work of Huysmans or of Maurice Barres in his "Cult of the Ego."

Mr. Hutchins Hapgood, the well-known critic and writer, says:—

"The subject matter of the book is philosophy; the spirit of it is poetry and the form is art. It is essential autobiography, since the spiritual and intellectual experiences of the author are narrated. It is original and unconventional. . . . It is a sincere, real book. It breathes nobility and temperamental strength and courage."

THE BOOK OF MY LIFE

By
JOHN ROMPAPAS

Cloth Bound \$1.00 Postpaid

The Rabelais Press

27-29 New Bowery New York

THE NEW REVIEW

BOARD OF EDITORS

Frank Bohn
William E. Bohn
Floyd Dell
W. E. B. Du Bois
Max Eastman
Louis C. Fraina
Arturo Giovannitti
Felix Grendon
Isaac A. Hourwich
Paul Kennaday
Robert Rives La Monte
Arthur Livingston
Robert H. Lowie
Helen Marot
Herman Simpson
Albert Sonnichsen
Wm. English Walling

CONTENTS FOR JUNE, 1914

	PAGE
The Key to the Mexican Problem.....	321
<i>Charles A. Beard.</i>	
Why I Am for Zapata.....	325
<i>John Kenneth Turner.</i>	
Financial Intervention in Mexico.....	327
<i>William English Walling.</i>	
Colorado, 1893-1914	329
<i>Isaac A. Hourwich.</i>	
Concerning Anarchy.....	332
<i>Max Eastman.</i>	
The Gompers Contempt Case.....	333
<i>Isaac A. Hourwich.</i>	
Karl Kautsky on the High Cost of Living.	334
<i>Frank Bohn.</i>	
Walling's "Progressivism and After"....	340
<i>Walter Lippmann.</i>	
Socialism and Feminism.....	349
<i>Floyd Dell.</i>	
Ernst Haeckel.....	354
<i>Robert H. Lowie.</i>	
A SOCIALIST DIGEST.....	357

The Colorado War and Compulsory Arbitration.
Is Land the Real Issue in Mexico?
French Socialist Victory.
A Revival of the Revolutionary Spirit.
The Trend Towards Government Ownership.
Do Socialists Increase Taxes?
Confiscation by Taxation in Great Britain.
Beyond Industrial Unionism.
The Threatened Civil War in England.
Shall Socialists and Progressives Combine?
How Far Are Socialists Disfranchised?
Government Employees in Australia.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

(incomplete)

Arthur Bullard
George Allan England
Reginald Wright Kaufmann
Harry W. Laidler
Austin Lewis
Walter Lippmann
John Macy
Gustavus Myers
Mary White Ovington
William J. Robinson
Charles P. Steinmetz
J. G. Phelps Stokes
Horace Traubel
John Kenneth Turner

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Alexander Fraser
Jessie Ashley
Louise W. Kneeland
Caro Lloyd
Gertrude W. Light
Arthur Livingston
Paul Wilson
Max Heidelberg
Louis C. Fraina

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

ALEXANDER FRASER
President

MAX HEIDELBERG
Treasurer

LOUIS C. FRAINA
Secretary

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

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

Kindly Mention the NEW REVIEW When Writing to Advertisers.

A LETTER FROM A "CONVICT AND SOME OTHER THINGS

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

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

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

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

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

MEANING AND NECESSITY OF "CONTRIBUTING SUBSCRIBERS."

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

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

you get 200 such contributors the NEW REVIEW has some foundation."

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

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

UP MUST GO OUR CIRCULATION.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LOUIS C. FRAINA,
Business Manager.

The New Review

Vol. II.

JUNE, 1914

No. 6

THE KEY TO THE MEXICAN PROBLEM

BY CHARLES A. BEARD

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

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

Strange as it may seem, the French contest for parliamentary

government which almost paralleled that of the English, was regarded by the descendants of those Englishmen whom Torcy held beneath contempt for their political imbecilities, in exactly the same spirit and with the same degree of penetration. Who does not recall Burke's stately and vindictive diatribe (for in spite of its lofty airs it was nothing more) and the many lesser diatribes against the poor, weak, and vacillating Frenchman wanting one thing to-day and another to-morrow, and in general acting like a spoiled baby? Chesterton has sagely remarked that to the average Englishman the French Revolution is still something like a huge bye-election.

Illustrations of the opening statement of this article might be indefinitely multiplied, if there were no limit to the patience of printers and readers. But one more reference will bring the principle closely home to citizens of the United States. A little more than half a century ago, the people of this country engaged in a desperate fratricidal conflict, testing whether the republic founded by their fathers could endure. For four long years they waged such a civil conflict as the world had never seen. Property totaling into the billions was destroyed in the South (including millions owned by Englishmen) and under the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus in the North the rights of persons were everywhere put in jeopardy. Wiseacres in Europe laughed loud in their scorn for a slave republic which had forever demonstrated, on a stupendous scale, the failure of democracy.

With such plain lessons of history before us, as Lincoln was wont to say, we are prepared to receive with interest, if not with cordiality, Señor de Lara's version of the long conflict of the people of Mexico against despotism.* For generations we have been surfeited with attacks on the character and intelligence of the Mexicans (for what purposes or from what motives we know not). The French despised the English; the English despised the French; and French and English joined in despising the Americans. We have all in turn despised the Mexican. The Englishman was not fit for self-government in the seventeenth century; the Frenchman was not fit in the eighteenth century; the American was not fit in the nineteenth century; and now the poor Mexican is not only not fit, but his innate character is such that he never can be fit. It is therefore our duty to laugh at his "comic opera" and to shoot him if we deem it necessary in the cause of "civilization."

It is to a nation proud of its own superiority and firmly convinced of the deep and total depravity of the Mexican that Señor de Lara addresses his plea for a new consideration of Mexico's

* The Mexican People: Their Struggle for Freedom. By L. G. de Lara and Edgcumb Pinchon. Doubleday, Page & Co., 1914.

problems, but we believe that his plea will not be in vain, even if a strong dissenting opinion may be written. Like a sane observer of great events he invites his readers to give attention to the long chain of causes leading up to them. The present revolution is not, in de Lara's view, an outbreak of madmen temporarily restrained by the strong hand of Diaz. It is a phase of a social process, of a long contest of the peons, or Mexican serfs, for the possession of the land now held in vast domains by feudal lords. The sudden and violent oscillations in Mexican politics during the nineteenth century are to be explained on the same ground.

Four centuries ago Spanish military adventurers conquered and settled down upon the native Mexican population, very much as the Normans conquered and settled down upon the English in the eleventh century. It was no band of naked savages that the Spaniards subjected to their dominion, but a fairly cultivated people with highly developed art, architecture, and literature of their own. The people became serfs of the conquerors, just as the English became serfs of the Norman barons. In the train of the army came the priests and monastic orders and a "spiritual baronage" was added in due time to the temporal baronage. Accustomed at home to stamping out in blood every protest against ecclesiastical monopoly and royal autocracy, the Spaniards, it may be imagined, did not encourage any signs of "liberalism" among the subject population of Mexico. For three centuries Mexico was "frozen" as Spain was "frozen." Those ancient devices, the rigors of the military discipline and the terrors of hell, kept peace in the land.

Then came the French Revolution and the conquest of Spain by Napoleon. The ruling class in Mexico, fearing the evil effects of the power of the ungodly French, refused to accept the rule of Joseph whom Napoleon elevated to the throne of Spain, and thus the forces of order became revolutionary. This was the pistol shot that started the avalanche. The ruling class denied the authority of the French-made king of Spain, and the peons began to deny the authority of feudal lords, lay and spiritual, whose dominion bound them to the soil. The war for independence became at the same time a civil war, in which freedom from Spain was secured, but at the cost of establishing the complete supremacy of the landed aristocracy and the clergy.

In all the events and movements which followed, contends de Lara, the antagonism of the peon and his lord is the central fact. To this disturbing element are to be added the national debt, principally held in Europe, and still later the stocks of Mexican railways and industrial enterprises, also largely held abroad and furnishing the economic basis for that "war of chicane" called diplom-

acy. To the operations of these interests are to be traced the changes in government and the foreign interventions on the part of the United States and France. A stable republic can be founded in Mexico only by a population of small farmers, enjoying civil rights, possessing educational advantages, and sharing in political power; but such a republic is as dangerous to the supremacy of the feudal lords and the clergy as was the republic of the embattled farmers to the dominion of George III. The foreigners with concessions in Mexico have derived their rights from the ruling aristocracy, and they too look with alarm upon a violent shifting in the basis of sovereignty. In other words, the capitalist edifice is based upon the feudal foundation, and the peon finds all hands turned against him.

But in spite of the odds, he will fight on until the land is his. Iturbide, Bustamante, Maximilian, Juarez, Diaz, Madero, and Huerta may come and go, but the tiller of the soil goes on forever, and he will possess the earth that nourishes him. He might possess it in peace if an enlightened government had made smooth the path of the inevitable. Nevertheless, if for every drop of blood drawn by the lash, a stream shall be drawn by the sword, still will he possess the land. If the serf of Europe can become free; if the peasant of Ireland, who for three centuries filled Britain with turmoil, can have home rule; if a descendant of a boor who labored in the fields under William the Conqueror can become the President of a mighty republic, why cannot the peon of Mexico become a free and independent citizen of a nation free and enlightened? The process may be long and the way beset with thorns, but the peon will tread therein. There will be bandits and dictators, but these are incidents, not fundamentals. Feudalism must go.

One need not accept Señor de Lara's rigid economic interpretation of the details in the story or share his somewhat utopian prophecy as to the immediate outcome in order to agree with the general accuracy of his main thesis: the key to Mexican history is to be sought in the contest of the peon against feudalism, lay and ecclesiastical, buttressed by foreign capitalism. This fact universally recognized would give new aspect to the loose talk in the United States about restoring order by bayonets. Social problems are not settled by bayonets, for we cannot sit on them or live by them. If a process is inevitable, it is better to let it alone or to aid in its culmination. If the question is fairly put to the people of the United States whether they want to the south of them a land of serfs or a republic of farmers, they surely cannot be false to their own traditions.

WHY I AM FOR ZAPATA

By JOHN KENNETH TURNER

I am for Zapata. Not for Zapata personally—I am for no man personally—but for the things and the people that Zapata stands for.

Zapata stands for the abolition of farm slavery through the parceling out of the lands to the Mexican people. He has stood unswervingly for this program ever since the first gun was fired against Porfirio Diaz three and one-half years ago. Madero tried to buy him. Huerta tried to buy him. Madero tried to exterminate him. Huerta is trying to exterminate him. But Zapata remains unbought and unexterminated.

Zapata is but one of thousands upon thousands. These people do not care particularly what individual sits in the castle of Chapultepec. They know that nothing can help them until they have the lands.

All Mexicans understand the basic cause of their civil war. Every spokesman of every noteworthy faction, from Porfirio Diaz to Huerta, has, at one time or another, admitted that land monopoly is the direct cause of Mexico's riot of blood. The domain of Mexico is held in fewer hands than was the domain of France before the great revolution. And in Mexico I am convinced that there are more rags, more starvation, and more of other pitiful effects of poverty.

But we "cultivated" and "superior" Americans disregard these facts. We prate of the "ignorance" of Mexicans. If there is anything of which Mexicans are more ignorant than we Americans are of Mexico, I should like to know what it is.

Sagely we ask each other if the Mexican people know what they want. Unlettered as they are, the mass of Mexicans who are fighting with guns know better what they want than any equal number of "superior" Americans going to the ballot-box know what *they* want—and they know better how to get it.

We ask each other if the Mexicans are really ready for self-government—if they don't need us to teach it to them. But until we ourselves have self-government, how are we going to teach it to others?

The Mexicans are fighting against class government with guns. We accept class government—with its consistent exploitation, its

inevitable injustices, and its occasional most flagrant official crimes—with hardly a murmur of protest. What is really intended by those responsible for the present campaign for intervention in Mexico, “in order to teach the Mexican people the ways of peace,” is that Mexicans may be disciplined into submitting to class exploitation without end, docilely, as we “superior” Americans do.

A short time ago Senator Fall, who owns Mexican mines and knows that he could capitalize them for a greater sum with the Stars and Stripes flying overhead, presented a list of what he called “atrocities” perpetrated upon American citizens in Mexico during the past three years. It would be easy to produce quite as appalling a list of “atrocities” perpetrated upon Mexicans by Americans in our border states during the same period of time—but Senator Fall has not been heard to advocate armed intervention in our border states to protect Mexicans.

Certainly I am prepared to produce a list of atrocities perpetrated during the same period of time upon the inhabitants of West Virginia, Colorado and Michigan, by private gunmen and state militia, that would make Senator Fall’s list look like a report of scratched fingers and bruised knees at a Sunday-school picnic. Why does not Senator Fall demand intervention to preserve the lives of Americans in West Virginia, Colorado and Michigan?

As to constitutional government, it is as conspicuous by its absence in certain parts of these three American states as it is in any portion of Mexico.

The Monroe Doctrine is not an issue, and no one knows it better than they who are loudest in crying the Monroe Doctrine as an argument for intervention.

Some Socialists, convinced of the omnipotent wickedness of American capital, like to believe that the Mexican revolution is at bottom a war between two rival oil corporations. Foreign capital, either American or European, has not *initiated* one of the various revolts of the past few years. The machinations of foreign concessionaires have complicated the situation, as have the personal ambitions of various leaders, but the struggle at bottom is and always has been a struggle between land monopoly and the landless. American money has been decisive only in its influence upon the policy of the American government. By tracing the history of the past four years I am able to prove that the American government has, again and again, interfered against Mexico’s struggle for liberty, unfairly, even unlawfully, in favor of despotism and reaction, has interfered decisively, and as a result of such interference is directly responsible for the continuation of the war, and the loss of thousands of lives.

Lest anyone here may rashly praise President Wilson, I will say that, preferable as is his Mexican policy to that which Taft would have followed, when the history of the past thirteen months is written, it will become plain that he has not proved himself wholly wise or wholly sincere.

The world has never seen a more justifiable and necessary revolution than the revolution of Zapata. Zapata can never become the president of Mexico; his revolution is too uncompromising for that. Unless propped up by foreign governments, Huerta must soon fall. Felix Diaz is a cringing and ridiculous nonentity. Carranza and Villa have made great promises of land reform. Carranza may become president of Mexico. If he does, and if he is inclined to go back on his land promises, you may expect Zapata to hold him to account.

Intervention, if undertaken, will be undertaken pretendedly on high moral grounds, but actually it will be for the purpose of promoting the schemes of rich Americans to grab the national resources of Mexico for themselves and fasten their own collar and chain upon the neck of the Mexican peon. There would follow a war of conquest, disastrous both to Mexico and the United States.

Intervention would not bring peace into Mexico. Nothing will bring peace except the extermination of the landless armies or the breaking up of the lands. If my country intervenes against Zapata, I shall be with Zapata.

FINANCIAL INTERVENTION IN MEXICO

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

It is now widely recognized that intervention in Mexico is an accomplished fact. The governments of the United States and Europe have not intervened, but American and European capitalists finance all governments and all revolutionary movements that are big enough to be worth financing.

It could not be otherwise. For *the foreigners own Mexico*. This is not a figure of speech, but a literal fact. Statistics quoted by Senator Fall show that foreigners own:

Two-thirds of the total wealth of Mexico;
Two-thirds of Mexico’s factories; and
Two-thirds of Mexico’s forests.

But this is by no means the most significant part of the situation. Railways are always even more important than their

enormous capital implies. Especially is this true in an undeveloped country like Mexico. Yet measured by capital alone, Mexican railways absorb 40 per cent. of Mexican wealth. And after railways in such a country come mines, banks and government loans. Mines account for 15 per cent. of Mexico's wealth, even if we do not attempt to reckon the enormous value of her oil fields, while banks account for 12 per cent. and government loans for 8 per cent. In view of this, consider the immense significance of the following facts:

Foreigners own—

86 per cent. of Mexico's railway capital;

96 per cent. of the Mexican mines;

70 per cent. of Mexican banking Capital;

90 per cent. of Mexican Government loans.

The rest of the story of the plunder of the Mexican people can be briefly told. The only industry of importance in the hands of Mexicans is agriculture. But the total value of Mexican farms, ranches and cattle is reckoned at \$129,000,000, or 5 per cent. of the national wealth. Even here \$22,000,000 worth are owned by foreigners, while wealthy Mexican favorites of Diaz, Madero and Huerta probably hold the larger part of what remains—the Creels and the Terrazas alone, before they were driven out by Villa, accounting for many millions each.

Several conclusions are unavoidable:

(1) Since Mexico has so little capital of her own, every Mexican government and every Mexican revolution of any size must be financed by foreign capital.

(2) Agriculture accounts for so small a part of Mexico's wealth and involves so little foreign capital, that foreign capitalists can well afford to allow the peons to have the land—provided only that confiscation precedents are not established that could be applied now or later to other forms of capital, such as railways, mines, oil wells and forests.

(3) Agriculture being the only important industry owned by Mexicans, the land is the chief object of the *domestic* civil war: In so far as the movement is agrarian it is not anti-foreign. And when Carranza and Villa say they are not going to confiscate foreign property, this means practically that only the land is to be restored to the people, while the other 90 per cent. of Mexican wealth is to remain, as at present, largely at the mercy of foreign capital.

(4) But we have not yet come to the real issue. If the constitutionalists win they will control the Mexican government. If it is an honest government, Mexican capitalists, the Mexican govern-

ment and perhaps even the Mexican people will get a large share of the *future* profit of railways, mines, oil fields, forests, and other resources—even though there is no confiscation. Moreover, foreigners may be heavily taxed, and the present mood of the Mexican people indicates that they will be. *At any cost*, then, even if it takes half a million American lives, Mexico must be prevented from establishing a popular or even a semi-popular government.

This brings us to an apparent paradox. *The land question is the red-herring drawn across the people's path in Mexico.* To be sure the people must have the land; feudalism and peonage must be abolished. But let the foreigners control the government, through Carranza, perhaps, or through some compromise candidate, and they will be able to make the most of the two billions' worth of properties they now control and of other billions they have in view. And when Mexico does develop agriculturally—a process which will be hastened by the division of the large estates—foreign capitalist ownership of railways, banks, factories and stores, and foreign control of the government, will prevent the larger share of the new agricultural wealth from going into the pockets of the agriculturists.

COLORADO, 1893—1914.

BY ISAAC A. HOURWICH

The record of strikes in the mines of Colorado goes as far back as 1880. Nearly every strike developed into an armed conflict between organized capital and organized labor. The history of these conflicts may be divided into three periods: (1) prior to 1893, (2) from 1893 to 1902, both inclusive, and (3) from 1903 to the present time.

In 1892 the People's Party was organized in Colorado, and at the election in November of that year its candidate, Davis H. Waite, was elected Governor of Colorado. While in other states the People's Party was a farmers' party, in Colorado it was the party of labor. The farmers in Colorado, according to the census of 1890, constituted only 12 per cent. of the population of the state, which precluded their domination over any party in that state. The industrial wage earners, on the other hand, numbered about two-fifths of the male breadwinners—the Colorado women had no

vote in 1892. The first national convention of the People's Party, held at Omaha, Neb., in July of that year, was attended by representatives of the Knights of Labor. The latter controlled the miners' organizations in Colorado, and their mixed assemblies included many mine workers. As a result of this combination, the industrial wage-earners and the farmers of that state gained control of a majority of the votes. During the Populist period in Colorado politics, from 1893 to 1902, the government in the mining counties was a miners' government. The sheriffs and their deputies were members of the miners' unions. Some of the governors, and even the judges, owed their election to the support of the Western Federation of Miners. The authorities therefore usually maintained a friendly attitude toward the striking miners.

In 1900 D. C. Coates was elected Lieutenant-Governor. During his term of office he joined the Socialist Party. In 1902 the Western Federation of Miners, at its annual convention, declared "for a policy of independent political action" upon the platform of the Socialist Party. A full ticket of the Socialist Party was placed in the field at the fall election. It drew a few thousand votes from the Populist-Democratic fusion candidate, with the result that the Republican candidate, James H. Peabody, was elected Governor by a narrow margin.

With his election, the mine operators regained control of the machinery of the state government. The Citizens' Alliance declared a war of extermination against the Western Federation of Miners. A sheriff, elected on the Populist-Democratic ticket, who was a member of the Western Federation of Miners, was forced by a Citizens' Alliance mob to resign under the threat of lynching. Martial law was declared, miners were imprisoned and held without trial in bull pens, or deported. A militia general boasted that where he was in command "habeas corpus" did not go, but instead of that he would give the strikers "post mortum."

This regime has continued in Colorado up to the present day. In 1906 William D. Haywood, then a prisoner, pending trial in Idaho, was nominated by the Socialist Party for Governor of Colorado, but he polled only 15,000 votes.

The social forces in the State of Colorado are expressed numerically in the following table, which is based upon the latest available statistics.*

* The method by which the results were arrived at and the meaning of the classification were explained in previous articles by the present writer ("Social-Economic Classes of the Population of the United States," *Journal of Pol. Econ.*, 1911, March and April; and the *NEW REVIEW*, March, 1913 [Signed "Isaac Halevy"]).

Classification.	Number of breadwinners, 10 years of age and over, 1900.			Percentage ratio.		
	Both sexes.	Males.	Fe- males.	Both sexes.	Males.	Fe- males.
Farmers	29,246	28,217	1,029	13.4	14.3	3.7
Members of family helping on the farm.....	3,733	3,692	41	1.7	1.9	0.2
Agricultural laborers (hired help)	11,092	11,030	62	5.1	5.8	0.2
Business men and women (<i>entrepreneurs</i>)	19,584	16,616	2,968	9.0	8.5	10.6
Professional men and women	15,730	10,376	5,354	7.2	5.4	19.2
Agents and commercial travelers	3,636	3,478	158	1.7	1.8	0.6
Salaried employees.....	10,780	8,813	1,967	4.9	4.6	7.1
Selling force (in stores)...	5,432	4,200	1,232	2.5	2.2	4.4
Industrial wage earners....	96,454	90,723	5,731	44.2	47.6	20.6
Domestic servants.....	8,850	2,410	6,440	4.0	2.3	23.1
Unclassified	13,726	10,742	2,984	6.3	5.6	10.3
Total	218,263	190,297	27,966	100	100	100

The percentage figures shown in the preceding table must have shifted somewhat since 1900, yet not sufficiently to affect the relative positions of the several social groups. The proportion of wage-earners engaged in capitalistic industries must have increased. On the other hand, there is a larger proportion of minors and aliens among wage-earners than among farmers, business men, professional men, etc. In the field of politics, accordingly, the industrial wage-earners count for less than these percentages indicate.

Moreover, only a small fraction of the women of Colorado are engaged in "gainful occupations," in census terminology, *i.e.*, in earning money, yet all women of age may vote.

The classification of female breadwinners may therefore not be typical for all women-voters. The general impression, however, is that the women vote as their men-folk do.

With all due allowances, it may be assumed that the percentages of male breadwinners roughly reflect the voting strength of the different classes of the population of Colorado. The property-holding groups, the business men and the farmers aggregate only 22.8 per cent., while the industrial wage-earners alone comprise nearly one-half the voting population of the State, and together with the agricultural laborers, a small majority (53.4 per cent.). A solid party of the wage-earning class could easily control the political machinery of the State against a political combination of the property-holding classes. The latter would need the support of every voter not a wage-worker in the strict sense of the term, in order to defeat the party of the wage-workers by

gerrymandering and other devices of the black art of the politician. Who is responsible for the domination of the mining corporations in Colorado politics? Is it John D. Rockefeller, Jr.?

CONCERNING ANARCHY

BY MAX EASTMAN.

You would be surprised to know from what source the lawless capitalists of Colorado derive proof that all the anarchy is on the side of the working class. I succeeded in the role of a Sunday School lecturer, ardently searching for God's truth, in meeting the General Manager of the Victor American Company, receiving admission through the lines of the Delagua mines, and having a talk with Snodgrass, its Superintendent.

I had just come up from the tent ruins at Ludlow, where I counted twenty-one bullet holes in one washtub, and Snodgrass assured me that the soldiers had not fired on the tent colony at all. So I have not given great weight to his very charming and judicious remarks upon other subjects. But I do want to quote this much upon the subject of the national officers of the United Mine Workers of America.

"Those men are arnichists, you know. Even the Socialists won't stand for them. Why, there's a book by this man—what's his name? He's a Socialist—Hunter. That's right, Robert Hunter. Have you seen it? He says the Socialists won't stand for the methods of these men, they're arnichists."

"Is that book being read a good deal?" I asked.

"Oh yes, it's being very widely circulated. I have it here. Everybody around here is reading it."

THE GOMPERS CONTEMPT CASE

BY ISAAC A. HOURWICH.

The contempt case against Messrs. Gompers, Mitchell and Morrison, which was pending in the federal courts for the past seven years, has been dismissed by the United States Supreme Court on technical grounds. Mr. Gompers is reported to have said, commenting on the decision of the court: "I am sorry the Supreme Court didn't take cognizance of the principles involved in the case. If the court had, it would have obviated the necessity of some legislation we are seeking now."

It is ungracious, to say the least, of the president of the American Federation of Labor to shift upon the court the responsibility for his own evasion of the issue involved in this case. The United States Supreme Court merely did that which Mr. Gompers, by his counsel, asked it to do. It was Mr. Gompers who pleaded in his defense that the contempt, if committed at all, was barred by the statute of limitations. The United States Supreme Court would have had no power to raise that point of its own motion, had it not been raised by the defence. It was entirely optional with Mr. Gompers to take that issue on appeal to the Supreme Court. If he wanted the court to give an opinion on "the principles involved in the case," he should have waived the defense of the statute of limitations. There would then have been nothing but the main issue before the court, and it could not have escaped the necessity to pass squarely upon the legality of the boycott. Of course, the obligation of Mr. Gompers' counsel in this case was primarily toward their client, and it was their professional duty to take advantage of every technical defense, in order to save him from the unpleasantness of spending one month in prison for contempt of court, in case the Supreme Court upheld the court below. But Mr. Gompers himself could have instructed his counsel to waive all technical defenses and to confine the appeal to "the principles involved in the case,"—to be sure, at the risk of spending a month in prison. There are many plain working men and women among the rank and file of the Federation who have deliberately assumed far greater risks in the struggles of labor and taken the consequences. If the president of the American Federation of Labor believed that the decision of the Supreme Court "would have obviated the necessity of some legislation" his organization is seeking, he would have really risked nothing. If the United States Supreme Court had decided against him on the main issue

and he had gone to jail, the sentence would either have forced the Democratic Congress to pass the legislation sought by the A. F. of L., or to throw off its mask of friendship to labor.

As the case now stands the decision of the United States Court of Appeals by which Mr. Gompers was found guilty stands as a precedent, which may—and probably will—be followed by other courts.

KARL KAUTSKY ON THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

BY FRANK BOHN

Some well-known Socialist writers and speakers in the United States have made the error of repeating, without taking thought, a very popular misconception. They have been declaring for many years that high prices have been due to the "bad" trusts. Hence the very natural middle class conclusion (which the Socialist writers hardly intended to come to) that if the trusts were destroyed prices would fall.* This blunder in economics is dangerous, because it leads directly to blunders in the tactics of the Socialist party and of the labor unions. The worker feels the pinch of a lowering standard of living not when he receives his wages, but when he spends them. The best digested statistics indicate that the

* Perhaps the most widely read pamphlet ever published by the National Office of the Socialist party has its whole argument based upon precisely this error. I refer to "The Growing Grocery Bill," from which the following quotations are taken:

"Centralization of business has so concentrated the control of the necessities of life, that the coming of an industrial depression no longer reduces the cost of living" (p. 7).

"The amount the public pays in excess of the cost of production is the amount out of which the public is gouged—the sum that represents no kind of value—only profit" (p. 5).

This latter error used to be common among Socialists who had just come to the movement. That it should still be spread broadcast over the land by Socialists is nothing short of marvelous. What the writer of the pamphlet in question does not in the least perceive forms the subject matter of that everlasting work of mind—Marx's "Value, Price and Profit." It is a common criticism of Americans by European scholars that our whole population gets its "notions" from the newspapers. And our journalistic gentlemen, like the clergy and the politicians, are absolutely devoid of general ideas. To circulate, even in the Socialist party, a small amount of sound literature on economics, history and politics, and get it read, has been a stupendous task.

prices of the commodities which the workers' families must purchase have risen during fifteen years, on the average, about fifty per cent. This equals a cut in wages of 33½ per cent. for every worker in the land. No wonder that among the vast majority, unlearned in economics, there is this fierce outcry against high prices. They might as well, when it rains through the roof, blame the elements or curse the weather department instead of mending the roof.

So, to our whole American movement, the translation and publication of Comrade Kautsky's little volume entitled "The High Cost of Living"* is a service of the greatest importance. Some of us, indeed, have tried to do our humble part in mitigating the evil of populist economics in this connection. We have urged that the Marxian theory of value and prices was quite sufficient to explain current economic tendencies. But those who have taken the opposite view have among them comrades of the widest influence in the party. Attention is here directed to the researches and conclusions of Kautsky in the hope that they will work mightily in the task of driving petty-bourgeois economics out of the literature and petty-bourgeois tactics out of the councils of the Socialist party.

Kautsky's work is divided into four parts:

- (I) Simple production of commodities.
- (II) Capitalistic method of production.
- (III) The circulation of money.
- (IV) Increase in prices and poverty.

In the first part Kautsky throws the Marxian theory of value into clear relief in connection with the whole matter of money and prices.

A man works for a day in his own bake-shop. He takes his day's baking of bread to the market and trades it for cloth. No great cleverness is required to comprehend that, under average conditions, there will be an even exchange of labor-time. When money (which is a mere commodity) enters into the transaction the matter is made more complex, but is not materially changed. The baker takes his bread to the market and trades it for a day's production of gold. He then takes the gold and buys a day's production of cloth. That is all. When the amount of labor-time required to produce an ounce decreases, an ounce of gold falls in value and therefore in price. When an ounce of gold can be produced only by the expenditure of more labor-time (through the working of low grade ores) it rises in value and in price. That is, since it will take more labor, more time to produce the gold, it will

* The High Cost of Living. By Karl Kautsky. Translated by Austin Lewis. Chas. H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. Fifty cents.

require more cloth or more bread to exchange for a like amount of gold. But gold being the measure of value, the one commodity in which prices are commonly stated, its own fluctuations in value are not generally noted. *Yet those very fluctuations are the cause of a general rise in the prices of all other commodities.*

There is a further reason why increased production of gold, whether or not its labor cost is lessened, has a tendency to cause a rise in prices. This effect Kautsky states most succinctly:

"For example, suppose it is possible by means of gold discoveries, to double the production of gold in the same mines with an equal expenditure of labor, instead of one hundred thousand pounds (140,000,000 marks), 200,000 pounds a year.

"Productivity in other branches remains the same, therefore the amount of commodities for the market does not grow in proportion to the amount of gold. The demand for commodities, therefore, grows stronger than the supply. The prices for commodities must therefore necessarily rise, even if there is not the least change in the disposition of the social labor forces.

"How high the prices will rise is, however, not solely fixed by the yearly increase in the production of gold. We have seen that the additional demand for commodities arising through every increase is dependent upon many varying conditions in the circulation of commodities.

"In the extreme cases which we have taken, that the productivity of gold production is suddenly doubled, there will arise a violent new demand for commodities, which cannot be satisfied at the old prices. Every commodity which comes into the market can find a buyer as the circulation of commodities is accelerated, but thereupon also the demand for commodities is still further increased in proportion to the newly furnished increase in the amount of gold.

"The result will be a doubling of the prices of commodities. If this is not so, gold-production will have a particular power of attraction for the labor-force of society. The gold digger could then buy for the product of an hour's labor more than the product of an hour's labor. He would have to work less hard than the laborers in other pursuits in order to live as well, or he could live better with the same expenditure of labor-power. So that numbers of workers in other branches of industry would leave these and take to gold mining. That means that under given conditions the production of commodities would be limited, and that of gold increased still further. Again, the demand for commodities would be increased until workers in the gold mines cannot live any better than those in other branches of labor and until the compelling force to

gold digging ceases, that is, until with the product of one hour's labor the product of one hour's labor can be bought, and the law of values has been realized" (pp. 25-6).

In Chapter II Kautsky takes up the effect of the production of gold upon prices under the capitalist method of production. Here we have the entrance into the scheme of things of that governing flywheel, the bank. Comrade Varga, in an article in the *Neue Zeit*, had declared that certain current developments in the banking system have been responsible for the rise in prices. It is against this error that the argument of Comrade Kautsky is quite often directed. Varga's main contention seems to have been that "Changes in the production of gold do not automatically operate to produce changes in the value of gold. Because the control banks corner all the gold which comes into the world market, no lowering of the value of gold can take place." This is the primary argument of what may be called the anti-gold theory of rising prices. The view that capitalists "corner" the commodities and thus effect a rise in prices is urged by scores of popular Socialist writers in America. But none has ever attempted to find a general theory upon which to base this whimsicality. Varga attempts to supply one. The biggest trust, the credit trust, having "cornered" the gold supply is enabled thus to overthrow the law of value which, under the system of simple production, controls the use of gold as money.

This theory Kautsky totally demolishes by a simple statement of the vast difference between the technical hoarding of gold and its economic hoarding. Technically, the banks have gold—there it is in the safety vaults. But economically they have much less than none at all. Modern business is done on credit. The basis of credit is gold. Every dollar of gold in the banks is doing business many times over as paper money. Thus at the end of the year 1910 the Bank of England had \$151,000,000 of gold, while its note circulation amounted to \$241,000,000; for the Bank of France the figures were, respectively, \$633,000,000 and \$1,024,000,000; for the Bank of Germany \$159,000,000 and \$391,000,000; and for the Bank of Austria-Hungary \$267,000,000 and \$477,000,000.

"The mass of gold declines not absolutely but relatively; the scope of the circulation of commodities can grow more rapidly and does grow more rapidly than the mass of money. The economic effect of the existing mass of gold will be increased, and thereby the impetus towards demand which every additional mass of gold lends to the production and circulation of commodities is strengthened. . . . The rapidity of the circulation of goods takes place as a result of increased gold production, not in opposition to it. It works in harmony with and intensifies its tendencies" (pp. 68-9).

The capitalist tendency, therefore, is not to hoard as much as possible, but to hoard as little as possible—to conduct the greatest possible amount of credit business upon the least possible amount of capital of any and all kinds.

The positive argument of Kautsky is quickly stated. A chart opposite p. 54 of the English translation tells the tale so that all but the hopelessly dull can comprehend. This chart should be carefully studied in connection with the table of the average prices of staples printed on pp. 57-8. The line of gold production from 1800 to 1850 runs almost horizontally at from 12,000 to about 40,000 kilograms annually. Then comes the discovery of gold in California and Australia. By 1855 it is 200,000 kilograms. Meanwhile the prices of staples (the norm being 100) rose from 112 in 1849 to 152 in 1855. In 1890 the annual production of gold was slightly less than in 1855. Commodity prices have fallen to 108. To hold prices up there would have been required an increasing production of gold commensurate with the world's colossal increase in population and economic production. In 1890 came the cyanide process and the consequent cheapening of gold. In 1898 460,000 kilograms were produced. But there was a world-wide depression of business from 1893 to 1897, a world-wide stringency so profound and of such duration as to break up the whole régime of the world market. Therefore, for a few years, prices fell despite the cheapening of gold. But the depression could not last forever. The natural effect of cheap gold on prices was operative as soon as it ceased. And still the amount of gold production continued to soar. In 1898 came Yukon. The close of the Boer war again opened the gold mines of South Africa, and in the first years of the new century came Goldfield. In 1910 seven hundred thousand kilograms of gold were mined. Prices went up until the workers were in despair.

The only hope, of course, was to organize and strike for higher wages. But the great army of the unskilled has been almost totally unorganized. The organized skilled workers raised their wages in many trades as much as the prices of staples were raised. This was the natural tendency where the wage market was under control. Among the unorganized there was an actual decrease in real wages as great as the rise in prices. This whole matter of the lowering of the standard of living of the American unskilled wage-worker I shall discuss in a future article in the NEW REVIEW.

It might be supposed that the observation of the most simple facts would prevent any great misunderstanding of this whole matter. The clothing industry has not been trustified, yet the prices of clothing rose as did those of Standard Oil products and stock.

Potatoes are produced on some 5,000,000 farms. Yet the price of potatoes rose with that of Steel Trust stock and farming machinery. There are practically no trusts in Great Britain and none at all in China. Yet the rise in prices affected the markets in those countries as it did those of the United States.

Of course an absolute monopoly *can* cause a rise in prices. The possible effect of this fact I pointed out in an introduction to an edition of "Value, Price and Profit" published eight years ago. But the conditions therein taken for granted have never yet come to pass in a single industry.*

Kautsky's conclusions are most interesting. The high prices and the resulting keen industrial enterprise having everywhere followed the great production of gold, we are now, due to a falling off in gold production, to suffer a period of falling prices and general industrial retrenchment. Kautsky wrote before the present industrial depression had set in. His clearness of vision in the matter has already been proven.

In America the various sponsors for the different exploiting groups are pointing fingers at one another and urging their own nostrums. The Socialist party may be, if it will, equipped with both an understanding of conditions and a programme which will help to abolish the causes of those conditions. Prices will fall. Unemployment will increase. The workers will again, as in 1893-7, become bitter in spirit and this time they will be ready to adopt revolutionary measures. If our party arms itself with the facts which Kautsky so clearly sets before us it may confidently conclude with him that:

"We may confidently enter upon the conflict which the new era of capitalism has for us, in which no rapid addition to gold production can longer interfere with the sharpening of class antagonisms, in which capitalism extends its domain only at the expense of the growing misery of the mass of the population, and the latter is more and more compelled to cause the overthrow of the capitalist system on pain of its own destruction."

* There are one or two Socialist writers who, probably through a desire to escape the pitfall of populism, err in the other direction. They give the Marxian theory of value and price a petrified and hence very un-Marxian interpretation. An otherwise most valuable pamphlet published by Kerr and Co. ("Shop Talks on Economics") contains this error. It wholly denies the possibility of prices being wilfully regulated through monopoly. Practically its conclusions are all well enough. But it does not square with sound economic theory.

WALLING'S "PROGRESSIVISM AND AFTER"

BY WALTER LIPPMANN

I.

If the ordinary American Socialist doesn't find this new book of Walling's the most disconcerting experience that has happened to him in a long while, it will be because he hasn't read the book. For the book is an attack on the basic items of his creed. The Party believes that society is divided into two social classes—the exploiters and the exploited. Walling asserts that there are at least four well defined social classes—the plutocracy, the small capitalists, the aristocracy of labor; and the unprivileged masses. The Party believes that a unified movement of the exploited is to bring in Socialism. Walling asserts that each of the social classes he defines is destined to rule society in turn—that the small capitalists must overthrow the big capitalists, that the aristocracy of labor must overthrow the small capitalists before the real struggle of Socialism can even begin. The Party believes that its program of collective ownership democratically controlled is Socialism. Walling asserts that this is the program of a class, that it will be carried out in the interests of the upper ranks of labor, that it will not abolish class rule nor establish equal opportunity. The Party believes that the workers are capable of solidarity. Walling asserts that there is a class struggle within the working class. The Party believes that poverty, overwork, unemployment are inevitable products of a capitalistic society. Walling asserts that capitalists will, out of their own interest, abolish them. The Party believes that no genuine reform is possible except through the Socialist movement. Walling asserts that progressivism means "a new life and a new world for the worker."

Let there be no mistake about this: Walling says quite definitely again and again that the self-interest of small capitalists and the self-interest of the privileged among labor will set up complete political democracy, will abolish poverty, reduce hours, end unemployment, will nationalize industry, will destroy large fortunes and large inheritances. All these immense changes, changes

which seem to most of us colossal and revolutionary, are to be carried through in the interest of privileged classes, not by the power of the unprivileged masses. Property, class interest, is to do these things, not the dispossessed and exploited. And yet, when these reforms are carried out, reforms which most of us advocate in order to end class rule, class rule will still continue and the rate of exploitation will be greater than ever.

I think that is enough to puzzle most Socialists, for it amounts to an attack on every fundamental belief they hold. They are informed by Walling that Socialism is to be the third revolution from this one; that there is no class struggle between labor and capital to-day; that the only class struggle just now is that of the small capitalists, represented by Wilson and Roosevelt, against the plutocracy; that the much despised reformers and progressives are going to perform the most thrilling event in history, for they are going to end poverty and misery.

II.

Walling says all this with such unruffled calm that the sensational meaning of his analysis might conceivably pass unnoticed. But it would be well for Socialists not to deceive themselves. If what Walling says were true, and if truth mattered very much to a popular movement, then the American Socialist Party as we know it would have received a staggering blow. However, before attempting to trace the consequences of his analysis, let me quote him:

I regard Socialism as the probable outcome of the progress of the next quarter century. But I differ completely with the leading official spokesman of Socialism as to its probable means of attainment, for I contend that two social stages must intervene. Far from looking forward to intervening stages of radical and even revolutionary social advance, between us and Socialism, not one of them, to my knowledge, recognizes any intervening revolutionary changes at all. The present social order, under the domination of large capital, is expected to continue until Socialism arrives, or if any revolutionary change takes place, it is to develop almost immediately into a Socialist revolution. Marx held to the view that as soon as industry became highly organized and monopolies developed, the small capitalists would be forced to act with the laboring masses to socialize industry and introduce Socialism. But already at least one stage, that of private monopolies, has intervened.

Two of the three stages of social struggle that I shall examine are already recognized, but only the first stage, the struggle against large capitalists, is recognized by non-Socialist progressives, and only the second, the struggle against the domination of society by the small capitalists, is recognized by the Socialists. That there

could be a third stage of social struggle due to a fundamental and lasting division within the ranks of labor itself, and that the masses of wage-earners would have to struggle against the privileged wage-earners even after capitalism is abolished, seems scarcely to have entered most Socialists' minds.

Walling, in short, attacks the theory of a two-class struggle; he insists that two stages of social advance, which he calls State Capitalism and State Socialism lie ahead of us; and he points out that these two "intervening" stages will mean enormous changes in the structure of society. These three points constitute an open challenge to the existing theory and tactics of the Socialist Party. For they mean that the real progress of the immediate future will come from privileged classes; they mean that we do not have to rely on the proletariat alone for the ending of poverty; they mean that the hope of the next few years does not lie in the exploited masses, but in the leadership first of the small capitalists and then of the aristocracy of labor.

Now there are two honest ways of reacting to Walling's challenge. It is not honest, of course, to ignore it. But you can deny the truth of his analysis, or you can accept it and set about adjusting yourself to it.

I, for one, agree that there are more than two social classes fighting out their conflicts in modern society. Men like Wilson, Bryan and La Follette seem to me to represent a real conflict with the plutocracy. Yet at the same time they do not represent the proletariat. They stand for the farmers, the small business men, the small bankers, the shippers—all of whom have a real and lasting grievance against the great monopolies, the railroads, and the large bankers. It seems very clear, too, that there is a division in the world of labor, that the railroad brotherhoods and most of the A. F. of L. are not likely to form a permanent alliance with the great mass of unskilled workers. There is already as much class antagonism among wage-earners as among any other two groups. Of course, I don't like the fact any more than anyone else does who wishes to create a solidarity of labor, but the fact is one that no realistic person can blink.

I agree too, in the main, with Walling's belief that an immensely valuable reform program will be carried out through the power, first of the small capitalists and then of the aristocracy of labor. He seems to me entirely sound in his assertion that this reform program, which he calls progressivism, is not the useless and hopeless thing American Socialists have called it, but a genuine, historical change. The pretense of Socialists that they alone are the agents of progress seems to me to be contradicted by the plain facts of everyday life.

So while there are details in Walling's speculation that I should wish to question, his general analysis seems to me to be sound.

III.

Where then is Walling's Socialism? The crux of it, as I understand him, is just here. The reforms of State Capitalism and State Socialism will abolish the worst evils of present society, and yet they will leave undisturbed the great facts of unequal opportunity and of exploitation. Even with complete political democracy, with industry nationalized, the children of the unskilled will not have an equal opportunity with the children of the more privileged classes. Moreover, while the unskilled workers will be better off than they have ever been before, their relative share of prosperity will not be any greater, so that the fact of exploitation will continue. And, says Walling, until you change the *proportion* in which wealth is distributed, you have not started to inaugurate Socialism.

When he asserts that the relative share of wealth going to each group is of more interest to the race than the absolute amount which it receives, I beg to disagree. Exploitation is a terrible fact where it means a denial of the decencies and elementary comforts of life. But after that, after a man is sure of enough to live happily and decently, exploitation becomes of far less human importance to him. Thus if you double the incomes of the poor, it would be an immense advance; quadruple them, the gain would be great, but not so great as before, and after that the money increment added makes relatively less difference to life. The difference between what I, a middle-class person, get as income, and what a multi-millionaire gets, is relatively far greater than the difference between my income and that of a Lawrence textile worker. But the difference between me and the multi-millionaire worries me not at all, while the difference between the incomes of the poor and mine is the most shocking fact of our civilization.

The real fight is not about the abstract proportion, but about the absolute amount. And any movement that promises the worker the immediate advance of his absolute income is of infinitely more importance to him than any other movement. Perhaps after the worker has raised himself to security and comfort the *relative* share will worry him personally. But not now. He must worry now about concrete amounts. To worry about statistical proportions is a luxury that belongs to middle-class theorists.

It is here that Walling, I think, shows his most serious lack of perspective as to the real value of the situation. The tone of the

book would lead one to believe that the abolition of poverty was of comparatively little interest beside the desire to equalize the sharing of wealth. To my mind this first step by which the whole population secures decency and comfort, is far and away the most revolutionary step that the world can take. No change of proportion after that is as important as this concrete advance. While people haven't elementary decencies, exploitation is paid for in flesh and blood. When they have the comforts, then they are essentially free people, their struggles are no longer matters of life and death, and the whole human problem takes on a different character.

Thus there is a class struggle between small capitalists and large capitalists, but it's a much pleasanter struggle to be in than is the struggle between wage-earners and the boss. And the difference is that in the former case both sides have resources, both sides have to respect each other, and the issue is not one of hunger and need, but of more comfort and less comfort. And so when the workers achieve the "economy of high wages," with unemployment and corresponding evils reduced, the whole nature of their struggle will be altered. This first step above the poverty line is the biggest step of all, and if it is true that progressivism as it develops will take that step, then Walling has paid it the highest tribute that can be paid to a social movement. The abolition of poverty is more revolutionary than a just distribution of wealth after poverty is abolished.

I don't mean that a just distribution isn't important. I mean that it is far less important than the achieving of elementary comfort and security. And so, if the Progressives, or the Socialists, or anyone else can end poverty, they will perform the most significant act of our generation. All that comes after is a matter of better adjustment, but this one thing, the creation of a civilized minimum, would be as revolutionary as any social change in history. I'm sure it is the first interest of the poor, far more interesting to them than any question of relative share; I think it's the first interest of all practical people. And while no one can object to Walling's emphasis on the proportions in which wealth is distributed, I think that in comparison with the absolute increase of the incomes of the poor, he raises a secondary issue.

IV.

Walling believes that the Socialism he holds to is to be the outcome of the next twenty-five years. He says that we are now entering upon State Capitalism, which will soon pass into State

Socialism, and from that will evolve the equal opportunity which he calls Socialism. Now, setting dates a quarter of a century ahead may be useful enough, but it's not a matter about which there can be fruitful debate. My own sense of progress is not so rapid as Walling's, but that is of no importance. Judging by this book alone, Walling lives in a very neat universe, one where the unexpected crisis plays no great rôle. It is perhaps well not to forget what a war with Japan might mean to Walling's orderly march of events.

But while you can't quarrel with a man for being too tidy about social evolution, you can quarrel with him if his too orderly mind leads him to a fatalism which inhibits action. I believe that just such a fatalism is what Walling has got himself into.

In his preface, he says:

As to the best that can be put into practical effect this year or next, given the present power of the various parties, all practical persons, of whatever party, may, and often do, agree. And the majority of the opponents of Socialism have complimented its ideal as a possibility or a probability of the remote future. The real field of political conflict lies between these two periods.

In short, men can agree, says Walling, about immediate progress and ultimate goals; they disagree about the intermediate program, say ten years from now. The most obvious answer is that ten years from now the intermediate will be immediate, so that there'll be no disagreement then. Now if that is true, then there is no practical conflict at all, there is only a conflict of theories; there is no class struggle about concrete events; about those there is social harmony; there is only a conflict of opinions about the future.

It hardly seemed possible at first reading that Walling should have gone down such a blind alley. I assumed that he was merely careless in his statement. But a careful reading of the book, it seems to me, leaves no escape from the conclusion that this is the particular blind alley he has walked into.

For he uses the theory of economic determinism with great literalness; that is to say, he bases his analysis on the assumption that economic power creates a ruling class which rules all the time it is in power. Now if you believe that, then the only immediate steps that can be taken are steps that the ruling class desires. Therefore all "practical" people agree on immediate programs. A lower class rises to power when its economic force is greater than that of the existing rulers. Then the immediate program which is to the interest of the new class becomes "practical."

Consequently a good, literal materialist can never disagree with the ruling class about immediate measures. It would be

"utopian" to do so. And therefore, your materialist becomes a fatalist, which is just what has happened to Walling. He has, if he's consistent, to be for the immediate program of the ruling class. He can talk about the immediate program of the next ruling class—that is, he can have an intermediate program, but he can't demand its enactment, until the balance of power has changed. This is the old dilemma of fatalism, the dilemma which has turned more revolutionists into pedants and ineffective theorists than any other intellectual blight which has fallen upon them.

It has fallen upon Walling, at least in this book. He foresees great changes carried out by the interest of the small capitalists and the aristocracy of labor, but he can suggest nothing but appreciation for them. Now, those who are not fatalists deny that men agree on immediate programs. They say that on most immediate issues there are alternatives, that you can fight for the better one, and that you may win. But Walling denies the possibility of this in plain words, and he means to deny it because he never suggests an alternative program for the present.

So that for all real purposes, Socialists are reduced to being people who know what is going to happen, but that knowledge helps them not at all, because they can't change what is going to happen. Whatever is to come is to be in the interest of a ruling class, and it's the ruling class that will carry them out.

Those of us who reject economic determinism and merely hold to a partial economic interpretation find a forecast like Walling's very illuminating. It helps us to know what we have to deal with. But we don't admit that we can't *deal* with it. We can agree with Walling that a forecast of the future is useful as a preparation for it, but we refuse to treat the future as if human effort could not deflect it. And for practical purposes "this year and the next" are still open to some choice: they are not settled and fixed by economic determinism.

The facts bear us out. It is simply not true to say that "all practical persons of whatever party, may, and often do agree" about the best for this year or next. For what on earth are all our struggles about? Do all "practical" persons agree about labor laws, municipal ownership, tariffs? Don't they fight with fury about these things?

V.

There is one statement of Walling's which seems to qualify his fatalism. He says in the introduction that "the great differences of opinion to-day are not as to the nature of progress or

its direction, but as to the rate." If that is true, then Walling has left himself a loophole of escape from the closed circle of determinism. He can't have anything to say as to what is to be done, he can't deflect the inevitable steps of progress, amend, or make substitutes, but he can hasten the inevitable a bit by education or organization. He might under this theory get done in one year what might have taken two, which would be a big difference. But he can't theoretically prevent bad things from being done, nor can he insist upon distinctions between better and worse. He is like the operator of a moving picture machine who might run off the film a little faster, but who has no power of altering the subject matter.

It seems to me, however, that it's untrue to say that the great differences of opinion are no longer about the nature of progress or its direction. Act on that assumption to-day and you'll butt your head very soon against all sorts of obstacles. Walling, I fear, is generalizing from the theoretical writings of Liberals, Progressives and Socialists, not from observation of business men, politicians, or even newspaper editors. The Manufacturers' Association or the Democratic Party does not agree with Socialists as to the nature of progress, its direction, or for that matter, its ultimate goal. Walling, it seems to me, has made the wish father to the thought, and by combining tremendous optimism with a fatalist philosophy, he has drowned his sense of the immediate in a passionate enthusiasm for the inevitable. And the result is that Walling, who is most interested in the unskilled, has no program for them now, and all that he can say to them is that they will be helped immensely by upper classes, but that their turn for real influence doesn't come until the third revolution from the one we are just entering.

This fatalism of Walling's is perplexing, in view of the fact that he wrote a book last year in which he embraced pragmatism. Now pragmatism in its whole temper is a method of thought concerned with the possibility of altering events that lie before us. Its bent is to make thought and action fit each other better. But fatalism cannot lead to action; it is a way of observing the world, not of dealing with it.

When Walling's "Larger Aspects of Socialism" appeared many of us hoped that a first rate Socialist thinker had at last abandoned the old materialist determinism which had done so much to divorce Socialist thought from Socialist action. But a shrewd friend of mine remarked after reading Walling's book: "The formulæ of pragmatism are here, but not the spirit of it." This new book justifies that comment, I think.

The proof of this assertion would require more space than is at my disposal. But there are a few points that may be indicated. The first is his fatalism about the immediate; the second is the emphasis which makes the proportionate distribution of wealth more important to him than absolute increases of income. For this emphasis is the child of an abstraction, and the abstraction is the dogma of equality. The roots of Walling's philosophy are the Eighteenth Century "natural rights" of man, and the essential drive of his intellect is the same Eighteenth Century intellectualism. It is no accident that Walling identifies his Socialism with the theory that Jefferson and his men took for granted. He is their legitimate heir, and he lives in their tradition.

Note, for example, his answer to Bernstein, who argues that the ultimate title of property should be in the nation, not in a local government or in an individual. Says Walling, why the nation rather than the world: "It devolves upon him (*i.e.*, Bernstein) to show us how, as to rightful titles of ownership, there is any necessary or real distinction between the nation as part of the world and local government as part of the nation." That is, of course, a piece of crass logic chopping on Walling's part, for anyone who has escaped from the Eighteenth Century knows you don't try to decide questions by natural rights, but by human uses. Bernstein may be foolish or wise, but it is certain that he cannot be answered by Walling's method. "Are not national rights to the soil as inadmissible and destructive of all equity as the so-called rights of a district, and on the same grounds?" he asks. "Equity,"—oh Walling, and you writing a book of modern science!

This is a small incident, perhaps, but it's only one of many that might be cited. Taken with his fatalism, his over-emphasis of an abstract relation in the distribution of wealth, and the dogma of equality which he never stops to criticize, we have the clues perhaps to Walling's habit of thought. The ideals are those of the Middle Western American democracy, and the underlying prejudices are those of the Eighteenth Century, from which the culture of the American Middle West derives.

I don't say this idly. What Walling understands by Socialism is far more closely related to the *laissez-faire* and equal opportunity of the American West than it is to the highly organized society that most people understand by Socialism. Temperamentally, Walling is attached to the old American dream, and he is much nearer to Henry George than he is to Bebel, or to the organized Socialist movement. It isn't analysis and conviction alone that have made him the outspoken critic of practically every Socialist party in the world; it is temperament, and a traditional

bias which, like Bryan, like Steffens, like Darrow, like every good Western radical, make Walling uneasy at the sight of organization and somewhat bored at administrative problems. There isn't in this book, so far as I remember, a single reference to the difficulties of organizing or managing a labor union, a political party, or a democratic State. For these are difficulties that all American radicals tend to pass over in silence. And Walling is an American radical first, and almost everything else second.

VI.

But I should not wish to conclude without correcting the inevitable impression that I have been trying to score points on Walling. For, in spite of all this criticism, the book stands out as the most honest and original contribution that has appeared for many a day by a man calling himself a Socialist. I have tried to point out certain twists in his method which seem to me to make his conclusions less fruitful than they might be. But when all is said, Walling is perhaps the only American Socialist of standing who keeps inquiry alive, the only one who doesn't rewrite the same book every year or two. And if honest inquiry happens to produce results very damaging to the existing pretensions of the Socialist movement that is nothing against the inquirer.

SOCIALISM AND FEMINISM

A REPLY TO BELFORT BAX

By FLOYD DELL

E. Belfort Bax has an honorable past, of which it will be well to speak here. He is the author of some books, and notably of some essays, which have done as much to inculcate in radicals a critical attitude toward current ideas of morality and immorality, as any other writings in English. In particular, he has had a share in the formation of the minds of latter-day Feminists. For Feminism is not only a revolt of women against conditions which hamper their activities; it is also a revolt of women *and men* against the type of woman created by those conditions.

In this revolt against the slave-goddess type of womanhood, Mr. Bax has been for Anglo-Saxons a pioneer. Bernard Shaw

has acknowledged him his teacher. In a famous anti-Feminist essay Bax has pointed out precisely those privileges which the slave-goddess enjoys in law and custom, and which she must renounce in order to achieve the condition of a Freewoman. One of these privileges—an obvious example—is alimony. Mr. Bax, in his essay on "The Subjection of Man," mentions many other examples of sex-discrimination in which men have the worst of it, including certain legal injustices which are not so characteristic of America as of England. One of these, exploited by Bernard Shaw in his comedy, "Getting Married," is the fact that in England a man can be sued for a libel committed *by his wife*.

It will be interesting to consider this particular example for a moment. Its origin, of course, is to be discovered in the fact that a man's wife was once his legal property. This is one of the survivals of that old condition. But the explanation does not render the fact any the less objectionable to an enlightened Englishman.

Now it is plain that if women were to claim every new right and at the same time insist on retaining every old privilege, the result would be a pretty state of affairs. And we have to thank Mr. Bax for pointing out the distinction. It is owing in great measure to the critical habit of mind which modern Feminists have learned from Mr. Bax and others of the same intellectual temper that we to-day define Feminism in terms which exclude all merely sentimental or even humanitarian efforts on behalf of women. Thus the effort that is regularly made on behalf of every lady murderess to save her from the death penalty, is not Feminist; it is sentimental. The passage of laws restricting the hours of work for women is not Feminist; it is humanitarian, besides being sound statesmanship. And the "movement" to make men give up their seats in street cars to women is not Feminist; it is sentimental-humanitarian, or something between the two. But Feminism itself aims to destroy *all* of the survivals in law and custom of what may be called the old "charter of women"—the code of assumptions according to which they socially and industrially existed.

Now, this women's charter, as I have called it, this bundle of special privileges and limitations which created the slave-goddess against which the nineteenth century has rebelled, was founded on a theory: the theory that woman was set apart by her peculiar sexual organization to peculiar social and industrial functions circumscribed by the home.

The refusal of women in constantly increasing numbers to take their sex so seriously as all that, their insistence that outside and beyond and above the fact of their womanhood was the fact of

their humanity—this has created the woman movement. In one direction after another they have broken down the barriers which set them off as a sexual class from the great world of human effort. It was one of the earliest taunts levelled at them that they had given up their special privileges—or, as it was tersely and poetically put, "their womanhood." They have gained for themselves the opportunity to be as well educated as men; they have gained the opportunity to indulge their predilections in the way of a career outside the home; and they are now gaining an opportunity to hasten and secure such gains by political means.

And if anyone asks what can women do with the vote, I will reply that they can repeal the law which, by penalizing the spread of information in regard to the prevention of conception, attempts to enforce upon women the tyranny of accidental and unwelcome pregnancy.

Let us pause on that fact a moment. There is certainly no kind of freedom where there is no command over one's own body. If a woman may not keep her body for her own uses as long as she wishes, and give it up to the service of the race when she chooses, she is certainly a slave. And if that slavery is fostered by the deliberate effort of male legislators, elected by male voters, we have a state of affairs for which the phrase "masculine despotism" is none too strong. A critical examination of the facts, of course, would distribute the blame for this law among such impersonal forces as religion, bourgeois morality and the superstition of State-worship, and would effectually dissipate any personal animosity against men as the original authors of the tyranny. But there is plenty of excuse for the indignant phrase, even in the pages of the NEW REVIEW.

But it was this phrase, appearing in Mary White Ovington's recent article on "Socialism and the Feminist Movement," which aroused the ire of Belfort Bax, and provoked him to the reply which appeared in the last issue under the same title.

Mr. Bax's early contribution to the Feminist movement, of which I have spoken, was of course an unwilling contribution. His writings helped Feminism, as good criticism must always help any genuinely revolutionary cause. And we might to-day have expected from him some valuable, if unfriendly, comments on the votes for women movement. But this article of Mr. Bax's is not valuable. It lacks the sound critical spirit which alone can justify such an attack. It is, to tell the truth, rather absurd.

Mr. Bax, disagreeing with Miss Ovington, says there is no reason why Socialists ought to be Feminists. That is a matter I will deal with very briefly later.

But Mr. Bax goes on to attack Feminism in the tones of anger rather than of argument. Feminism is "the Feminist craze," its adherents are "sex-obsessed women," its arguments are "the usual falsification of fact familiar in all Feminist propaganda," and the Socialist leaders who have been instrumental in putting a "woman suffrage" plank in the Party platform "have been driven to bow the knee in the temple of the Feminist Rimmon (probably against their real judgment)."

In spite of this feeble violence of phrase, it is possible to discover an arguable case in Mr. Bax's remarks about Feminism. He makes two points against Feminism. The first is that it means a "sex-war"; and the second, that women are inferior to men.

Here is his first point in his own words:

"The upshot of the article [Miss Ovington's] is the advocacy of the solidarity of womankind against men; in other words, the preaching of a sex-war."

It happens that Mr. Bax is quite wrong in saying that Miss Ovington preaches sex-war in her article; I cannot quote the whole article to prove this, and I do not care to go into the ethical question of Mr. Bax's methods in quoting and re-quoting *part* of one of Miss Ovington's sentences as a basis for the charge of preaching sex-war. Suffice it to say that Miss Ovington no more preaches sex-war in that article than I do in this.

A sex-war is, of course, a silly thing to preach, a silly thing to believe in. There is no possibility of a war between beings who hunger and thirst after each other, who go insane and die when deprived of each other's society, who cannot have even ordinary good health, let alone peace of mind, without the most intimate association with each other—a war between beings who have at the very basis of their lives a necessity for each other, is too ludicrous to take seriously.

Mr. Bax, however, does take it seriously. He actually does! He says with solemn menace that "sex-war is a game that two can play at." And in language which recalls a recent editorial in the *New York Times*, he declares the "time may soon come when men will begin to recognize *their* 'obligation to stand with all other' men who are fighting against what they consider as female usurpation and an attempted 'feminine despotism.'"

His next remark seems to show that he considers the war already on, and the two sexes arrayed in hostile armies. For he says: "Any success women may achieve in their 'anti-man' crusade is entirely due to the help given them by 'rats' from the camp of men themselves."

Saddened by this extraordinary lapse of an able mind, I turn to his second point against Feminism. Here it is, in his own words:

"Given an average intellectual, and in certain aspects, moral inferiority of woman as against man, and there is obvious reason for refusing to concede to woman the right to exercise, let us say, administrative and legislative functions such as have hitherto accrued to men."

Note that Mr. Bax says "given." Concede to him that women are inferior—well, anyone who likes may concede it, and prove to Mr. Bax (as is quite easy) that even beings of an "average" intellectual and moral (whatever that means!) inferiority to men, would be justified in wishing to live their own lives in their own way, without interference from the superior sex. It would be no handicap to give Mr. Bax all he asks for in this argument. But just the same I decline to give it. "The inferiority of women" (I mildly remark) is a mere private opinion, of interest possibly to one's biographer.

"I do not pretend," says Mr. Bax, "in this article to discuss the whole problem of sex-capacity and its implications." It is just as well, since no one knows anything about "sex-capacity," and all that can be said on the subject must be drawn from the imagination. I am not unwilling to draw upon mine, and suggest all that a century of enlightened education and physical training would do to broaden the capacity of women for everything in which they are imagined by Mr. Bax to be now deficient. But inasmuch as Mr. Bax has been forbearing in this matter, so will I.

And now I return to the question of whether Socialists ought to be Feminists. What I have to say is this: If there is no necessary connection between Feminism and Socialism, it may yet be advisable to invent one. Otherwise, the Socialist movement stands to lose the enthusiasm and the energy of some thousands of young women of the growing generation, who will turn in disgust from our cause when they discover that the Socialist ideal—the abolition of classes—was never meant to refer to women.

ERNST HAECKEL

By ROBERT H. LOWIE

Turgéniëff has divided men into two categories,—the type of Hamlet and the type of Don Quixote: the Hamlets—realists keenly aware of obstacles and checked in action by morbid self-criticism; the Don Quixotes—plungers where the others tiptoe, chargers of windmills that hurl them aground, yet withal leaders of men and moulders of history.

The man whose eightieth birthday was celebrated this year by radicals throughout the civilized world belongs emphatically to the second group; he is the very incarnation of the Don Quixote type. Viewed from a purely intellectual point of view, he is perhaps the least of the really significant figures in the history of science. So far as can be judged by the student of a branch of knowledge adjoining his own, Haeckel's achievements in biology do not rank with those of, say, the founders of modern physics. Nowhere in Haeckel's works, so far as I can see, is the most sympathetic reader held spellbound by the glimpse of a supreme intellect such as awes us in an account of Galileo's discoveries. And even when we descend to the realm of the demigods, Haeckel's deficiencies loom neither slight nor few. More tenacious of a view once formed than Wundt, he lacks Wundt's omniscience and wisdom; Darwin's caution, James's open-mindedness, Mach's analytical acumen and historical attitude are alike foreign to his mental make-up.

Yet in spite of all intellectual shortcomings, Haeckel's biological work may be called truly great. Not only has he made notable contributions to our knowledge of the lower forms of life, but he has enriched biology with a variety of concepts that have become part and parcel of the science. And the bold survey of biological fundamentals based on Darwin's "Origin" which he published under the title of "Generelle Morphologie" remains beyond cavil one of the landmarks in the history of zoology. Huxley, never an uncritical admirer, cited it as one of the two books in the bibliography of his famous "Britannica" article on "Biology."

However, it is not fair to Haeckel's personality to focus attention on his intellectual output. His place is only in small measure in the history of science. His next of kin are not Helmholtz,

Newton, and Darwin; rather must he be classed with the Savonarolas and Luthers and Voltaires, with the seers of visions and the makers of history. His cultural mission lay in the spread of advanced thought as moulded by the doctrine of evolution, and in this field he has had no rival. To be sure, his character of prophet has not been spotless. I do not refer to the occasional confusion of fact and hypothesis that scandalized the more pedantic of his guild. That was a fault, from a tactical no less than from a scientific point of view; for it exposed Haeckel and his cause to needless attack. But Haeckel's championship of radicalism suffered from a deeper fault. He is at bottom not a radical at all, neither in science nor in anything else. Nothing is farther from him than the cool, incisive, consistently applied rationalism of the French Encyclopedists. Like Carlyle and Nietzsche, he is radical by fits and starts, relapsing at times into the crassest conservatism. Certain radical ideas impress his artist's soul with compelling force, and he becomes their apostle and slave. But in spite of all his talk of monism, there never follows a consistent harmonization of his entire world-conception through the critical principle of radicalism; and so he remains conservative where emotional grounds persist for conservatism. In vain we look for that complete freedom from traditional prejudice that glows in the pages of Kropotkin or Mach.

By an irony of fate the accepted champion of advanced thought turns his back on the greatest advances in his own and neighboring sciences,—sneering at the exact methods of the experimental biologist, continuing to retail in diluted form the physics he learned at college. And as in science, so in philosophy and politics. Of the petty traditions of the German middle class into which he was born, Haeckel never quite succeeded in ridding himself. Even in a purely æsthetic way, despite his rich artistic endowment, this heritage often causes him to lapse into triviality: he is still Apollo, but Apollo in clogs and nightcap. And with this temperamental susceptibility and frequent abeyance of critical judgment, new crochets were added to the old folk-ways. So we find him a curious combination: an atheist playing with the words "god" and "religion"; a progressive and a worshiper of Bismarck; a humanitarian, yet a Spartan eugenist and race-theorist,—in short a hodge-podge of liberal and reactionary elements. Yet, to his glory be it said, every change in his outlook was a step forward. The political philosophy of "Die Welträtsel" (1899) towers head and shoulders above that of the rejoinder to Virchow (1877); in "Die Lebenswunder" (1904) I find again a more progressive point of view; and Haeckel was among those who protested against the legal assassination of Ferrer.

Wherein, however, lies Haeckel's greatness? Why is his cultural significance in the history of freethought incomparably greater than that of men much wiser and more learned? We can only say, explaining little though it may, that it is by virtue of his unique personality. Others were more thoroughly and consistently liberal, he had the gift to make his liberalism more effective than any of his competitors. We need merely compare his propaganda with William James's propaganda of pragmatism to get a notion of the overpowering personality of the man. James had a professional reputation hardly inferior to Haeckel's; through the peculiar historical position of psychology as a science he was indeed rather more favorably placed relatively to his compeers; there can be no doubt that James was a most engaging personality; and he preached the gospel of pragmatism with all the fervor of a religious prophet. Yet what has been the result? A teapot commotion in academic circles. Haeckel espoused *his* cause, and it became a phenomenon that shook to its foundation the body of traditional belief. In the face of pusillanimous colleagues, against clerical vituperation and the stupidity that defies the gods, he made his mode of thought into a religion. If evolution has become a household word in Germany, as pragmatism perhaps never will be anywhere, if it is being embraced, though reluctantly, with reservations and maledictions against its chief apostle, even by the most reactionary circles, to Haeckel belongs the credit above any one other man. In the face of this immense social service, criticism pales. We do not wish popularization of science to cease where Haeckel left it, but in purifying and adding to the concepts he has made public property we are standing on his shoulders. The very men whose teachings go beyond Haeckel—Ostwald and Mach—gratefully acknowledge his cultural significance as "an upright incorruptible champion of popular enlightenment and the liberty of thought." We need not be more fastidious. There are thistles in the scholar's laurel wreath; there are cracks in the warrior's armor; but he has brought a sword into the world that we may be proud to pick up when the Great Commoner of science shall have ceased to wield it.

A SOCIALIST DIGEST

THE COLORADO WAR AND COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

The action of President Wilson and the federal army officers in forbidding the further importation of strike-breakers into Colorado is apparently an interference on behalf of labor—certainly a new attitude for a Government of the United States to take. Yet the new departure is generally approved by the progressive capitalist press. The *New York World*, for example, says:

Strike-breaking as now carried on is not far removed from peonage. It recognizes no human obligation whatever. Its tendency is always downward. It is toil without hope. It is a cruel struggle for life, with the knowledge that newer strike-breakers may at any time introduce a fiercer competition.

His refusal to employ the forces of the United States to protect this shameful traffic will be remembered to the President's honor forever.

How explain this apparently "radical" position of an avowedly capitalistic administration and an avowedly capitalistic press?

If we take our impression from the progressive or small capitalist press, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., is the issue. From first to last, the *New York World*, the *Philadelphia North American*, and the progressive papers generally, whether Democratic, Rooseveltian or Republican, have been almost as strongly on the labor side as the Socialist and labor press itself.

But they have given their chief attention to an utterance made by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., before a committee of Congress several weeks before the crisis occurred. Said Rockefeller:

My conscience entirely acquits me. We would rather that the unfortunate conditions should continue, and that we should lose all the millions invested, than that American workmen should be deprived of their right, under the Constitution, to work for whom they please. That is the great principle at stake. It is a national issue.

Here the language itself suggests a nation-wide attempt to crush the unions, and the progressive press argues that recent statements of Rockefeller have shown that this is his real purpose—in Colorado. But the Socialist press, especially the *Appeal to Reason*,

claims that Paterson, Lawrence, West Virginia, and Colorado have shown that the plan is nation-wide. The *Appeal* claims to have secured definite evidence to this effect from a several months' investigation it conducted through John Kenneth Turner, the results of which it is now publishing.

Certainly the language of such Tory organs as the *Boston Herald* seems to prove that the *Appeal* is right:

May not this Colorado strike be the exact point where the battle should be made, and may not Mr. Rockefeller be the man best equipped to make it? The answer depends largely on whether you believe in the system of private property, or in Socialism, which is its most prominent alternative.

The *World* says:

Young Mr. Rockefeller repeats that the maintenance of certain labor conditions in Colorado is "a matter of principle which we could not concede or arbitrate."

To the feudal lords of mediæval Europe the attachment of the serf to the soil was a legal right and a matter of principle.

In the pulpits of the South in 1860 property rights in black slaves were upheld by citation from Scripture and the Book of Common Prayer as a matter of principle.

In England it was long a matter of principle that government should not restrict a woman's free right to crawl on hands and knees through low mine tunnels dragging a carload of coal by a harness about her waist.

It is a matter of principle to some capitalists that parents shall be free to hire their little children to work long hours in shops.

That right of combination and organization, even if forced upon the unwilling, which Mr. Rockefeller would deny to workingmen, is defended by the lawyers of industrial monopoly as a matter of principle.

Mr. Rockefeller is correct in stating his "matter of principle." What he fails to note is that matters of principle are ever perishing in the development of human institutions. No matter of principle is big enough to stand out to the end against public necessity.

Public necessity, it will be noticed, is the final note of this editorial. The *North American* is not less vehement:

No capitalists ever spent millions merely to "protect the freedom" of workers; no corporation would prefer that its entire investment be consumed rather than that "workmen should be deprived of the right to work for whom they please." Pretended regard for that "great principle" has been used in defense of every species of economic iniquity.

But back of all this advocacy of the worker's "right" and "freedom" lies the real inspiration—a belief in the supreme sanctity of property and a determination to maintain that principle in the teeth of an aroused social sense which would subordinate it to human welfare. By the "right" of the workman to work "for whom he pleases and how he pleases," the supporter of the system means

the "right" of capital to dictate the terms and conditions of work and of the employee to accept those terms or starve.

The issue is not so clear-cut to-day, perhaps, as in the conflict over slavery, but it is fundamentally the same.

The *World* and the *North American* do not want the A. F. of L. Unions crushed, nor do they go so far as to advocate the compulsory arbitration law now being discussed by the Colorado legislature. Such a law is regarded by the farmers who constitute a majority of Colorado's voters as no less than a panacea against all these bothersome and expensive labor troubles, which not only interfere with their market, but also cause a considerable increase of their taxes in order to pay the militia. But the A. F. of L. is unanimously opposed to compulsory arbitration, and neither Rooseveltian nor Democratic progressives dare offend this valuable political ally. But neither do they dare offend the farmers, and the result must be some compromise step in the direction of public intervention, some attempt to make strikes difficult, if not impossible. The Progressives, indeed, were among the first to suggest compulsory arbitration. Such denunciations of the capitalists as follow must be read, then, in this double light. They are seizing this opportunity to attack the trust magnates, and they are preparing the ground to take some new action against strikes.

The public is to see to it that corporations no longer rule the land and dictate wages. But this same "public" is equally anxious to abolish strikes. If the workers call in the "public," or if they feel compelled to submit to such intervention, they must pay the price.

The *New York Times* says the situation is "more grave than that which exists between the United States and Mexico," the *World* that Rockefeller waged a civil war, the *Evening Post* that the state authorities were factional. But all will agree with the *World* that "the banditti of labor" as well as "the banditti of capital" must be dispersed—which can mean only that the same pressure will be exerted against labor as against capital. Wages and conditions of labor may be slightly improved, but neither the employer-farmers of Colorado nor the Bryan-Wilson small capitalist employers' government want to see the power of the unions materially increased.

Compulsory arbitration, literally taken, means to make striking a crime. This the various groups of progressives know they cannot demand without losing all labor support—even that of the most conservative unions. But the discussion of the Colorado situation has shown that the progressive press is unanimously in favor of the essential principle of compulsion. The working people must

be forced to take such wages and labor conditions as the "public," that is, the small capitalists and middle class, decide best. They may have the *right* to strike, but if they strike for more than the "public" is inclined to grant them, if they inflict losses on the shopkeepers, landlords, taxpayers, and consumers (no account is taken of the infinitely greater cost of strikes to the workers themselves), then the "public" will simply withdraw its support and hand them over to the tender mercies of their employers.

Of course, the "public" regards itself as impartial. Says the *Independent*:

Whoever—be he employer or working man—refuses to submit his grievance to the impartial judgment of arbitrators, thereby puts himself in the wrong.

Thus labor stands condemned at the outset. This sinister proposition means just this: Labor must hand itself over to arbitrators who believe that strikes must be prevented at all costs. They are impartial only insofar as they are willing to force capital to pay a part of this cost. In return for this they demand that labor should reduce itself to impotence, should accept as sufficient whatever the charity or interest of the "public's" arbitrators are inclined to give them, should give up all hope of advancing itself, as does every other class, by its own economic power. What the progressives demand, in a word, is that the wage-earners should abandon all claim to economic self-government and become the wards of the State.

As to the other progressive motive, the effort to use this situation against the big capitalist reactionary, the Socialists are naturally more sympathetic. We shall not be satisfied with the overthrow of *special* privilege alone—since we aim at the abolition of *all* privilege, including that which attaches to small capitalist control of government. Nor do we expect to see *special* privilege altogether overthrown in Colorado or elsewhere. But we shall be glad to see it checked.

As to this aspect of the present situation and the probable outcome, a correspondent—a man of prominence, whose information and judgment in this matter are as good as those of any man in Colorado—a man who has taken a leading part in the movement of the people of Denver to force the legislature to meet the situation, writes us as follows:

"At this writing, May 4, a special session of the legislature is being held. Little is expected from it, as the majority of the legislators owe the same allegiance to Special Privilege as does Governor Ammons. The hope of the people lies in the Initiative which can be used at the coming fall election. Constitutional amendments

will be urged that will give the people the right to destroy privilege of every kind, and to develop their natural resources and to operate all public utilities.

"Partisan politics have received a death blow. The working class has gained consciousness and solidarity. Unless the lesson of Ludlow is forgotten in the next few months, November will see the people advancing as an industrial army, bent upon reclamation of stolen and surrendered rights."

IS LAND THE REAL ISSUE IN MEXICO?

Semi-official declarations from Washington have led to a general understanding of the Mexican situation as a struggle of the peons for land. This Bryan-Wilson view, as the reactionary press calls it, seems also to be that of most of the Socialists, but is it the correct view?

The Bryan-Wilson view is well expressed by the *New York Globe*:

The Mexican struggle is not of the familiar type of Latin-American revolution. There is more to it than an enterprise of the "outs" against the "ins." There is a fundamental upheaval; and a true revolution is in progress. The revolution is economic as well as political, just as the French revolution was. Profound changes are to occur. The hacienda feudalism, based on the practical enslavement of the peon, is doomed, and Mexico is to be put in the way of becoming a civilized nation.

The fighting peon is not primarily interested in constitutionalism. What he wants is a bit of land where he may raise his corn and pasture his cow. He has been despoiled. Wherever the peon armies have gained control their first act has been to declare illegal and void the titles on which the vast estates rest and to provide for a distribution of the land.

Before the days of Diaz the peons generally owned their homes, or thought they did. There was a vast quantity of common land. The speculators about Diaz secured a decree invalidating all titles not established by a specified date. The peons knew little about legal titles, and thousands and thousands of them were evicted. These lands together with the common land were "sold" to members of the Diaz group for less than a cent an acre. In Chihuahua three families owned two-thirds of the area of the state. The bolder spirits among the dispossessed became bandits, as Villa did. Those becoming serfs on the haciendas nursed a sense of wrong. When Madero declared that every industrious Mexican should have land and a home the peons rose in his favor. When he weakened on the policy, saying the change could not be accomplished at once, they deserted him. They have followed Zapata and Villa because they have put the land issue first. Villa, out of

the expropriated estates, has granted to every soldier sixty-two acres, inalienable for ten years. Blanco has cut up the huge estate of Felix Diaz, near Matamoros, into fifteen-acre allotments.

Seldom do real revolutions go backward. If Mexico is to have peace there must be some recognition of the legitimate aspirations of the Mexican people. A change in presidents, with no change in land laws, will not bring peace. A way must be found to dissolve the huge estates that Diaz distributed among his favorites and whose titles are thus tainted.

So far Mexican town workers have taken little part in the revolution. It has been almost wholly agrarian. But recently the town workers have shown greater interest, and are beginning to join with their cousins of the country.

Neither peon nor town laborer cares much about the ballot *per se*. He has never had it and he does not miss it. He is not much concerned about the constitution or the form of the government. He is not far enough along to perceive the relations between a bad political régime and bad economic conditions. But into his dull mind has entered the idea that he has been unjustly excluded and kept from the land. He is enlisted in behalf of the same cause that led Wat Tyler's men to march on London, and that led the French peasants, when the French intellectuals had started the revolution, to march against the chateaux and to insist on a land distribution as the first item of the revolutionary programme.

The declaration of the Socialist National Executive Committee takes the same point of view:

For centuries the resources of Mexico have lain dormant. Of late that country has been touched by the magic wand of capitalism and the same development is taking place there that always takes place when modern capitalism clashes with backward feudalism.

Ninety per cent. of her population are still landless and propertyless. For hundreds of years her people have struggled against almost insurmountable difficulties to overthrow tyrants who have ruled and ruined them.

For hundreds of years the Mexican people have been in a state of continuous revolt because the great majority are in a condition of peonage. Robbed of their land in an agricultural country, the change from the Spanish rule to an independent republic avails the Mexican people little or nothing. So long as peonage remains, revolt must follow revolt.

In vain did the Mexican people elevate Madero to the presidency. Their hope that he would recognize their need and restore the land to the people was not fulfilled. They are still fighting to win Mexico for the Mexicans.

In Sonora, Durango and Chihuahua, where the revolutionists are in control, the people are taking possession of the land. Now, when the revolutionists believe that victory is in sight, the great American republic, controlled by sinister capitalist interests and without a declaration of war, lands an armed force on Mexican soil.

We know that the Socialist Party is free of Wall Street influ-

ences and the *Globe* seems to be remarkably independent. But when we find a Wall Street organ like the *World* taking the same view—an organ whose radicalism never goes farther than that of the small investor and the craft unionist—we begin to suspect that this may, after all, be a view that some of the Interests are anxious to foist on the public. The *World* says, under the caption of "The Real Issue in Mexico":

There will be no permanent peace in Mexico until the peon is on land that belongs to the peon, and is protected in his ownership.

The Mexican problem is an agrarian problem. The great mass of people are living under feudalism. They own nothing. A few men own everything. There are great states in which practically all the land is in the hands of a dozen proprietors, and the peasant population lives in semi-slavery.

Mexican dictators have been generous with foreign concessionaires. They have sold mines and oil rights and franchises with little restraint. There are million-acre estates in Mexico for which American and other foreign proprietors paid less than 10 cents an acre; but there is nothing for the peon. He is systematically robbed of the fruits of his labor, and only his rags can he call his own.

The Constitutionalist movement is a campaign for peasant proprietorship. That is the meaning of Villa and Zapata and Carranza and all the forces that have been battling against Huerta. That is what the Madero uprising against Diaz meant, but unfortunately Madero was unable to carry out his promises, and so Huerta climbed into power over his corpse.

Some of the criticism of the President's refusal to recognize Huerta was inspired by honest ignorance of the true conditions in Mexico. But most of it was inspired by men who profit by the reign of tyranny and privilege and corruption. When they talk about the necessity of "a strong government," they mean a government that will favor the rich and oppress the poor. They do not mean a government that will administer even-handed justice with a firm hand. They would denounce this same "strong government" if its sympathies were on the side of the peon, and would use all their influence to overthrow it.

Not since the United States Government under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln destroyed human slavery has it undertaken a nobler mission than the emancipation of the Mexican masses from a tyranny that is little better than slavery.

The *Globe* compares this Wilson view not to that of Lincoln, but to Thomas Jefferson's friendly attitude to the French Revolution. And there can be no doubt that to make of Mexico a country of small farms would have been the first idea of Lincoln and of Jefferson. But new factors have arisen in the last half century, and the capitalism of to-day is a hundred times more powerful than it was a hundred years ago. The farmers of the United States have scarcely been able to hold their own against corporate wealth,

though the two classes have grown up side by side. In Mexico a nascent self-governing community of small farmers would have to fight its way to power against the matured capitalism of all the earth.

That the land question is the most immediate one to the peon, that it appears to be everything to him, is quite natural. But whether it actually is everything, especially in view of the future development of the country, this is the question. The question is whether the land issue is not a mere cloak, behind which the Interests propose to divide up all the rest of Mexico—at least ten times more valuable, as figures quoted elsewhere in this number show.

To give the Mexican people the land would be a very cheap solution of the problem for foreign capital. Foreign capital would retain control of the railways, mines, oil fields, banks, etc., which represent nine-tenths of Mexico's wealth. And the majority of Mexico's large estates belong to Mexicans anyway. Why not sacrifice the Mexican capitalists and landlords, the Diaz, Huerta, Madero, Terrazas and Creel interests, in order to save the rest? The only big foreigners involved would be Hearst, Otis and a few others—who may be known as the howling advocates of intervention—since they are in mortal fear of this very outcome. But all their lands put together do not constitute one per cent. of the total capital invested in Mexico.

With this point in mind we can understand the enthusiasm for the Wilson policy on the part of the *World*, Senator Sheppard, the *Review of Reviews*, and a large part of the press. Intervention might mean years of chaos, might cost the capitalists hundreds of millions here and in Mexico. The Constitutionals, on the other hand, if they follow the example set by Madero, will protect all foreign capital and check the present tendency towards political democracy and social revolution.

The well-informed New York *Evening Post* features this view on its first page, as an interview with a well-known capitalist:

The policy of the United States in gradually bringing war with Huerta nearer, has, in his opinion, been the means of averting war by securing a new lineup of the financial interests which by loans and otherwise exert a compelling influence in Mexican politics. This reassurance may be said to come from efforts recently made by Carranza's representatives here and in Washington.

"Heretofore," said Mr. Flint, "the Constitutionals have been embarrassed by the influence of the Cientificos behind the Huerta régime with the group of European bankers and associated American bankers who financed the last Mexican loan."

Mr. Flint proceeds to specify six of the largest French banks and three of those of Germany, and continues:

"As it becomes evident that the Administration is on the verge of going to war with Huerta, if any advance step is taken, it is not too much to believe that the American bankers in this association will follow the precedent which men like the late J. P. Morgan so consistently followed of making their dealings harmonize with well-defined national policies. In other words, while the thing is not accomplished, it may well be expected that financial assistance is to be no longer withheld.

"The increasing success of the Constitutionals, and their avowed willingness to give to American and foreign interests in North Mexico the protection which they need for the prosecution of mining and oil development plans, has, too, been followed by a sharp reaction in their favor here and abroad."

Yet most Socialists have come to take the Bryan-Wilson view. The *New York Call*, for example, says:

The revolt of the peons has assumed proportions which threaten every concession. After many defeats and betrayals, the peons finally got hold of the right idea. They want land. They want economic power. The Maderos, Carranzas and other middle class revolutionists made the peon fight for "liberty," "constitutional government" and other beautiful things which are good enough, but would be of no earthly use to the peon without land. Therein lies the secret of the strength of Zapata and Villa, who demand the confiscation of large estates and the distribution of the land among the peons.

The possession of the land need not give the peons economic power, for it might leave nine-tenths of the country's wealth in the hands of foreign capitalists. Only an effective democratic government could give real economic sovereignty.

And John Reid, in his widely-noticed letter to the *New York Times*, notes that the peons are beginning to realize this fact:

And there has also grown up, not only among the soldiers but even among the women and old men in outlying villages and haciendas far removed from the lines of communication, the feeling and the desire for representative government. They have decided that they will be no longer ruled by jefe politicos or other Federal agents of the Palace in Mexico City—that they will be no longer policed by Federal soldiers and spies. Their common form of political society is communal and tribal. But now there is a pretty general realization that in order to protect themselves against the predatory rich and the Government they must have their own representatives in Congress.

The correspondent of the *New York Sun* also sees this truth:

If the Constitutionals succeed the people may for a time be better off, but until some power comes into Mexico strong enough to hold in check the wealthy class the peon has nothing to hope for in the way of advancement.

And, again, agreeing with all well informed observers, the *Sun* correspondent sees that Carranza does not represent the peons, while Villa does. So that in Villa and Zapata—provided they are

backed by the United States—lies the only real hope for the establishment of a small farmers' democracy in Mexico. He says:

The Constitutionalist movement is in some degree a popular movement. The Diaz gang, or Cientificos, were doing what the educated and wealthy class have always done, oppressing the poor. They had done this so long and so successfully that a revolution was necessary to give the peon a chance to get enough to live on. Madero did head a popular uprising of a sort. The Constitution-
alists are continuing that movement.

Here is where the cleverness of a certain group, we will say of Americans, came in. They saw the possibility of unifying these outbreaks, which had nothing in common but the desire for loot, into a coherent movement which could hope to cope with the forces of the *de facto* government. To do this it was necessary to get the backing of the only government which can interfere in Mexican affairs, and this the men proceeded to do. The whole early part of the Constitutionalist revolutionary movement was managed from Washington.

It was necessary to have some head of the movement to make it appear other than it was, an outbreak or series of outbreaks of brigandage. This man was found in the nonentity Carranza. His recognition as First Chief of the Constitutionalist movement came about not through his own force but through the ability of the group which has its headquarters in a certain tall office building in Washington. Carranza has always been amenable to the suggestions of this group.

The *Sun* writer then points out that Villa, however, has not been amenable to this capitalist group. So that, after all, Mexico has one hope, Villa—provided he and the peon government he may establish are backed up by the full power of the United States, both now and for a sufficient period of time to allow them to build up a truly democratic government. For otherwise the international capitalists, the concessionaires, the very men whom Wilson attacked so bitterly in his Mobile speech, will continue to rule. If Wilson means business he will have to do far more than merely to see that the peons get the nominal title to the land.

FRENCH SOCIALIST VICTORY

The French Socialists won their first battle against the present wave of militarism in that country, after a six months' Herculean struggle in Parliament and out—ably assisted, in the outside struggle, by the Syndicalists. This was a few months ago when they secured a postponement of the application of the new three-years' military law. They won their second battle a few weeks later when, by continued agitation, they forced the Radical party in its

Congress at Pau to adopt a demand for a gradual repeal of the hated three-years' law.

Then by overthrowing the Barthou Ministry and putting the Radicals in power they won a voice as to military loans and military taxes. Nor was this the only advantage of putting Cail-
laux in power, for on the income tax question the Radicals are genuinely radical and would establish taxes against the rich—which could later be used for other than military purposes, that is, for democratic social reforms.

Only one more victory was necessary to make the triumph of the Socialist-Radical *entente* complete. (There is no alliance, but the *entente* is undeniable.) If the democratic forces won in the Parliamentary elections this month, the three-years' law might be repealed and an era of democratic social reform inaugurated.

In order to ensure the success of the Socialists and Radicals in the election, two steps were indispensable. First, the Socialists must postpone their agitation for proportional representation. For this reform is opposed (on grounds of expediency) by their Radical associates, and so has been seized upon (on grounds of expediency) by Briand and the reactionaries. And, secondly, those Radicals that are pledged to stand by the repeal of the three-years' law (as promised by their own program) must be supported on the second ballot wherever the Socialists had no chance of election. These steps the Socialist Party Congress decided to take.

For a time it seemed that the Caillaux and Rochette scandals would take away more votes from the Radicals than the Socialists could gain, so that there would be a net loss for the *entente*. But even on the first ballot the Radicals' losses were slight, while the Socialists' gains were considerable. And above all, the Socialists showed an enormous increase of votes—55,000 in Paris and suburbs alone. This was an increase of 22 per cent. since the last election, and the Socialists now have 34 per cent. of the vote of the Metropolis. Their total vote for the nation was approximately 1,400,000—which shows an increase of 25 per cent. since the last election.

On the second ballot, which occurred May 10th, the Radicals, supported usually by the Socialists, advanced from 156 members of the former Chamber of Deputies to 161 in the new Chamber, while the Socialists, supported in most cases by the Radicals, advanced from 68 to 102.

The reactionaries, for the first time marshalled in one body by the Socialist renegade and former Premier, Briand, lost approximately 30 members. So that the progressive gain is almost wholly due to the Socialists—a result that has happened in country after

country in recent years. This tremendous gain was made in the face of one of the fiercest campaigns of "patriotism" and press lies of history—a campaign that was fully reflected in the cabled lies of our American press.

The election means, first, the defeat of the reaction and the early reductions of the three years of military service to two. Next it promises a series of social reforms, beginning with a graduated income tax and proportional representation. Even before the election the Chamber of Deputies had voted a law taxing incomes from two-fifths of one per cent. on incomes of from \$1,000 to \$2,000, to 2 per cent. on incomes above \$5,000. These figures are far below the British, but they are above ours for the medium incomes. And this tax is probably the real issue that accounts for the bitterness of the attacks on Caillaux and Jaurès—the three-years' law being largely a cloak after all.

This victory, then, of the non-capitalists and very small capitalists is immensely significant, for it means nothing less than a check to the great banks that have hitherto governed France.

A REVIVAL OF THE REVOLUTIONARY SPIRIT

The events in Mexico and Colorado have stirred up a new revolutionary spirit among Socialists and labor unionists in this country. As a rule it assumes an anti-military form. The agitation began with Haywood's announcement that the miners had decided to call a general strike in case of war. "You may call this action of the mine workers traitorous to the country," he declared, "but I tell you it is better to be a traitor to your country than to your class." This speech was denounced as seditious by the *New York Times*. But similar speeches were soon being made all over the country. Within a few days Charles Edward Russell spoke out even more strongly at another New York meeting. He said, as reported in the *Times*:

I would not enlist for such a war, and if I should be drafted I would refuse to serve. This may be seditious, but if it is sedition, then bring on your Dick law. I am not afraid. And let the long-eared ass that edits the *New York Times* invite the attention of the proper officials to my conduct.

And if some wild jingo calls for war, must I rush into a senseless and idiotic war? I want to love the land wherein I was born. Of course I do. And I want to honor the flag that floats over it. Of course I do. But I want that flag to stand for liberty, justice, democracy, and the rights of the people. A flag is worth only what it symbolizes. If a nation should turn international bandit and make the streets of an undefended city run with blood, then the flag of that nation is nothing but a filthy rag.

For American soldiers and sailors who might be killed in Mexico, Mr. Russell proposed this epitaph:

In whatsoever stress or strife,
Or bloody battle's toil,
Through all his short unhappy life
His heart beat true to oil.

A few days later the Boston Socialists resolved "We will not bear arms against our brother workers of Mexico," while an I. W. W. leader of New York, "Wild Joe" Carroll, according to the *Mail*, advised his hearers if they were conscripted to shoot their officers in the back—the well-known advice of recent Premier Briand of France in the days when he was a revolutionist.

The Colorado affair had equally startling results. When conservative organizations like the Typographical Union and the Colorado State Federation of Labor subscribe for arms, while the Cigar-makers actually resolve to send 500 men to the scene of war, revolution itself is at hand. Even more significant was the mutiny of several companies of militia—events strangely, yet naturally neglected by the capitalist press:

Before the troop train left Denver, Company C, eighty-two men, mutinied and refused to go to the district. The men declared they would not engage in the shooting of women and children. They hissed the 350 men who did start and shouted imprecations at them.

Reports from other towns told of similar mutinies.

"Guilt is personal," say the small capitalists in their campaign against the trust magnates. Not only was this principle applied in the "picketing" of Rockefeller's office, town home, country home, and church, by independent Socialist and revolutionary groups, but the State Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of New York adopted a resolution that might satisfy the most revolutionary. "It is John D. Rockefeller, Jr.," this resolution declared, "who caused the Colorado butchery and hecatomb and is guilty as an accessory before the fact just as much as if he with his own hand plunged a knife into the breast of the victims and held their quivering bodies over the fire."

Recent statements of Secretary Bryan and Senator La Follette help us to answer the question whether the Wilson administration is tending to restore competition or to lead the way towards government ownership.

The amalgamation of the four anti-trust laws in a single bill to establish an Interstate Trade (or Industrial) Commission and to give it certain discretionary powers, suggesting at some points those enjoyed at present by the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Attorney-General, seems to indicate a third course—an effort to regulate private monopolies almost exactly along the line proposed by Roosevelt. La Follette accuses the administration of attempting just this thing—and of failing as Roosevelt failed, surrendering, that is, to the so-called “good” trusts.

Bryan, in the *Saturday Evening Post*, denies that the Wilson administration is doing anything of the kind. He says that he and Wilson are agreed with La Follette that “a private monopoly is intolerable,” and cannot be regulated effectively. And he says that the American people know this:

They know that efforts to regulate private monopoly are futile, for the monopoly, profiting largely by the control of officials, cannot resist the temptation to elect those whose duty it is to control them, or to corrupt them, if possible, after election. The tribute paid by each individual, though aggregating a large sum, is so small that the citizen is not able to cope with the vigilant and sleepless beneficiary of privilege. To allow a monopoly to exist and then attempt to control it is like letting a burglar into the house and then staying awake to keep him from stealing. In the end the public prefers to rid itself of the nerve-racking effort to protect itself from organized greed.

Frank as it seems, this statement is not altogether frank. What is a monopoly? The control of 100, 75, 50, or 25 per cent. of a product? And then every large corporation produces a thousand articles of a thousand qualities and sizes. How many of these must it monopolize in order to be a monopoly?

Still, this Bryan statement says clearly that a class with economic power will use that power for its own selfish interests. And it also says that the administration is opposed to these interests. Moreover, Mr. Bryan unintentionally discloses, in the same article, the classes he and Wilson do represent. The new Interstate Trade Commission, it is clear, is to serve mainly the small producers:

The growth of the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission suggests the possibilities that open before a trade commission that shall have for its object the establishment of equitable relations between corporate producers and the *producing public*, as the Interstate Commerce Commission endeavors to establish equitable relations between railroads and their patrons.

The question then arises as to whether Wilson and Bryan are, as a matter of fact, serving the small producers in their struggle against the large. Bryan says they are. La Follette says they are not. The chief hereditary enemies of the small farmers and producers are the banks and railways. Bryan gives two reasons for the claim that the Government (in the currency law) has won control of the banks for the small producer:

While the banks are rejoicing in the advantages conferred by the bill, the general public finds satisfaction in the vindication of the Government's right to issue the money and to control the banking business through government officials.

With eight or more sub-centers of finance, all dependent upon the Government for assistance and subject to the Government's direction, it will be impossible for a group of men in New York to coerce any section of the country.

La Follette claims, on the contrary, that the currency law was a complete surrender to the banks:

When the Currency bill was pending, every effort was made to insure a public instead of a private control of the banking system. All amendments offered to provide for public ownership of the stock of the reserve banks and for the appointment of a majority of the directors of each reserve bank by the Government instead of the banks, were defeated by orders of the Administration.

But La Follette attaches even more importance to his accusation that Wilson has surrendered to the railroads. He points out that eleven progressive Democrats joined the progressive Republicans to oppose the appointment of Daniels to the Interstate Commerce Commission, while Wilson was supported by the ten most reactionary Republicans. “It reminds thoughtful men of the beginning of the second year of the reign of one William Howard Taft,” remarks La Follette. Wilson, La Follette reports, told several Senators that the time had come “to let up on the railroads.”

But if regulation is breaking down, this is no surprise to Bryan and should be no surprise to Wilson. For both agree that there is no half-way stopping place between competition and government ownership. Bryan says:

There are but two forces that can protect the purchasing public: One is competition; the other is government ownership. In the case of competition, the self-interest of rival producers is relied upon to furnish the consumer with the best article at the lowest price. In the case of government ownership, it is the desire of the officials representing the public to furnish the consumer the maximum of benefit at a minimum charge. Without attempting to discuss the relative merits of the two systems, it is sufficient to say that there is no middle ground between the two. There is no disposition on the part of the general public to undertake government ownership where competition can exist. A large majority of the people are individualists.

There may be disagreement as to whether regulation is failing. There is certainly no widespread claim even that competition is being restored. And there is a marked tendency to government ownership. One cabinet member proposes nationalization of telegraphs and telephones, another a government steamship line to South America. For Secretary Daniels not only favors the use of existing naval vessels for this purpose, but says that "auxiliary" vessels might later be constructed especially "for use in this trade." A similar proposal has already secured thirteen votes in the Senate.

And now comes Senator Lewis, of Illinois, and proposes not only government merchant vessels, but also that the Government shall buy the railways. To be sure, they are to be leased and privately operated, and the bonds with which they are purchased "are not to be a charge upon any taxpayer of the present generation." In other words, the big interests are to be cut off from the purely financial graft of stock-jobbing. But they are to keep their graft in contracts, land deals, nepotism, etc., etc. And the small capitalists are to be protected in every capacity—as shippers, as taxpayers, as railroad shareholders. Still this kind of government ownership is a logical step in the concentration of industry and may greatly facilitate control by the working people.

If the Democrats do not take up government ownership, the Progressives will. For the publication of an article by the *Outlook* giving four points against and four points in favor of government ownership and operation, coming as it does from a railway president, must be taken as an affirmative argument.

The article is by Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, and the points for government operation are as follows:

Railway property being the most easily socialized body of wealth, and one of the largest as well, if the twenty billion dollars of railway property were taken away from private control, your enormous and distressing inequalities of wealth would no doubt be largely limited. This is the first advantage, and it is considerable.

Second, railway investment, which employs so much of your capital, would lose its speculative character by the substitution of bonds bottomed on the Government's credit for bonds bottomed on the credit of a private company. This would remove one of the chief grounds you have for complaint against your railways as hitherto managed.

Unfair discrimination, in the next place—another just ground of complaint—would also disappear under government ownership. It is hard to conceive of a government in your country that would not administer its railways impartially.

This is the fourth advantage, and very important—under government ownership rates can be adjusted with reference to a maximum development of the country as a whole.

DO SOCIALISTS INCREASE TAXES ?

This question is asked in the Information Department of the Socialist Party *Bulletin*, which is edited by Carl D. Thompson, formerly City Clerk of Milwaukee. A sub-head gives the answer. To assert that Socialists raise taxes is "a stupid capitalist lie." Thompson gives figures to show not only that Socialist municipalities in this country have not raised taxes, but that the "municipal Socialists" of Great Britain have even used the profits from municipal ownership to lower taxes.

Yet we are told by many reformers, some of them quite conservative, that the very first steps even in non-Socialist reform require the raising of taxes. In the state that contains Milwaukee, for example, there is a contest at the present moment, in which the reactionaries are attempting to stem the whole reform tide by checking that increase of taxes which is its first prerequisite. Says *Collier's Weekly*:

A campaign of national importance is waging in Wisconsin. The forces which have carried this most progressive of American commonwealths forward to achievements which are envied her by intelligent people everywhere are fighting for political existence again. The standpat forces are now calling attention to the fact that taxes have risen. The progressive forces admit this, but, after showing that most of the increases are to be found in those local taxes which the people in the counties and towns have levied upon themselves, retort that if the state has spent more money it has bought something with the funds. It has the greatest of American universities, they say; the best laws in all the states; the most wonderful body of experts administering these laws. "Where," they ask the people, "do you wish us to retrench? Shall we cripple the university? Shall we cripple the Railway Commission? Shall we cripple the Industrial Commission? Shall we cripple any of these great commissions?" While economy is always to be considered, the answer of the voters will be looked upon everywhere as a test of their intelligence.

Wisconsin is in the heart of that portion of the map which the business experts show as enjoying good times. Much of the state's solid prosperity may be accounted for on the ground of her people's intelligence, and that intelligence has been gained through a generation of struggle for political reform. . . . The revolution against paying for good government may sweep the standpatters in. . . . But so far the Wisconsin folks have never seriously kicked against the forces of light and leading.

It is to be hoped and believed that when the Milwaukee Socialists again come into power they will disprove the assertions of the *Party Bulletin*, take the progressive side, and boldly increase taxes.

The *New Statesman* might be expected to support the Milwau-

kee Socialists' policy, since it has become the chief organ of Fabianism in Great Britain. But the Milwaukee tactics do not fulfill the requirements even of British "gas and water" Socialism. In a special article on American Socialism, the *New Statesman* says:

What is this municipal Socialism and what has it done? You will find the answer in the Milwaukee campaign. "Public ownership of public utilities"—that is the definition of policy at the head of Mr. Seidel's ballot. And in the electioneering propaganda that appears day by day in the Socialist Milwaukee *Leader* you may see it often: "Public ownership of public utilities—that is municipal Socialism."

It is in this definition, and in the state of mind underlying it, that the crux of the whole question arises. It attracts non-Socialist voters, and, honest as the Milwaukee Socialists are, it is meant to attract non-Socialist voters under the impression that Socialism is something less than it is. Public ownership to the average citizen means that the city will make money on public utilities and with this money reduce the taxes. The Milwaukee Socialists coddle this belief. "When we were elected," they say, "you had a cash deficit of \$216,000; when we left, you had a surplus of \$400,000. We may have raised your taxes a little, but the present Mayor raised them more." A mandate on these principles and on this psychology is not a Socialist mandate. The question then arises—do the Socialists do right or wrong in seeking and accepting the office under such conditions?

The justification of municipal Socialist politics would come more convincingly from Schenectady, a city whose Socialist movement is much more typically American than that of Milwaukee. And it is in Schenectady that you strike the full confusion on these essential issues which at present plagues American Socialism. Mayor Lunn, a popular Socialist minister, had two years of governing Schenectady on a mandate partly personal, partly reformist, and only partly Socialist. He got more votes on his defeat than on his victory, which was a handsome showing after what he had had to go through. For his experiences showed that Schenectady, and every similar American city, was entirely unripe for Socialism, and that necessary compromise, at present at any rate, raised questions to which no Socialist has any answer. To satisfy the sentiment of undigested reform which elected him, and which held on to him while in office, Mayor Lunn had to conduct "crusades against vice," cut down taxes, select non-Socialists for most of the city's most responsible positions, and repudiate altogether the "advisory control" the local Socialist branch claimed to possess over his activities and appointments. It was a superb muddle all through. The National Office has an Information Bureau which does little else but keep distracted Mayors on the straight path of municipal efficiency. But there is no bureau, and there never can be one, which will be able to advise an administration how to be Socialist and non-Socialist at the same time. The practical distinction is simple. Vote-catching municipal Socialism means public utilities to reduce bourgeois taxes. Real municipal Socialism means public utilities to serve the people regardless of the rich

taxpayers. The blunt aim of a Socialist Mayor should be to spend money for the poor and get it out of the rich. At least, that is consistent with the real aims of Socialism. If one doesn't like it, one isn't a Socialist, that is all.

CONFISCATION BY TAXATION IN GREAT BRITAIN

The celebrated Lloyd George Budget of 1910 increased income taxes to 10 per cent. on the largest fortunes and inheritance taxes to 15 per cent. The new Budget (that of 1914) increases these maxima to 13 and 20 per cent. respectively.

At this rate the income tax of the very rich is being augmented a little less than one per cent. every year and the inheritance tax at a little more than one per cent. This is a fairly satisfactory rate to begin with. But it will have to be still further augmented, as the total confiscation of large fortunes at this rate would take another 85 years.

The British income tax rates are now far higher than ours. A \$5,000 income under our law pays far less than one per cent. (when we allow for the exemption). A British income of \$5,000 pays three and three-quarters per cent. A \$50,000 income in this country pays a little over 2 per cent.; in Great Britain 10 per cent. A \$500,000 income pays here something less than 7 per cent.; in Great Britain almost 13 per cent.

But the figures just given are for so-called *earned* incomes alone. A far higher rate prevails on incomes derived from rent, interest or dividends. These are called *unearned*, and on such an income of \$5,000 the tax is $6\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., instead of $3\frac{3}{4}$ as on an "earned" income of the same amount—with proportionate increases throughout.

The new budget is a victory of the Radicals over the Whigs in the Liberal Cabinet. For Asquith announced, a few months ago, that these taxes ought to be increased both for small and for large incomes, and the new budget not only fails to increase the rate on "earned" incomes under \$5,000, but even diminishes it by doubling the exemption for children allowed to incomes under \$2,500. This is undoubtedly the result of the campaign carried on by Lloyd George and his supporters. Indeed, the *Nation* during this campaign even went so far as to declare that all large incomes are unearned, whether derived from rent, interest and dividends, or in some other way:

A Liberal finance must for the future devise methods of applying the principle of ability to pay with more courage and with

greater productivity to that class of citizen whose large and expanding income does not really feel the present fixed super-tax of sixpence in the pound as any burden or sacrifice. It must firmly extend the conception of "unearned" income, so as to realize the principle that great wealth, whatever its immediate source, is in no true sense a reward for, or an incentive to, the personal productive skill or energy of its recipient.

But the principal part of the confiscatory programme of the British Radicals—confiscatory, that is, as applied to *large* capitalists and landlords—is undoubtedly the Lloyd George land programme.

The Budget of 1910 confiscated 20 per cent. of the future rise in city ground values.

The land policy of Lloyd George, announced last year, proposes that rural rents shall be fixed by the government.

The Budget of 1914 adopts the Henry George principle of distinguishing "site values" from "improvement values," and so opens the way to a still greater increase of taxation of site values.

The new budget marks other advances over that of 1910, which increased the taxes of the poor almost as much as those of the rich and expended the larger part of the sums produced on increased armaments. Of the ten million pounds sterling to be raised by the new budget, nine are to come from the rich and well-to-do, while one is to come from the Sinking Fund. More than four million pounds are to go to local governments to be expended on roads, schools, and public health, while other millions are to go to the new governmental insurance schemes. Of course, these expenditures on localities will relieve the small local tax-payers of burdens that would have been theirs. Also expenditures on roads redound directly to the benefit of the small capitalists, as well as those on public health. And the money spent by the government on the health, education and insurance of the workers, is also to the interest of all employers, but especially of the small employers who do not pay for it.

Altogether, the new budget is a great victory in the warfare of the small capitalists against the large.

It is not a Socialist budget, as the *New York Times* claims. But it does "squeeze more money out of the rich," to use the expression of Gibson Bowles, M. P. It is not Socialistic, because the benefit of this money goes chiefly to the small capitalists and middle classes. But it is a good precedent for the Socialists, first, because the money taken from the rich may be expended for the benefit of the wage-earners, and second, because the same process can be used for confiscating the surplus incomes of the well-to-do middle classes.

BEYOND INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

Revolutionary industrial unionists in this country, members of the I. W. W., as well as Tom Mann in England, have said that they were aiming not merely at industrial unionism but at class unionism, the solidarity of the whole working class. And it seems now that some of the largest British unions are, indeed, about to take a step that passes beyond mere industrial unionism.

An amalgamation of unskilled laborers is being prepared which will include Transport Workers, the Packers, the Gasworkers, the General Laborers and other unions with a total of more than 400,000 members. They are to be "merged into one consolidated union."

Nor is this all. In view of a possible railway strike this autumn, and in accord with a resolution of the Miners, "an offensive and defensive alliance" of railway workers, miners, and transport workers, is being worked out. In an interview with the *Daily Citizen*, Robert Williams, Secretary of the Transport Federation, gives the following account of this new move, which will embrace 1,270,000 workers (700,000 miners, 270,000 railwaymen, and 300,000 transport workers) :

The greatest tribute to the common-sense action about to be taken by the three largest organizations in the country—the miners, railwaymen, and the transport workers—is the measure of hostility meted out by those who write for the Tory press. With characteristic ineptitude, a number of journals which are supporting civil war in Ireland and are shouting in gross exaggeration of the dangers imminent in a working alliance between these three organizations. . . . All three of us would be well content to conduct any disputes between ourselves and our employers single-handed, so to speak. But when threatened with the interference of any third party such as organized "blacklegs" in the case of transport workers, or the use of the army, and particularly of the Royal Engineers to break a railway strike, or the use of the police and military to coerce the miners in a mining strike, then we might make the power of the triple alliance felt.

THE THREATENED CIVIL WAR IN ENGLAND

There is little doubt that the British reactionaries, goaded by the abolition of the Lords' Veto and increasing taxes, are practically in a mood for civil war. The question is whether the working people,

with their far greater grievances, are ready to proceed with equal courage. The preparations for a more or less general strike, as well as recent meetings, indicate that perhaps they are. Says the *New York Evening Post*:

At the time the English Unionists were holding their great meeting in Hyde Park, to protest against the "coercion" of Ulster, there was a large gathering of laboring men in Trafalgar Square. They, too, had their addresses and harangues, and it is rather amusing to find the Tory newspapers describing the proceedings as a "defiance of law and order," and the speeches made as "seditious." Yet the labor leaders simply applied to their own purposes the good Unionist doctrine of the army. The teaching of the Ulster crisis, affirmed Mr. Grayson, was that "the workers could arm themselves, and, better still, that the officer and the private soldier could refuse to shoot." In Ireland, asserted Mr. Lansbury, the officers had mutinied, and all that the labor cause wanted was that "Tommy Atkins should do likewise." This is horrifying to the Conservatives, but what difference does it make whether the language is uttered by Bonar Law and Lord Hugh Cecil, or by labor agitators?

SHALL SOCIALISTS AND PROGRESSIVES COMBINE ?

The *Metropolitan Magazine* raises this question :

If the Progressive Party is sufficiently purged of the old leaven of capitalism and is really intent on a genuine program of reform, we should like to see an understanding, if not an alliance, between the Socialist Party and the new Progressive Party at the polls. In other words, where a good progressive is running in a district with a fair chance of winning, he should get the support of the Socialist vote, and where a good Socialist has a fair chance of winning he should get the Progressive support. Such a suggestion will, we know, bring cries of horror from most of the orthodox Socialists. But we shall not take these cries too seriously. What we propose is not new. It is freely adopted in Europe, and no one can pretend that the result has not been greater progress in carrying out Socialistic measures. It is, in fact, the only sensible way for two parties to act if they believe in political progress at all. There is not much difference between the views of the intelligent Progressives and the intelligent Socialists. The main stumbling block in the way of any sort of alliance is the strong feeling that most Socialists have against Colonel Roosevelt. But the personality of one man should not be allowed to interfere with the welfare not alone of two political parties, but of the whole people. And we are very certain that the time has come for more intelligent political action on the part of the Socialist forces. In no other country in the world does the Socialist Party insist so strongly on orthodoxy and isolation and in no other country is the political organization of Socialism so futile in obtaining results.

The *Metropolitan* makes two cardinal errors. It fails to note that the Progressive Party, at the best, is a small capitalist organization, fundamentally opposed to Socialism. And it fails, secondly, to note that Socialist experience has shown that all such objects as Socialists and Progressives do hold in common can be accomplished without combination and the resulting abandonment of Socialism. Socialists can vote directly for progressive measures and do so vote wherever the initiative and referendum are in existence. And, secondly, wherever there is preferential voting the Socialists give their second choice ballots to progressives.

But, sad to relate, only a part of the progressives give their second choice ballots to Socialists.

HOW FAR ARE SOCIALISTS DISFRANCHIZED ?

The Socialist Party must draw its chief support from the unskilled (or semi-skilled), the laboring masses. The majority of the laboring masses in this country are foreign-born, and the larger part of the foreign-born, especially in New York and other Eastern cities, are unnaturalized and so without a vote. Thus the working class which would otherwise have a majority is nearly everywhere reduced to a minority.

The *New York Call* shows that over 3,000,000, or more than 45 per cent. of the foreign-born white males of voting age, are thus disfranchised. Less than 18 per cent of the Italians are naturalized, 14 per cent. of the Hungarians, 25 per cent. of the Austrians, and 27 per cent. of the Russians.

In New York City only 318,000 of these foreign-born residents—overwhelmingly wage-earners—are naturalized, while 510,000 are without the right to vote. No wonder the Socialist Party is comparatively weak in such cities!

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN AUSTRALIA

The Labor Party nationalized a large coal mine in Victoria. Nevertheless, there have been strikes. An Australian Laborite correspondent of the *New Statesman* (London), in advocating government ownership, makes an interesting allusion to the situation :

The Syndicalist wing of the Miners' Union has had an unfortunate influence owing to its promotion of sudden strikes prior to negotiations by the union officials, but there is every

reason to believe that a new agreement will be arrived at which will clear up troubles such as those which caused a succession of "stops" in January.

So it seems that when a Labor party has nationalized anything, and the employees strike without permission, the strikers are forthwith "Syndicalists." This throws a valuable light on the meaning that the term "Syndicalists" is coming to have in popular usage. It is coming to mean labor unionists who do not accept democratic collectivism as the end of their troubles.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- William English Walling, *Progressivism—And After*; 406 pp. The Macmillan Co., New York. \$1.50 net.
- Karl Kautsky, *The High Cost of Living: Changes in Gold Production and the Rise in Prices*; translated by Austin Lewis; 114 pp. and statistical tables. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. 50 cents.
- Daniel W. Hoan, City Attorney of Milwaukee, *The Failure of Regulation*; 98 pp. Published by the National Office of Socialist Party of the United States, Chicago. 25 cents.
- Gustavus Myers, *History of Canadian Wealth*; 337 pp. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. \$1.50.
- George Allan England, *Darkness and Dawn*; 672 pp. Small, Maynard & Co., Boston. \$1.35.
- Des Imagistes: *An Anthology*; 64 pp. The Glebe, Albert and Charles Boni, New York. 50 cents.
- Franz Oppenheimer, Ph. D., *The State: Its History and Development Viewed Sociologically*. Translated by John M. Gitterman, Ph. D.; 302 pp. The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis. \$1.25 net.
- Arturo Giovannitti, *Arrows in the Gale*, with introduction by Helen Keller; 108 pp. Hillacre Bookhouse, Riverside, Conn. \$1.00.
- Howard Vincent O'Brien, *The Joy of the Working*; 320 pp. Rand McNally & Co., Chicago and New York.
- Clarence Gilbert Hoag, A. M., *A Theory of Interest*; 228 pp. The Macmillan Co., New York. \$1.50.
- Robert Hunter, *Violence and the Labor Movement*; 388 pp. The Macmillan Co., New York. \$1.50 net.

THE NEW REVIEW

BOARD OF EDITORS

- Frank Bohn
- William E. Bohn
- Floyd Dell
- W. E. B. Du Bois
- Max Eastman
- Louis C. Fraina
- Arturo Giovanitti
- Felix Grendon
- Isaac A. Hourwich
- Paul Kennaday
- Robert Rives La Monte
- Arthur Livingston
- Robert H. Lowie
- Helen Marot
- Herman Simpson
- Albert Sonnichsen
- Wm. English Walling

CONTENTS FOR JULY, 1914

	PAGE
Class Lines in Colorado.....	381
<i>Max Eastman.</i>	
New Phase of the Contempt Cult.....	388
<i>Frederick Haller.</i>	
Daniel De Leon.....	390
<i>Louis C. Fraina.</i>	
Why A Socialist Party?.....	400
<i>William English Walling.</i>	
The Drama of Dynamite.....	404
<i>Floyd Dell.</i>	
Another Study in Black.....	410
<i>W. E. B. Du Bois.</i>	
Labor in the Roman World.....	414
<i>J. B. S.</i>	

ADVISORY COUNCIL

- Arthur Bullard
- George Allan England
- Charlotte Perkins Gilman
- Reginald Wright Kaufmann
- Harry W. Laidler
- Austin Lewis
- John Macy
- Gustavus Myers
- Mary White Ovington
- William J. Robinson
- Charles P. Steinmetz
- J. G. Phelps Stokes
- Horace Traubel
- John Kenneth Turner

A SOCIALIST DIGEST... ..	418
The Upshot in Colorado.	
Do Socialists Hold Rockefeller Responsible?	
Wilson's Populistic Views About Mexico.	
War on the Catholic Church.	
Jack London in Mexico.	
An A. F. of L. Victory.	
Debs, Revolutionary Unionist.	
American Socialists and the Land Question.	
Shall Child-Bearing Be Made Compulsory?	
Socialism Outlawed in the British Labor Party.	
Is Labor Permanently Split in New Zealand?	
The March Towards Political Democracy.	
The Ethics of Sabotage.	

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

- Alexander Fraser
- Jessie Ashley
- Louise W. Kneeland
- Caro Lloyd
- Gertrude U. Light
- Arthur Livingston
- Paul Wilson
- Max Heidelberg
- Louis C. Fraina

CORRESPONDENCE 439

- Why "Revolutionary"?
- Charles W. Wood.*
- The Abolition of Poverty.
- S. S.*

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

ALEXANDER FRASER MAX HEIDELBERG LOUIS C. FRAINA
President Treasurer Secretary

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

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

The new forces in the labor movement of the world vividly expounded in Dr. Louis Levine's

Syndicalism

in France. "Most comprehensive and illuminating study of revolutionary syndicalism in the English language."—*American Economic Review*. At all bookstores. \$1.50 net, Paper covers; \$2.00 net, Cloth.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

SPECIAL CLUB RATES

	Regular Rate	Club Rate
The New Review, (1 year)	1.00	} 1.50
The Masses, " "	1.00	
	2.00	
The New Review, (1 year)	1.00	} 1.50
The Inter. Socialist Review (1 year)	1.00	
	2.00	

A MATERIALISTIC CONCEPTION OF "GOOD WILL"

If good will alone could "make" a magazine, the NEW REVIEW would be self-supporting. The good will attests the merits of the NEW REVIEW; the fact that we are *not* self-supporting proves that our friends are not capitalizing this good will for us.

George Cram Cook, in the Chicago *Evening Post*, says of the NEW REVIEW: "The June number came with such live criticism—some hard-hitting, some penetrative—that I was reminded of the month-old announcement, and read it again with the mental comment: Perhaps they are going to 'make it indispensable.'"

Many of our readers are sending in expressions of praise and good will, succinctly summed up by Miss Sophia Christensen: "I don't want to miss a copy of the magazine."

You are convinced of the merits of the NEW REVIEW—*why not convince others of the merits, and get them to read the "indispensable Socialist magazine"?*

Capitalize your good will. Co-operate with us. Send us subscriptions. And do not forget financial contributions.

Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, the famous Feminist, has accepted membership in our Advisory Council. Mrs. Gilman's acute intellect and aggressive personality are a distinct asset to the NEW REVIEW.

The NEW REVIEW must be made self-supporting and permanent. One Dollar a month for one year from two hundred readers will help us "make good."

NOW WE'LL DIP INTO THE FUTURE.

A future holding in store a rare treat for NEW REVIEW readers—and which you should unselfishly share with non-readers by getting them to subscribe.

First of all, our August issue will contain a symposium on "Feminism," in which representative Feminists will discuss the many phases of their movement and philosophy. We are preparing to distribute this issue among the women's organizations: won't you help?

In the September issue appears another symposium—"Problems Which Confront the Socialist Movement." Charles Edward Russell has already contributed a very interesting article for the symposium; other men in-

cluded to contribute include Eugene V. Debs, Victor Berger and Frank Bohn.

And there'll be a wealth of other interesting material in these issues. *The NEW REVIEW is indispensable!*

We gave The Tinsely Co. a circular letter to multigraph for the Workers' Defense Conference which is fighting the Tanenbaum conviction; and The Tinsely Co. wrote us: "Will you accept the work from us as a contribution towards obtaining young Mr. Tanenbaum's release, as we are heartily in sympathy with your movement. If we can aid you further by such work in your efforts, it will be a pleasure for us so to contribute."

UP MUST GO OUR CIRCULATION.

There was such a small answer to this appeal printed in our last issue that we reprint it for the sake of emphasis:

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

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

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

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

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

The NEW REVIEW must be made self-supporting and permanent. One Dollar a month for one year from two hundred readers will help us "make good."

One of our big plans is to get Socialist party locals to back us up. The NEW REVIEW is worthless to the movement unless its roots are planted deep in the soil of the movement.

LOUIS C. FRAINA,
Business Manager.

The New Review

Vol. II.

JULY, 1914

No. 7

CLASS LINES IN COLORADO

BY MAX EASTMAN

A single motion brought us all to the platform as the train pulled slowly past those ruins at Ludlow, and with incredulous eyes we saw the broken black acre of desolation that is a monument to the National Guard of Colorado. I think every heart was silenced for a moment there in presence of those ravaged homes. The naked violation of every private article of familiar life is so sharp a picture of sorrow. But it was not more than a moment. A voice out of a thin nose behind my ear so soon recalled us to our daily bread.

"What ta hell's the use comin' down here with soap and specialties—this territory's been *shot up!*"

Is there a person with more purity of purpose in God's golden world than the commercial traveller of America? Trinidad, he informed us, had been the best city for business, outside of Denver, in the State of Colorado, and at present you could sell more soap in a graveyard.

In another forty minutes we arrived at Trinidad and could verify his words. A paved, marbled, improved, modern city, shining with efficiency, ready for business, ready for a high time, a thoroughly metropolitan center. And yet the inhabitants seemed to be standing around the corners, idle and anxiously waiting for something to fall out of the sky. I have never seen humanity so stripped of pretence and cultural decorum, so bared to the fighting bone, as it is in Trinidad. They have been through a terror of blood. They have seen their government and their officers of peace evacuate, leaving the city to what seemed an army of revolution. They have either welcomed this army or moved to the cellar. There seems to have been no middle course. And whichever course they pursued, they pursued with the combined passions of a blood feud and a financial panic. Like my friend of the soap and specialties,