YEAR

25 CTS. A COPY

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

DECEMBER
1919

Published by the
INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY
ROOM 914, EDUCATIONAL BUILDING, 70 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Contents

Our Contributors

FRANCIS AHERN. One of the editors of the *Australian Worker*.

ALBERT DE SILVER. New York attorney and Director of Civil Liberties Bureau.

W. HARRIS CROOK. Managing editor of the *Socialist Review*, formerly editor of the Boston *Forward*.

H. W. L. DANA. Member of the Editorial Board of the *Socialist Review*, one of the founders of Boston Labor College.

ARTHUR GLEASON. Joint author of "British Labor and the War," Contributing Editor to the *Socialist Review*.

FELIX GRENDON. Member of the Editorial Board of the *Socialist Review*, author of "Nixola of Wall Street."

HARRY W. LAIDLER. Editor of the *Socialist Review*, author of "Boycotts and the Labor Struggle."

JOHN MACLEAN. Member of the Executive Committee of the British Socialist Party.

JACOB MARGOLIS. A labor attorney in Pittsburgh, Pa.

EDWIN MARKHAM. Author of "The Man with the Hoe." One of America's leading poets.

VIDA D. SCUDDER. Professor of English Literature at Wellesley College, and author of "Socialism and Character."

CHARLES P. STEINMETZ. Consulting engineer of the General Electric Company; Professor of Electrophysics at Union University, Schenectady. Past president of the Amer. Inst. of Electrical Engineers. An inventor of note, author of "America and the New Epoch." Sometime President of Schenectady Common Council on the Socialist ticket.

M. C. OTTO. Associate Professor of Philosophy in the University of Wisconsin.

GREGORY ZILBOORG. Formerly Under Secretary of Labor in the Kerensky cabinet.

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. VIII. DECEMBER 1919 No. 1

The Peril of Ease

By Edwin Markham

Are you sheltered, curled up and content by
the world's warm fire,
Then I say that your soul is in danger!
The sons of the Light, they are down with
God in the mire,
God in the manger.

The old-time heroes you honor, whose
banners you bear,
The whole world no longer prohibits:
But if you peer into the past you will
find them there,
Swinging from gibbets.

So rouse from your perilous ease: to your
sword and your shield:
Your ease is the ease of the cattle.
Hark, hark, where the bugles are calling!
Out to some field—
Out to some battle!

Foreword

THE I. S. S., satisfied that its quarterly organ, *The Intercollegiate Socialist,* no longer adequately serves the growing public interest in Socialism, has decided to venture on a monthly publication, THE SOCIALIST REVIEW, in place of the quarterly one. The change begins with the current number. The new monthly incorporates *The Forward,* a Boston periodical which, under the editorship of W. Harris Crook, has promoted "the popular control of politics and industry." Mr. Crook's services have been secured as managing editor of the present publication.

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW will be much more than a mere monthly continuation of its predecessor, as those who have read the prospectus already know. Its purposes are much broader and more definite, its staff is larger and better equipped, and its facilities for an intelligent appraisal of decisive Socialist events are far more highly ordered. The change, like the change of a tadpole into a frog, is intended to be one of quality and not a mere enlargement of parts.

In making its first appearance, THE SOCIALIST REVIEW announces its intention of being a review in fact as well as in name. That is, it will serve Socialists as an informational rather than as a propagandist organ. It is to be a record and survey of Socialist experiment, achievement, and thought—indeed of all significant occurrences in the industrial and political struggle by which our social system will eventually be transformed.

Not so many years ago, a leading British politician remarked, in a jocular vein, that "we are all Socialists now." Few politicians or profiteers will nowadays repeat this remark—in a jocular vein. The Socialist reform pill of the late nineties (gas and water Socialism, as the masters of industry contemptuously called it) was swallowed almost with gurgling glee. But the pill is no longer an airy trifle. The great empire of Russia is now a Soviet Republic. Hungary and Finland, after declaring for Socialist governments, are deprived of them only by force of a foreign sword. Socialists are at the head of the German and Austrian republics. A Labor party, with an avowed program of industrial democracy, stands ready to take the helm in British affairs. And Socialist parties in France, Italy, and the three Scandinavian countries, when not the strongest political force in the nation, are an Opposition constantly to be reckoned with. Whether we favor it or not, in short, Socialism is the most energetic mass movement in the civilized world today, and no citizen can afford to emulate Rip Van Winkle in his ignorance of its active phases.

To supply the data for an intelligent understanding of this tremendous movement, and to do so in simple, vigorous, high-class English —this summarizes the aim of THE

SOCIALIST REVIEW. More particularly, the REVIEW hopes to undertake the following services:

1. An explanation of the facts *behind the scenes* of the big strikes, of the advances or retardings of public ownership, democratic management, coöperation, national guilds, and the craft or industrial unions; also of the principles at the bottom of these phenomena.

2. A discussion of those problems of Socialist theory and tactics that emerge directly from the current industrial and political struggles. The guild and soviet schemes, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the shop steward movement, academic freedom—these questions, especially as they come home to American Socialists in their specific American environment, will receive analysis and interpretation.

3. The publication, from time to time, of the most significant documents affecting the Socialist and labor movement.

4. An observation of the chief works of literature, art, and science springing from or reacting to the struggle for a new society.

For these purposes THE SOCIALIST REVIEW aims to mobilize the best thought of the United States and Europe; nor will it spare any effort to secure contributions from men and women here and abroad who are actively serving or leading their respective causes.

Socialism and Invention

Charles P. Steinmetz

Our modern scientific and industrial civilization essentially depends on invention for its progress.

If it were not for the constantly increasing productivity of man due to invention, with the increasing population of the earth, retrogression, famine and disaster would inevitably overtake our human society.

Every intelligent mind, which is not afraid to reason fairly and without bias based on likes and dislikes, knows that our present industrial organization, which I may call individualistic capitalism, inevitably leads, as its final outcome, to the coöperative commonwealth, that is socialism. The grave question then arises: with the inducements and rewards which capitalism holds out or is alleged to hold out for the inventor, removed by the socialization of society, will invention stop, and our civilization lapse, as the civilization of the ancient times gave way to the barbarism of the middle ages?

When speaking of inventions, the layman thinks of those great inventions which have made stepping stones in our civilization, as the invention of the steam locomotive by Stevenson, that of the steamship by Fulton, etc.

Did Stevenson become rich by the invention of the steam locomotive?

Not as rich as many a successful

stockbroker or saloonkeeper. And what did his invention consist of? There were numerous steam carriages built and tried before Stevenson's, and Stevenson's "Rocket" was very far from the perfection of the modern steam locomotive. Thus Stevenson's work was one step in the development of the steam locomotive, though such a great step, that he is justly called the "inventor" of the steam locomotive, and the reward he received is the fame and reputation—which would equally be his in a socialist society—but, financially, a Gould, or Vanderbilt, or Harriman have made many times more out of the steam locomotive than Stevenson, and without inventing anything on it.

Three Groups of Inventions

Roughly, inventions may be divided into three groups:

(1) Fundamental or basic inventions which create new fields for human effort, or even a new era in the world's history, such as the invention of the steam engine, steamship and locomotive; of the cotton gin, which created the cotton industry, of the alternating current transformer, which made modern electrical development possible.

(2) Inventions which are merely steps in the design and development of things, such as a new form of gear shift in the automobile, or a new way of winding an electric motor.

(3) Incidental or accidental inventions, such as a new puzzle, which strikes the popular fancy.

Consider first the second group, since it represents by far the largest majority of the many thousands of inventions patented annually in the United States, and since, while individually these inventions are not radical and revolutionary and usually not thought of in the layman's discussion of inventions and inventors, in their bulk they represent the industrial progress of the country.

In the successive steps of his work, the engineer, designer or constructor devises means to accomplish the desired result, drawing upon his knowledge, skill and ability. Where these means are new, they constitute a patentable invention, and invention thus is an integral part of the routine of the engineer's work. That is, the engineer lacking in originality and limited in his work to the known means, finds himself seriously handicapped, and originality and inventive ability are essential for the successful engineer or designer.

With the progress of the world's industrial development towards organization into larger and larger corporations, steadily the number of independent engineers is decreasing and more and more find it to their advantage to enter the employ of the corporations.

In corporation employment of the engineer, it is, however, to a large extent the custom that the inventions made by the engineer, and the patents covering them, belong to the company, and not to the inventor, and the inventor thus derives no direct financial benefit from his individual invention. This practice is increasing, as experience proves it to be the most satisfactory.

Morally, there is much justification in this arrangement. Usually the problem which the engineer solved by his invention has been brought before him by his work for the company, and the data and information which enabled him to solve the problem, to a considerable extent made available, and the means to develop the invention supplied by the corporation, so that outside the corporation the engineer probably would not have met the problem, and if he had met it, would have been unable to solve it. The engineer's compensation then is his pay, which covers the products of his knowledge as well as his originality and inventive skill, and the reputation he derives as an inventor. It is interesting to note that experience shows corporation engineers working under this arrangement to be on the average more prolific in useful inventions than independent engineers —probably due to the more numerous and greater problems they meet, the better facilities they have to solve them and the satisfaction from the larger field of application of their inventions. But this arrangement is just as barren of the direct individualistic profit, so frequently considered as the essential incentive of invention, as any we would meet in socialistic society.

Thus, the evidence of experience is that this most numerous and in their aggregate most important class of inventions would not be decreased by the socialization of society; organized society would simply take the place of the present day industrial corporation; and the prolificness of the inventors would still further increase by the increased opportunities and facilities.

Coming now to the third class of inventions, such as a new puzzle, a new drink, which strikes the popular fancy, and thus makes its inventor rich. These we may almost call "gambling inventions," since the profits have no relation to the value of the thing, or to the mental and intellectual work of the inventor, inasmuch as equally meritorious inventions may be an entire failure or a great financial success, almost like a stock speculation. It is not probable that in a socialist society, or in any other form of well-organized society, such conditions would exist. However, it is hard to say how this could have much effect on such accidental inventions, or if they should decrease, that the world would lose much by it.

Inventors Rarely Rich

There remains thus the first class of inventions, the great radical or basic inventions which the layman has in mind when discussing inventions or inventors. Would the withdrawal of the possibility of vast financial profits interfere with them?

First, the number of great radical inventions is much less than appears, since the outsider usually only sees the final product, and the man identified with it, but does not see the many steps preceding it, the many inventors, on whose shoulders the last one stood, as I illustrated in the preceding on the invention of the steam locomotive.

Furthermore, does modern capital-

istic society hold out great financial rewards for the inventor? I know of no great inventor who has become very rich. Edison is very well to do, but far less due to his inventions than to his sharing in the industrial exploitation of them, and a small part of his genius and intellect, in the pursuit of Wall Street activities, might have made him a multi-millionaire. There is rather more truth in the statement—though wildly exaggerated—that most of the great inventors die in the poorhouse.

Usually, the statement of the "poor inventor" is backed by the statement that he has been defrauded of his dues by the corporation which acquired and manufactured his invention, and that, if he had his rights, he would have become vastly rich. Without doubting that in a few instances this may have been true, it can easily be seen that in general it is not true, but that the relatively meager return of great inventions is the inevitable consequence of our industrial organization.

A fundamental or basic invention, representing a new idea, the first step in a new field, necessarily is crude, and inferior to the improvements which are made later on the idea, after the path has been broken by the basic invention. As a matter of fact, every inventor being entitled to his invention, neither more nor less, the original inventor is not entitled to the improvements made by others, and without them, his invention is of lesser industrial value. The inventors of the improvements cannot use them, as they are not entitled to the original invention. To the inventor, his invention is of no value unless it is applied. He can rarely apply it himself, having neither the means nor the mental ability to develop its industrial production. Thus he depends on the established industry to take up his invention. The industry however has got along without the invention, does not need it as a necessity, but merely as an improvement, or an advantage. Thus in the relation between the inventor and the industry, the advantages are against the inventor.

There is another feature, which the inventor rarely realizes.

Between the invention, as conceived, tried and patented, and the successful industrial product, there is a wide gap, the industrial development of the article often involving a vast amount of work and great expenditure. Thus, for instance, in the development of the steam turbine, now the most powerful and most efficient source of power, millions of dollars, and years of work had to be expended, from the time that the completed and patented invention was turned over to the manufacturers, until the manufacture was financially successful. And that latter period sometimes never arrives. Thus in the industrial development of the invention of the Nernst lamp, a vast amount of engineering ability, energy and many years of work were expended and when it just began to be successful, the tungsten lamp came, with its superior efficiency, and drove it out of existence.

The quality of mind of the inventor rarely is successful in developing and exploiting, and so we have seen

numerous inventors making a fair fortune from their earlier inventions, which they turned over for development and exploitation to corporations, and then, in their later inventions, desirous of getting the entire financial benefit of the invention, undertaking the industrial development themselves, and failing, and thereby losing all they had obtained from their former inventions and ending relatively poor.

Thus the great financial rewards awaiting the inventor in present-day society are an idle dream. The reward of the inventor is reputation and fame, and the satisfaction of his accomplishment—rewards which will remain and be greater still under socialism—but financially the reward of the inventor is inferior to that of the successful stockbroker or promoter.

Lack of Recognition

The most serious side is that in present-day society there is a danger, not at all remote, that the inventor may not even receive recognition and reputation for his invention. Commonly, final decision whether an achievement is an invention and who is the inventor, is made by the formal mind of the lawyer and not by the historian or expert. The judge called upon to decide upon the invention, when two powerful financial interests fight in court over the patent, cannot be expert in technical matters, and the "experts" hired by the contending parties, however expert they may be, naturally do not represent the facts as the historian would see them, but as their employer's interest wishes the court to see them. Furthermore, by that time, perhaps 10 or 15 years after the invention was made, important inventions often have become generally used and familiar and appear as obvious and self-evident to the average mind, which is incapable of putting itself back into the time when the invention did not exist. The result is failure to appreciate the invention, and the judge is liable to take the same attitude, especially if a big corporation controls the invention—even judges are human beings and as such inevitably affected by the trend of public sentiment against corporations. Instances hereof are Edison's "Main and Feeder" patent, W. Stanley's invention of the alternating current transformer, etc.

Fortunately, when the patents have expired, and no more commercial interests are involved, history usually reverses the court decision and restores the inventor to his recognition —but this may not always be so.

Obviously, in socialistic society, there would be no special interests opposing the inventor's fullest recognition; no man belittling and denying his invention for commercial reasons, and the realization that a successful invention would be immediately adopted by the whole national or even international industry, and used for the common good, that it would make the inventor a national hero, but a hero of creation and not of destruction—as have been most heroes of past days—all this will necessarily be an incentive for the inventor, far greater than anything present-day society has to offer.

Labor the Unready

By Arthur Gleason

The war caught British labor unprepared. It required three years for the workers to find themselves and begin to shape a policy. So it is with the coming of peace. The post-war world demanded a policy, and labor was unready. If there had been a determined program backed by five million convinced workers (and their families), it would have won its way against the Government, Parliament, the middle class, and big and little business.

And by a program I do not mean a political pamphlet, like "Labor and the New Social Order," however brilliant and well-balanced. The authentic aims of labor were stated in that eloquent document, but they were clothed in the terms of political change and government administration, and their appeal is to the political consciousness. Now, the political consciousness of labor is undeveloped, because its political experience is slight. Instinctively it turns to industrial action, because its desires and impulses have long gone out along that track.

Very simply, labor wanted its freshly gained war-wage made permanent (regardless of slight decreases in the cost of living).

It wanted shorter hours of work.

It wanted unemployment ended.

It wanted more control over the industrial process: over "discipline and management." What percentage of control it wanted it did not know.

It wanted nationalization of the key-industries for two reasons:

(1) It believed that ownership controls management, and that there would never be "self-government" under private ownership.

(2) It did not wish to work longer for a system of private profits.

It wanted war profiteers to pay for the war.

Such a program would have carried the day, had three "ifs" been granted.

(1) If British labor had been united.

(2) If the leaders had been agreed.

(3) If the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress were a central executive of trade union government.

Actually labor was in disarray, with war-weariness, chronic inertia, large conservative blocs, and little revolutionary cliques moving in various directions.

Its leaders were at loggerheads on aim and method (from "more production" to "direct action").

The Trades Union Congress is "an unorganized public meeting unable to formulate any consistent or practical policy," and its Parliamentary Committee represents very perfectly the inertia, the weariness, the conservatism of the membership.

Strikes.

A year has gone since peace of a sort came to the British Isles. With

the beginning of the year sectional strikes broke loose. The aim of the workers was to hold the war wages with reduced hours. The miners went further and aimed at a slightly better standard of living than that of pre-war days. But so well tutored in misery and servility were all the workers of Britain that no industry asked for an average that should exceed $800 a year, and even these faint-hearted demands for a wage of from $600 to $800 a year were called revolutionary. And the same cries of ruin came from the owners of land and capital as had come from their God-fearing ancestors when it was proposed to remove tiny children and pregnant women from heavy work underground in the mines.

Then followed the Coal Commission and the National Joint Industrial Conference: extra-Parliamentary extemporized devices to save the face of Parliamentary government, when the power had moved. The Coal Commission was the tribunal before which the old order humbly appeared. The National Joint Industrial Conference was an affair of employers and workers where the Government figured in the position of referee, second, and sponger-off. It mopped up the spilled, received blows, congratulated each side and noted how many points had been scored. It finally announced "No decision," and another great expectation faded. Mr. Lloyd George appeared at that Conference with all the irrelevance of a beautiful woman on a battlefield.

England is slowly building new organs of government (both in legislation and administration) outside of Parliament. Political questions will still be handled at Westminster, but the economic life of the nation will largely function through trade unions, industrial councils and shop committees. A political parliament is powerless to grapple with these economic questions, because it is not present where these vital forces are visibly active. What the Russians grabbed for too swiftly in soviets and workers' committees, England is attaining step by step, stumblingly, in the Shop Stewards' movement and pit committees. It is control of industry by the producers (including, of course, foremen, managers, draughtsmen, directors, technical advisers).

The fundamental fact is that the owners of land and capital have lost control of labor. Labor refuses longer to work under a system of "private enterprise," and for "private profits." The game is up. Labor demands a transfer of economic power. It has undergone the mental change which precedes change in institutions. The individual worker has experienced growth in the last ten years. "Produce individuals and the rest follows." The individuals have been produced, and the consequences are beginning to follow. Large scale organization, workers' education, persistent propaganda, and the reactions of the war, have done their work.

The Revolution.

If by revolution is meant general economic paralysis or riot, the British worker does not wish revolution. If by revolution is meant the transfer of economic power from the middle class to the workers—an organic change—that change is slowly, sectionally, painfully being made. And the worker does not mean to watch this process eventuate in the fulness of time, himself standing by as a casual spectator. He is determined to see the process fulfilled in this generation. He plays his part in bringing it to pass. He prefers settled order to wholesale experimentation, but he does not prefer settled order to piecemeal experimentation.

The British are trying to include all the revolutionary aims at once: the conquest of power, the suppression of counter-revolution, and the smooth working of the new order (and yet take them one step at a time). Their method is the persuasion of the intellectuals, the winning over of the salariat, the splitting of the middle class, and the consequent inclusion of useful middle-class members in the labor movement. The upper class is negligible. It has never been sharply differentiated. There are few old families. Most are like Smithson, who to his amazement became Duke of Northumberland. Those who have not been graduated from middle-class groceries, tea, beer, and soap, are a small group as compared with the community.

Collapse of "Reconstruction."

The Government has been caught as unaware by peace as it was by the German Army pounding down on Paris in August, 1914. Its "schemes," and "approved sites," and "strongly worded circulars," are to the tidal rip of the mass-in-motion, as the British Naval Reserves that went to save Antwerp were to the Prussian legions and the 16-inch guns. I have seen both exhibitions. They are the twittering of sparrows in a thunderstorm. In the London "Sunday Times" for June 8th, Frederic C. Howe is quoted as saying: "Great Britain has not carried through a single one of the great ideas included in her reconstructive program." He is correct. No houses. A few hundred soldiers settled on the land. The acquisition of land at landlords' prices.

The "literature" of any of these subjects is voluminous, the schemes multitudinous. Of action there is none. Of determined policy, none. Everything is left to drift, the march of events, and the revolutionary moment. It is the first two years of war, over again. Then, there were the French to hold the pass, while England groped instinctively toward final resolute action. God has always granted England time to grope. He is a slow and constitutional worker himself, using trial and error. The devil is a fiery revolutionary. Who will win?

The owners of land and capital have made large concessions inside the old social structure. These will not suffice. Labor demands a radical change in the division of the product, and in the terms of ownership and

management. Until this is granted, there will be increasing unrest, recurring strikes and diminished production, leading ever nearer to national financial disaster. To save their country, the owners of land and capital must make a sacrifice comparable to that of the volunteer soldiers. The first signs of trouble are manifest this winter, and within two years they will begin to force the issue. I believe that the change will be made peaceably and constitutionally. I believe that the Coal Commission will be the precedent for reorganizing the great industries. In short, Smillie (backed by the industrial pressure of the Triple Alliance) is an arbiter of events, and his organization is the instrument of the British constitutional social revolution.

The change now being wrought will break into revolution if it is thwarted by the employers and the Government. But if the ruling class yield, the change will be made constitutionally. The leaders of labor wish to make the transition to the Socialist State, managed by the workers, without loss of life or loss of productive power. The first step only has been taken in this change. The far greater steps remain to be taken. The younger men wish to take them in the next two years. The older men say five, ten, fifteen years.

Heritage of War.

The change, in any case, is being made within the framework of a huge debt, worn-out plant, a falling volume of production, fatigue and bitterness. The sooner the workers share the knowledge and the responsibility of these menacing fundamental conditions, the safer for the structure of society. The war has brutalized and embittered all relationships from family life to political procedure. Violence and immorality are now embedded in the consciousness of the nation. So any wildness is possible—but I think bloodshed is improbable. I think the overwhelming force of the trade unions will awe the possessing classes into submission. The workers, once in power, will realize for the first time that, as the legacy of the war, they are faced with primary poverty for the next twenty years. No nationalization, nor workers' control, nor shop committee, can devise a machinery for escape from the iron law of diminished wealth, lessened productivity. But for the first time the workers will sit in at the banquet which now will be dead-sea fruit.

The financial situation is the most serious of any since the years following 1815. The debt approaches £8,000,000,000. A daily expenditure of nearly £4,000,000 goes gayly on. Hours are decreased and wages increased on a falling market. Unemployment benefit is paid to half a million persons. Between 10,000 and 20,000 rich persons are spending £50,000,000 or more a year in luxury. And all this orgy is being written off against future productivity. The Government postpones the day of liquidating the war by creating more debt.

Within two years two things are inevitable:

A capital levy.

Hard work and greater production from all the community.

But labor will not give its fullest effort until—

The system of private profits is altered.

Workers' share in control is granted.

Full facts of industry are revealed by share in management.

There is no use in beating the big drum of high production, as Professor Bowley, and W. L. Hichens and the rest are doing unless the division of the product of industry is organized on a new basis. As long as the Dukes and Marquises take royalties from every ton of coal, and Lord Tredegar's "golden mile" of railway (3 double tracks, 1 mile long) pays him, taxes not deducted, £19,000 a year on an original outlay of £40,000, labor will not speed up to pay the interest on war debt. These facts from the Coal Commission are reverberating through the island.

The Temper of Labor.

The temper of the returned soldier will be the determining factor in all this. The sacredness of life and property no longer deters him from an impatient rush to the thing he wants.

Britain has the "Young Men in a Hurry"—the 25 per cent. of the workers who demand a new social order without delay. She has the not more than 1,000 wild men (in all Britain) who would destroy the present order at a stroke by tying up industry, and would establish a dictatorship on the lines of Lenin.

She has the twenty or twenty-five per cent. of "Old Timers"—the older order of trade unionists, who desire gradual amelioration inside the existing order. These men (Walter Appleton, Havelock Wilson, Sexton, Tillett, Seddon, Stanton, Roberts, Clem Edwards) rank much as Gompers does in America.

In between these strata lie the fifty per cent. of silent voters, with whom the final decision rests. Whether they move constitutionally step by step, or instinctively in a swoop, will set the history of the next five years.

The giants of the year have been Smillie, Hodges, Clynes, and Henderson. Clynes is the consummate voice of the elder labor statesmen. Hodges is the one young man of British labor expressing the aspiration of workers' control. Smillie is the rugged personality of the order of Lincoln, who by moral authority and human sympathy is the greatest figure in labor of this generation. Henderson is the adept honest politician who thunders common sense. He is less gifted than Clynes, but he has a policy. He is a battering ram of the centre, where Clynes is a brake.

The "private enterprise" type of young man is pretty sure to emigrate in these coming years to some one of the business republics.

The socialized miner, railwayman, engineer, shipbuilder, cotton operative, will be the governing class of

Britain-national service, good wages, workers' control.

The rate of exchange will then be determined between a business republic (Canada, U. S.) and the socialist state of Great Britain; and the relative *general* level of well-being will then determine the number and quality of emigration.

It is safe to predict that a million or more persons will in any case emigrate. But that is only the accumulation of the average rate (200,000 a year for five years of damming up).

My trips to the North of England and to the Midlands have convinced me that the situation is more disturbing than Government officials realize. They receive their information from the old-line trade union officials, and they sit in their barracks at Whitehall exchanging memoranda, writing detailed reports. They rarely talk with the militant leaders, with the rank and file, or with the returned soldiers.

Thus, at Coventry, I heard George Morris, District Organizer of the Workers' Union (350,000) say of a certain Major, who was head of a jam manufactory:

"He received so much a head for sending the boys out to the front, and now I suppose he is buying back their dead bodies for his jam."

The official and upper-class tendency is to underestimate the volume of the currents now running. At present they are running under the surface. They are largely instinctive and subconscious. But with an obstacle to dam them, they would swirl up through the crust. They can still be canalized constitutionally. God is very good to the English and He may give them a moratorium.

The Next Issue

The January issue of THE SOCIALIST REVIEW, which will be published just before Christmas, will contain, among other important matter, articles on "South American Labor," by Marion Eaton; "American War Prisoners," by John Nevin Sayre; "The Ideal Police State," by Isaac A. Hourwich; and "The Nature of the State," by Jessie Wallace Hughan. The first of a short series entitled "The Failure of Liberalism" by "S. E.," and the second article on "The Present Status of Socialism in America," dealing with the three Chicago Conventions, by Harry W. Laidler, will also appear in the January issue.

A further statement on the steel workers and an article by George V. Lomonosoff on "The Russian Church, the Soviets and Marriage" will also appear in the January issue. This issue of THE SOCIALIST REVIEW is entitled the December number in view of the delay caused by the New York pressmen's strike, now happily settled as far as our printer, the Nation Press, is concerned.

Release of Political Prisoners

(*Continued from page* 14)

the sort of a cause that the rank and file of organized labor will get behind and shove." That was the keynote of the convention. It was organized labor mobilizing for amnesty.

For Release of Political Prisoners

Albert De Silver

The American Freedom Convention, which gathered in Chicago in the closing days of September to discuss ways and means of securing the release of political prisoners, was a cheering symptom of democracy astir, of the coming of the people to take counsel together concerning things which were near to their hearts. Its genesis had been in the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party. Its organization had been carried on under the direction of J. Mahlon Barnes, who, with tireless energy, had labored against all obstacles which the Post Office had placed in his way. Present at the convention were 298 delegates, representing a constituency of well over a million men and women.

It was clearly a gathering in which labor was preponderant. Among those whose counsel stood out above the general run were Fraenckle of the Chicago machinists, Pearl of the Central Labor Council of Seattle, and Kendall of Detroit. But neither they nor anyone else dominated the convention. Discussion from the floor was abundant, thorough (sometimes only too thorough).

The convention adopted an admirable declaration of the conditions essential to political and civil liberty, and demanded the immediate release of those men and women who had been imprisoned or prosecuted because of their opinions. Its real achievement, however, was the formation of a permanent organization to carry on a tireless campaign of education and agitation until all of America's political offenders shall have been set free. A central headquarters is to be established in Chicago in charge of a national secretary who will direct the campaign. A national committee is to be chosen which will represent the opinion of every state in the Union. An Immediate Action Committee residing in Chicago and consisting of G. T. Fraenckle and J. P. Neary of the Chicago machinists, J. Mahlon Barnes of the Cigar Makers' Union, Robert Buck, editor of *The New Majority,* Mary O'Reilly of the Teachers' Union, Mrs. Lenetta N. Cooper of the Chicago Fabians, and H. Austin Simons, conscientious objector and Director of the Workers' Institute of Chicago, will be on call.

The organization is to be known as the American Freedom League, and it is to bind together all the scattered efforts which are being made to bring about amnesty for political prisoners. It will be supported by those who hold the simple faith that justice and humanity require an amnesty. Particularly will it be supported by organized labor. The delegates were very clear about that. "Why, of course, the locals will support this thing," said Kendall from the Detroit carpenters. "Simple right and justice are at the bottom of it and that is

(*Continued on page* 18)

Australia Will Be There

W. Francis Ahern

The workers of Australia are determined that in the march along the world's highway towards industrial democracy, they shall not be camp-followers.

It is becoming more and more clear that in the post-war days the Australian workers are not going to take their orders even from their own political leaders, but that they themselves are going to say what they want, and see to it that their representatives in parliament secure their needs for them.

Always militant, compared with the workers of other countries, the Australian workers have fared well in the past. Before the war they enjoyed conditions and a freedom unknown in any other country. But the war has been responsible for the birth of a newer democracy in Australia. The Australian worker today no longer argues that he is entitled to a fair day's pay for a fair day's work—that Mr. Capitalist is entitled to a juicy cut so long as the worker is well paid. He objects to Mr. Capitalist being in the business at all. And he doesn't want to change over from private capitalism to state capitalism either. He figures that that could be even worse—that the devil he does not know may be a monster compared with the devil he has suffered so long.

The Australian worker is heading for social democracy and industrial control—call it soviet rule or what you will. The Australian worker doesn't much mind the particular embellishment you give it. All he is concerned about today is that if his product is worth $100 he wants that $100 all for himself, and not a meagre share of it that he receives at the present time. And he is hitting the trail to try to secure it.

Between arbitration courts putting 12 cents extra into his pay envelope, and the profiteers extracting a dollar out of his wife's purse, the Australian worker finds himself in bad shape just now. There is nothing like a shrinking breakfast table or a diminishing dinner-pail to set a working man thinking. It made the workers think in Europe—it is making them think in Australia, too. And it is whetting their appetites for big things in the near future.

Arbitration a Failure

Arbitration in Australia is a failure—and nobody knows it better than the Australian worker. I say this as one who has given long years to the study of arbitration and its results. It has not stopped strikes—on the other hand, it has exasperated the workers. Instead of benefiting workers by granting them wage increases at short notice—as it was expected to do—it has been availed of by employers to hang up cases, sometimes as long as three years, so that when the time came for legal adjustment, the claims of the workers were often ancient and of no use whatever. The only unions

that have benefited from arbitration are the large key organizations which have been able to force their claims through the courts in preference to others by threat of a general strike. And they could have secured their increases, by the same threats, if no arbitration courts had existed at all. The coal miners, for instance, could plunge the continent into darkness and stop all machinery in a couple of weeks, the seamen and railway men could, by united action, starve two-thirds of the people in the same period of time, the rural workers could stagnate the primary industries of the continent in a month. They would get their demands if the arbitration courts were in heaven.

While arbitration has regulated the workers' wages in some small way, it has not prevented their being exploited by the profiteers. I stress these facts about arbitration because its failure to deal with industrial unrest in Australia is largely responsible for the birth of the newer and more militant movement.

In 1911, the average weekly wage for male adult labor was $12.30. In 1918, it was $15.60—an increase of 26.8 per cent. But during the same time the purchasing power of the dollar had shrunk to such an extent that what could be purchased for $4.80 in 1911 required $7.26 in 1918—a decrease in the purchasing power of 51.4 per cent. In other words, while wages increased $1.28 per £1 ($4.80) the cost of living increased by $2.46 per £1 ($4.80)—that is, double the wage increase. So that for every dollar the worker received in wage increased by arbitration, his wife was mulcted $2 in the cost of living increase.

If we take unemployment into consideration, the disparity is greater because, instead of the nominal wage increase of $3.30 as above, the effective wage increase was only $3.08. It will be seen, then, that in order to keep pace with the increased cost of living, the Australian worker should have received an increased wage over the seven years of $7.32, instead of the effective wage increase of $3.08. Or place it another way, the Australian worker finds himself robbed of $3.24 more per week today than in 1911. As a matter of fact, the robbery is greater because these figures only related to food and groceries, and take no account of the increase in the price of clothing, house-rent, or any other necessities of life.

Now while the worker has found himself with an actual wage decrease of $3.24 per week after seven years, he also finds that between 1911 and 1918 the private wealth of Australia has increased from $7,089,505,000 in 1911 to $9,250,000,000 in 1918—that while his wage has actually shrunk $3.24 per week over the seven years, capitalism has enriched itself to the tune of $2,160,495,000.

Distribution of Wealth

One-sixth of one per cent. of the people own more than 25 per cent. of the private wealth of Australia. Less than 2 per cent own 61½ per cent., while 4½ per cent. own 78 per cent.

of the total private wealth of the country. That is the capitalist's side of the picture. On the worker's side of the picture we find that 80 per cent. of the people of Australia own less than $500 in cash or belongings, while 63 per cent. of the people do not own a single cent other than the wages they earn from week to week, or are in debt.

The Australian worker realizes that less bread must come to his breakfast table today than formerly; that shoddier clothing must be worn this year than last; that this winter will find his children more often shoeless than during the winters of previous years. Is it any wonder that he resolves today that the whole infernal system must end; that the snapping point has been reached, and that whether it be by revolution or otherwise a newer, juster, and saner democracy must supplant the present inequitable and unjust system?

You have here the basic causes leading up to the birth of the newer militant movement that is spreading like wildfire through Australia at the present time. In any case, what is happening in Australia today had to come some time or other. We owe it to the war that it has come so soon. The war has opened the eyes of the Australian people to the reality of capitalism.

Prior to the war the average Australian worker didn't appreciate the evils and possibilities of capitalism as we economists did. I have always contended that in the past the workers of Australia got their concessions on the industrial field too cheaply because of their unionized strength—nearly 60 per cent. of the male workers of Australia carry union tickets, and they are not drawing-room unionists, either. Australian workers, generally speaking, never had to put up a fight against capitalism for better conditions or higher wages as have the workers of the United States. Though there have been times in Australia when the workers have endured hardships, during strikes or lockouts, the breadline as I have seen it in the U. S. A. is unknown in Australia.

But the war gave the Australian workers a keener sense of what capitalism really is and what strength it possesses. They declare themselves exploited—as shown above; their liberties curtailed which they had believed could not be interfered with; their most outspoken leaders thrown into gaols for speaking the truth that was in them; they assert that their own trusted parliamentarians deserted them and went into the camps of the political enemy, whence they tried to enslave them with the manacles of conscription. Slowly but surely they realized that if they were to gain anything at all, or even if they were to retain their present economic position, they had to fight for it themselves.

The real move came towards the end of 1917. The Australian people defeated conscription at the ballot box for the second time, and then set out to make up the leeway. They struck out at their political leaders

"gingering" them into a militant mood; while at the same time they became stiffer-necked in their opposition to the war. Labor Councils became decidedly socialistic and anti-militaristic in their character—the largest Labor Council in Australia (New South Wales) carrying a "stop-the-war" motion by a threefold majority, and the political wing of the movement demanded peace by negotiation. The one big union movement sprang into existence and tens of thousands rallied to its standards. There was some opposition from the standpatters, but the industrialists argued that if one big union was good for the capitalists, it must likewise be good for the workers. If the fight had to come, why not between two well-organized contestants? The logic of the argument could not be assailed in any way.

Present Day Program

Today Labor in Australia is so militant that it scorns the militancy it expressed five years ago as something conservative and out of date. It has keyed up the political leaders to a degree never known before. It has given them definite instructions that when they secure control of the National Parliament of Australia they will revolutionize the system of government. At the last All-Australian Labor Conference, held in Sydney (N. S. Wales) in June, at which I was present, the following objective of the Labor Party was adopted:

"The cultivation of an Australian sentiment, maintenance of a White Australia, and the development in Australia of an enlightened and self-reliant community.

"The emancipation of human labor from all forms of exploitation, and the obtaining for all workers of the full reward of their industry by the collective ownership and the democratic control of the collectively used agencies of production, distribution, and exchange.

"The maintenance and extension of relations with the Labor organizations of all countries.

"The prevention of war through the settlement of international disputes by a tribunal clothed with powers sufficient to enforce its awards."

Labor in Australia today is working towards industrial democracy at express speed. The workers are aiming at democratic control of industries —at retaining the real strength on the industrial field and forcing the political machine to reflect their ambitions. The real parliament of the future in Australia will be on soviet lines in the industrial field, with parliamentary representatives giving constitutional effect to what the real producers of wealth consider the best for the workers. That, however, is looking ahead.

For the present, the workers of Australia are pressing onward, growing more militant than ever—resolved that their country will not be a straggler on the world's highway when the banners of industrial democracy are unfurled to salute the dawn of a better day.

British Workers and The War

John MacLean

Stolid as are the workers of Britain as a whole, they have nevertheless been stirred by the war and its accompaniments beyond all precedent and have advanced in thought and organization so rapidly that they have reached a point that might have been reached twenty years hence, had no war occurred with its revolutionary consequences.

Let us take the coöperative movement first. The rise in prices from the very start of the war drove masses of workers into the movement and the increase would have been greater had it not been for food-rationing during the course of the war. Under the rationing scheme coöperative societies only received allowances in proportion to membership and purchases prior to the war, with the result that many members had to go to the private traders. So bad were the flour and other raw materials supplied to coöperators that the same "disloyalty" of members ensued. Appeal was made to the Government after a huge conference in London in October, 1917, but the supercilious attitude of Lloyd George, who refused to meet the conference's delegates, compelled the coöperative movement to plunge into politics independent of the Labor Party, although friendly thereto. Ten candidates were put up at the general election of December, 1918, and obtained 57,676 votes. One, Mr. A. E. Waterson, was returned to Parliament.

All things considered, the growth of coöperation is phenomenal. At the last Coöperative Congress in June the Coöperative Union was unable to provide complete statistics beyond the close of 1917. Still a close reading of the *Coöperative News* and the *Scottish Coöperator* enables us roughly to estimate the growth till the end of 1918. In 1913 the membership was 3,011,390; in 1917 it was 3,835,376, and in 1918 it rose to over 4,000,000. This shows that the numbers rose at least a million during the war period, or 33 per cent.

In 1913 the total sales were £130,035,894; in 1917, £224,913,795, and in 1918 about £280,000,000. Care must be taken to note that these figures include wholesale and retail sales, and that the wholesale societies exist to supply the retail ones, so that the duplication of the wholesale statistics necessarily occurs in the totals given. In 1917 the wholesales sold to the retails £75,441,542, which in turn sold the products to the members at a higher valuation, about £100,000,000.

Since the signing of the Armistice the Coöperative Wholesale Society (C. W. S.) and the Scottish C. W. S. separately and jointly have been striving to get access to raw materials throughout the world on a larger scale than before and are preparing to trade with Coöperative Wholesale Societies in other lands. At the same time preparations are being made to meet the trusts in production and the multi-

ple shop companies in distribution. The struggle in this direction will drive coöperators to see that their only hope lies in world-established socialism, since workers' capital cannot compete with that of the capitalist class.

Trade Union Growth

The Defence of the Realm Act made strikes illegal, thereby placing the trade unions' funds at the mercy of the Government. The union leaders were paralyzed in consequence and only became active (largely on the Government's side) when spontaneous outbursts or threats of strikes resulted from the rapidly rising cost of living. To avert strikes the Government compelled employers to negotiate with the union leaders, or laid down the rate of wages and conditions itself. In these circumstances non-union workers, especially women and the unskilled or semi-skilled, were driven in shoals into the trade unions; between 1913 and 1917 the general labor unions increased by 389,000 members. The total membership of the 1,133 unions has risen from 3,952,861 in 1914 to 5,287,522 in 1917. At present the total is about six millions, an increase of two millions, or 50 per cent.

The tendency since the signing of the Armistice has been towards amalgamation, a tendency fostered by the workshop committee movement, Government war-control of industry, trustification, the establishment of Industrial Councils by the Government, the ambitions of trade union leaders (who realize that their importance in political life is determined by the numbers behind them), and by the spread of industrial unionism.

Although the Triple Alliance of the miners, the railwaymen, and the transport workers came into being before the war, it did not begin to function till after the start of the war. It claims to have brought pressure to bear on the Government repeatedly during the war. At any rate this year it has loomed large in the public gaze, and as it has been formed to negotiate and to conduct strikes many unionists are urging their industrial federations to join it, so that some see in it the nucleus of the One Big Union in opposition to the British Empire Producers' Organization and are actively promulgating the idea.

The rendering of strikes illegal under D. O. R. A. (our Espionage Act) brought into being the unofficial workshop or shop stewards' movement as typified by the London, Sheffield & Clyde workers' committees, and the miners' reform movement. By developing strikes along the lines of industry they have helped to kill the old craft spirit and, by the spread of literature and papers inside the workshops as well as by holding demonstrations, industrial unionism and revolutionary socialism have been rapidly spread amongst the unions. Despite the efforts of most union leaders the tendency is to see in the unions amalgamated, allied and transformed the main instrument of the class war for the overthrow of capitalism. Instead of being simple agencies of negotiation with the employing

class they are being transformed into engines for the destruction of the system and the running of the workers' commonwealth. Typical of this tendency is the South Wales Miners' Federation, driven onward by the unofficial committee there.

Labor Colleges.

Hand in hand with this agitational and organizing work goes the educational. As a breakaway from the Ruskin College, in 1908 there came into being the Central Labor College, now located in London and controlled by the railwaymen (N. U. R.) and the South Wales Miners' Federation. The C. L. C. was suspended during the war: it reopens this September. However, the Plebs League, composed of former students and Marxian devotees, has developed a system of classes over England during the war period on Marxian economics and industrial history, and with the object of spreading the classes, gaining support for the C. L. C., establishing other colleges, and stimulating the study of Marxism generally, many conferences of delegates from working-class bodies have been held.

In Scotland this September a Labor College will be opened and supported by classes all over the industrial belt. In May the third conference was attended by 571 delegates from 369 Labor organizations.

In Ireland classes have been run in Dublin and elsewhere since the war, and the birthday of James Conolly was celebrated in June by a concert, the proceeds of which will be devoted to establishing a Conolly Memorial Workers' College. This mighty mental awakening is to be attributed to the conditions arising out of the war, and will be the basis for a newer and higher activity of the British workers.

The great growth of reading has brought into being the Peoples' Year Book, first issued in 1918 by the Co-operative Press Agency, and the Labor Year Book, first issued in 1916 by the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress and the Executive Committee of the Labor Party.

Labor in Politics.

The Labor Party acquiesced in the war from the start, and most of its leading members, like those of the trade unions, acted as recruiting sergeants. On December 11, 1916, the Labor Party joined the Coalition Government formed by Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Arthur Henderson entering the War Cabinet. At the Labor Party Conference in August, 1917, and again in January, 1918, the British Socialist Party urged withdrawal from the Government. Ultimately it withdrew before the General Election in December, 1918. This supineness of the Labor Party, viewed by the younger men in the light of the Bolshevik Revolution, led to a reaction against "parliamentarism" made manifest in June, 1919, at the Labor Party Conference, by the passing of a resolution instructing the National Executive to consult the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress with a view to effec-

tive industrial and political action to stop further Allied intervention in Russia.

At the same time it must be noted that the Labor Party membership has grown from 1,612,147 in 1914 to 2,465,131 in 1917, a 50 per cent. increase due to the growth of the trade unions predominant in the Party. At the General Election of 1910 the votes cast for the Labor candidates amounted to 506,020, and in 1918 to 2,482,566. This increase can partly be accounted for by the increased number of candidates, the vote granted to women of 30 years of age and over, and to the break-down of independent liberalism. Henderson anticipated coming to power as Scheidemann arrived in Germany, but the Labor Party has only 59 seats in a House of Commons of 706. Only one of the 59, Mr. Neil Maclean of Glasgow, stood out as an anti-war socialist. All other anti-war labor and socialist candidates were wiped out by the combined forces of capitalism. This partly explains the intensified industrial strikes, and the decision of the Labor Party in connection with allied attempts to suppress Bolshevism.

The war saw the Independent Labor Party leaders and membership largely against militarism, but its activities were largely suspended through the operations of D. O. R. A. MacDonald and Snowden made occasional speeches in Parliament, although more of a pacifist than of a socialist type.

The B. S. P. was paralyzed by the attitude of its organ, *Justice,* and most of the Executive Committee, led by Hyndman, who with Blatchford of *The Clarion* went war-mad; but it recovered on the defection of Hyndman and a few others who formed the National Socialist Party. After the suppression of *The Vanguard* at the same time as the suspension of *The Forward* (both of Glasgow) the reconstructed B. S. P. started the official organ, *The Call.*

It must be confessed that none of the socialist parties as such played a prominent part during the war, as the most determined men saw that really effective work could alone be done inside the workshops. Hence we find mighty resistance to capitalism springing up in the Clyde area amongst the engineers, steel-workers, and ship-builders and in South Wales amongst the miners. The great war strikes and threats of strikes spread from these storm-centers. New centers were established at Manchester, Sheffield, Coventry, and London in steel and engineering. The socialists led all the fights, as might be expected.

The war has tended to drive the rank and file of the I. L. P. into Marxism, and there is the possibility of the best elements linking up with the B. S. P. and the S. L. P. and other groups to form a communist party outside of and antagonistic to the amorphous Labor Party.

Dissatisfied as some of us are with the progress of the British working class in the light of European developments, great strides have nevertheless been taken in the education and organization of the people.

A Students' International

On February 11, 1919, a group of French socialist students issued a manifesto to the socialist undergraduates of the world, in which they declared that today, more than ever, it was necessary to bring together athwart national boundaries all the socialist forces for the building up of a new social order. They protested against the conduct of those French intellectuals "who became the propagators of the fiercest national hatred whilst we were led to the slaughter," and expressed gratitude for such a man as Romain Rolland, "who, alone, knew how to lift himself above chauvinistic passion and who, during the unchaining of all the wild instincts which war calls forth among men, proclaimed the first words of reason and goodwill.

The manifesto continues:

"We count upon the socialist students of the world to join us in our efforts to combat universal ignorance and intolerance and the deep moral degradation which has been created in all belligerent countries during the four years of war.

"We pledge ourselves to struggle against the worm-eaten structure of capitalism with all the means in our power, through the incessant spread of socialist ideals, through the study of socialism and social problems which continuously confront every thinking man, and finally through revolution.

"We enthusiastically greet all those in Russia and Germany who struggle for the realization of the great dream, the liberation of mankind."

The manifesto was printed in the advanced press throughout Europe, and caused undergraduates in Munich to urge the calling of an international congress in some neutral European country. A few socialists in Geneva, Switzerland, thereupon founded an International Committee of Socialist Undergraduates, and invited students of various lands to attend a conference in that city, December 26 to 29, 1919. By September, organizations in some 18 countries representative of 20,000 students had communicated with the Committee, and, in many instances, had promised to send delegates.

The Congress will consider the organization of an International Federation of Socialist and Communist Undergraduates; the foundation of a permanent federation office; the establishment of a magazine and the development of a bureau of correspondence, to strengthen the spirit of fellowship between the students of the various countries. Attention will also, undoubtedly, be given to the peace of Versailles, to the question of affiliation with the Second or Third International, and to such university problems as the internationalization of university programs.

One of the members of the I.S.S. Executive Committee now in Europe will, probably, attend the sessions of the Conference as fraternal delegate. The headquarters of the committee is Comité Internationale des Etudiants Socialistes, 8, Rue des Chaudronniers, Geneva, Switzerland.

H. W. L.

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Published Monthly by the
INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY
Room 914, Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

Editor, HARRY W. LAIDLER. Wesleyan.
Managing Editor, W. HARRIS CROOK. Oxford.

Editorial Board

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

83

Hungary

A further attempt of the Allied Council "to make the world safe for democracy" by methods beyond the comprehension of the mere man on the street is evidenced in the diplomacy which dethroned the Hungarian Soviet Republic and made Hungary a prey of monarchical Rumania and the Hungarian "White Guards."

In late March, 1919, Hungary became a Soviet Republic, modeled after that of Russia. During the spring the government held elections according to the soviet plan. Within ten days after these elections, Allied intervention began. The Rumanian army invaded, the Czecho-Slovak troops followed, while under the wing of the French command a royalist "White Guard" army was formed in the occupied territory. The Hungarian army resisted, met with frequent success, and at one time advanced into Slovakia, where it was received with acclamation by the working class population.

Following this invasion, Clemenceau telegraphed Bela Kun, proposing that the Hungarians withdraw from Slovakia, and that the Rumanians retire from the Theiss to the line arranged under the armistice at the end of the last year. Bela Kun, before answering this note, asked the French Premier what guarantee the soviet had that the Rumanians would carry out their agreement. Clemenceau replied that his word was his guarantee. The Hungarians thereupon withdrew. The Rumanians, however, refused to budge an inch from the Theiss.

Bela Kun asked Clemenceau for an explanation. For some time no answer was received, but at last a reply was sent stating that, as long as the Hungarians did not carry out their armistice terms of November, 1918, the Supreme Council would not negotiate with them. To a request for information as to what were the terms of the original armistice that Hungary had failed to carry out no reply was received.

The Allied military missions in Vienna, through the Hungarian Minister Boehm, however, got in touch with moderate socialist and trade union leaders, and gave them to understand that the blockade would be raised if the Bela Kun government retired, and a Social Democratic Government took its place. On the strength of these representations, the Soviet Government resigned.

Jules Peidl, formerly Minister of People's Welfare under Karolyi, succeeded as Premier and formed a

new cabinet, consisting chiefly of moderate socialists. The Rumanians continued their advance into Hungary, despite this change and, on August 4, 30,000 troops occupied Budapest, and demanded the surrender, before the night of the fifth, of 30 per cent. of the harvest, animals and farm machinery, 50 per cent. of the railway supplies, a large proportion of the Danube shipping, and equipment and supplies for an army of 300,000. On the night of the fifth, the Rumanians, despite the protest of the Allied Council, began the seizure of live stock, farming implements, rolling stock and food—although Hungary was on the verge of starvation—and the severing of railway communications from Budapest to Vienna.

On August 6, the Archduke Joseph and a number of royalist counter-revolutionists surrounded the palace where the new Hungarian Government was sitting, took over the government and invested the Archduke with supreme power. Stephen Friedrichs, a conservative, was made Premier, and formed a government containing many members formerly identified with the old Tisza régime. Paul Caromi, leader of the Social Democrats, announced that the socialists would not participate in the government unless Archduke Joseph abandoned the regency.

Incited to action, the Supreme Council finally forced the resignation of Archduke Joseph and presented a demand for a coalition government. The archduke resigned, and a new cabinet was formed by Premier Friedrichs, containing four members of the Archduke's Ministry, and absolutely unrepresentative of any except the bourgeois and royalist groups.

The *Manchester Guardian* correspondent (see Sept. 10 issue) declared in regard to the activities of this ministry:

"All newspapers are suppressed until and unless they support the government. . . . Through the double terrorism of the Rumanians and White Guards it is impossible for the mass of respectable or working class opinion to offer any protest. . . . So little support has Friedrichs among the working class that he cannot find nine or ten printers required to set up his two-page governmental sheet. His sole force is his White Guard and officers of the old army, with the aid of which he usurped power."

The moderate Social Democratic Party of Hungary issued an appeal to the workers of the world in early September, thus describing conditions under the Friedrichs régime:

"We, Social Democrats, can only condemn the methods of the Dictatorship and the Red Terror. Yet at the moment that we are in the mood to make up for past mistakes we find ourselves face to face with a cruel White Terror of a mediæval and barbaric character. We have for Bolshevism only words of condemnation. Nevertheless, we are compelled to point out—and can establish it by documentary evidence—that the White Terror in the four weeks since the usurpation of the 'Archduke' Joseph of Hapsburg and the government of his adventurer lackey, Friedrichs, has spilt a hundredfold more blood than the dictatorial régime of the now-overthrown Soviet Republic did in the whole four months of its existence.

(*Continued on page* 29)

Russia

Once again the class-tactics of the Allied governments have brought a speedy nemesis upon their luckless authors. Before the war closed France backed Skoropadsky in the Ukraine against the Russian "Reds," backed him with financial and "moral" support, only to see him turn pro-German. In Finland the Allies, France leading, again backed the White Guard of Mannerheim against the Red Finns, only to find Mannerheim go the way of Skoropadsky.

Finally, in Section 12 of the Armistice itself was writ the fear that was greater than fear of the "Hun" —the class hatred of the Bolshevik. Section 12 declared that all German troops then in former Russian territory must retire behind the original German frontiers *as soon as the Allies deemed opportune.* Marshal Foch interpreted this as meaning that German troops must remain in Russia to fight Bolshevism as long as the Entente saw fit! Erzberger and the temporary German government protested at this interpretation, but ultimately the fact was accepted.[1]

For months past Germany has been a recruiting ground, with full connivance of the Allied governments, for the anti-Red Russian armies. Recruits in Berlin received 50 marks per head, uniforms and outfit. In Jena they got 330 marks and the promise of all they could take from the Jewish population when they got there.[2] From Tilsit trains of German troops passed continuously eastward towards the Bolshevik front.[3] Von der Goltz, the notorious Prussian Junker who aided Mannerheim in the Finnish White Terror, was leader of the armies, and "received orders from Paris; money and equipment, by roundabout ways, from the Allies."[4] In Lettland troops of the German "Iron Division" were transferred in bodies to the Russian (anti-Bolshevik) Army, merely being commanded to don Russian shoulder straps and cockades.[5] As late as August of this year the Entente-German alliance was transporting German prisoners in France to the Baltic Provinces, the French Government supplying the outfit and the German Government the transportation![6]

Now, at last, the Entente is faced with a serious situation where the Baltic Russo-German land barons, till now the left wing of Marshal Foch's "cordon sanitaire" round Soviet Russia, have become powerful enough to attack Riga and, in short, do much as they please with Allied orders; their ultimate goal being a strong east-Prussian jumping-off point for final counter-revolution at Berlin.

The latest act of the curiously crooked statescraft of the Allied governments is to order Germany and

[1] *Manchester Guardian,* January 8, 1919 (Berlin correspondent); *New York Times,* October 13, 1919 (Paris correspondent).

[2] The *Berlin Freiheit* of August 18, 1919.

[3] *Berliner Tageblatt* quoted by Philips Price.

[4] M. Philips Price, Berlin cable in *London Daily Herald,* August 28, 1919.

[5] *Berlin Freiheit* quoted in Reuter Berlin cable of August 30, 1919.

[6] M. Philips Price, Berlin cable in *London Herald,* August 30, 1919.

Austria to join the anti-Soviet food blockade. So the wheel swings round. The nation that gave most lives to hold the German drives from sweeping Europe is today to be starved by an iron ring of Allies and erstwhile enemies. A significant comment upon forecasts by socialist and pacifist groups!

W. H. C.

Boston Labor College

The Trade Union College started in Boston at the beginning of this year seems to have been the first instance of a college organized by the central labor body of any American city. On February 2nd, at a meeting of the Boston Central Labor Union, a committee including several former presidents of that body was appointed to carry out this educational project with Michael A. Murphy of the Stablemen's Union acting as chairman. On April 7th, the College opened its preliminary spring term, in the building of the High School of Practical Arts in Roxbury. The enrollment fee was $2.50 for a course of ten lectures. Of the 14 courses offered the most popular were those entitled "How to Write English," "Practice in Discussion," and "Introduction to American Law." The 169 students enrolled included many men prominent in the labor movement who were able to bring to the discussions of the class room the mature fruits of a practical experience which was very useful to the professor. The lectures were given by the Dean of the Harvard Law School and various other college and high school teachers of the neighborhood. Several of the instructors formed a Teachers' Union and thus became themselves members of the Boston Central Labor Union. This autumn the College has begun, with a still larger enrollment, a fuller program for the coming year. The experiment launched in Boston has already been imitated by the Trade Union College in Washington, D. C., and by the Workers' University just opened under the auspices of the Seattle Central Labor Council. Other cities throughout the country are starting similar educational work. Plans are afoot for a national and perhaps later an international conference on labor education. Since the end of the war, organized labor the world over is realizing the need of educating itself in preparation for the part it is going to play in the new industrial and social order.

H. W. L. D.

King Coal

Are the coal miners really trying to hold up one hundred million people? Is it true, as President Wilson has declared, that the strike is unjustifiable, unlawful and a grave moral and legal wrong against the government and people of the United States? What are the facts?

In September, 1919, a Convention of over 2,000 delegates from various mining districts (the largest convention in the history of the United Mine

Workers of America) voted unanimously for the following demands:—a six-hour day underground and a five-day week in all coal mines; a 60 per cent. increase in all mine wages; time and a half for overtime, and double time for work on Sundays and holidays. President Brewster of the National Coal Association declares that these demands "would more than double the high cost of producing coal," but James Lord, President of the Mining Department of the American Federation of Labor, replies that they would add only 60 cents to each ton of coal. The present wage scale agreed upon by coal unions and coal miners in 1916 was declared when war broke out to be in effect till the end of the war or till March 31, 1920, whichever date was the earlier. The miners contend that the contract expired upon the signing of the Armistice, November 11, 1918.

They claim they have shown their patriotism during the war by deferring their demands, by increasing the coal output from 590,000,000 tons in 1916 to 684,000,000 tons in 1918, by over 53,000 enlistments from their ranks and more than 3,000 deaths in battle, and finally by the collective purchase by their unions of nearly $10,000,000 in Liberty bonds and war savings stamps. President C. F. Keeney of District No. 17 in the West Virginia coal field, writing to Woodrow Wilson declares: "The coal miners of the country have not received a cent of wage increase for two full years. . . . A miner who made $75 per month in July, 1914, must average $131 per month now to be as well off as he was in July, 1914, yet the official figures show that the miner only made an average wage of $111 a month during the year 1918 (which was the best year for the coal miners) . . . during the year 1918 there were employed within the state in the coal industry 93,132 persons, 52,468 of which were Americans, 40,664 foreigners. These are the men who dug the coal during the war. . . . They were loyal during the war, they are loyal now, but they must live. They must have heavy clothing to keep the body warm and plenty of wholesome strength-giving food to keep it nourished so as to be able to meet the hard physical toil of the mines. At the present wages received these necessities cannot be had."

Quoting the report of the Department of Mines, he asserts that the cost of mining per ton of coal in 1916 was 52 cents; in 1918 78 cents, an increase of 50 per cent., whereas in the same years the selling price of a ton of coal (presumably at the pit mouth) was $1.09 in 1916 and $2.83 in 1918, an increase of 184 per cent. over 1916.

When the armistice went into effect the operators found large reserves of coal on their hands. The mines in many instances proceeded to run only a three-day week with two results: (1.) At the present moment only a few weeks' reserve supply of coal exists. Of this lack the operators were making the most till government price fixing, which had ceased for eight months, was reinstated. (2.) The mine workers, being unem-

ployed for a large part of each week, received an average wage over the past 12 months of approximately $800.* In view of these facts and in view of the unanimous demand at the Cleveland Convention that a strike be called on November 1st if the miners' terms were not met by the operators it is difficult to see what the leaders of 450,000 union members could do, save obey their rank and file. The government injunction silences those leaders and threatens the ranks with starvation, but far from removing the urgent causes for the miners' demands simply adds fuel to their present aggravated feeling and stern determination to gain an American living for themselves and their families.

The Executive Committee of the American Federation of Labor, meeting on November 9 after the court had upheld the injunction, declared:

"Both the restraining order and the injunction, in so far as its prohibitory features are concerned, are predicated upon the Lever act, a law enacted by Congress for the purpose of preventing speculating and profiteering in the food and fuel supplies of the country.

"There never was in the minds of the Congress in enacting that law, or in the mind of the President when he signed it, that the Lever act would be applied to workers in cases of strikes or lockouts. The Food Controller, Mr. Hoover, specifically so stated. Members of the committee having the bill in charge have in writing declared that it was not in the minds of the committee, and the then Attorney General, Mr. Gregory, gave assurance that the Government would not apply that law to the workers' effort to obtain improved working conditions.

"By all the facts in the case the miners' strike is justified. We indorse it. We are convinced of the justice of the miners' cause. We pledge to the miners the full support of the American Federation of Labor, and appeal to the workers and the citizenship of our country to give like indorsement and aid to the men engaged in this momentous struggle."

W. H. C.

* Statement by James Lord, President of the Mining Department, A. F. of L., October 27.

(*Continued from page 25*)

"Men's lives and workers' organizations have been destroyed that have not had the least thing in common with Bolshevism. Thousands upon thousands of innocent workers have been thrown into jail and there have been bloodily flogged and tortured. Simultaneously has the Friedrichs Government, under the false pretext of hunting down communists and through the lavish expenditure of money and the exercise of other official pressure, called into existence a pogrom movement and inaugurated a race war on a scale that is perilous for all Europe.

"Hungary is occupied by a foreign military power. Military occupation pursues its own political and economic aims. Meanwhile we are not free to move or breathe. Neither newspapers nor leaflets can be published. We are not permitted to hold public or private gatherings. All that we behold is the raging of the darkest reaction. All that we behold, too, is that no food trains are entering; that no coal is coming in for the winter and for the needs of our factories; that in one way after the other every possibility of economic production has been taken away, and that in consequence a frightful anxiety is seizing upon the working population of the country.

"We are overwhelmed by the prospect of a dreadful future in which scores upon scores of thousands of workers will seek to leave this land in the search for a new home, only to find every door closed against them. We have the feeling that our beautiful land is being treated by the victorious Powers like a corpse on the dissecting table. . . ." H.W.L.

The Present Crisis in the Steel Industry

Jacob Margolis

Since the Homestead strike of 1892, no serious crisis has arisen in the steel industry of the Pittsburgh district. With the exception of the strike of the employees of the Pressed Steel Car Company in 1909 conducted by the Industrial Workers of the World, a slight disaffection of the Braddock workers during the Westinghouse strike of 1916 and a walkout of a part of the employees of the Jones and Laughlin Steel Company in October, 1917, this district has experienced no labor difficulty. The freedom from strike disturbances and industrial upheavals may be indicated by the opinion expressed by the Chief of the Coal and Iron Police of Braddock during the trial of Merrick and others indicted for inciting to riot at the time of the Braddock disturbances. This officer, when asked what had been the measures employed on such occasions, said that there had been no strike or disturbances during his experience of twenty years as Chief of the Coal and Iron Police of Braddock. For this reason this crisis is highly significant and aside from what may eventuate a new chapter has been written in the history of the steel industry of the Pittsburgh district.

Beginnings of Organization

To those in close touch with the industrial situation in this region, a strike in the steel industries was regarded as practically impossible. The power of the steel corporation was felt to be so great that the workers in the steel mills would encounter insurmountable difficulties in an attempt at organization. Even to radical thinkers, lack of response on the part of the steel workers and their inability to organize these workers had been so discouraging that the conclusion had been reached that steel workers would follow only in the train of general industrial upheaval. For this reason it is a matter of the utmost importance to trace the origin of the strike.

The present leaders of the strike had conducted a successful campaign of organization in the packing house industry of Chicago. This task was for many years considered impossible, but it was, nevertheless, crowned with success. Their success in this industry gained the interest of the international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The St. Paul Convention of the A. F. of L. decided to undertake the organization of the steel workers and outlined a vigorous campaign.

John Fitzpatrick and William Z. Foster, to whom is due most of the success of the packing house organization, were put in charge of the steel campaign. After considerable work in Gary, Indiana Harbor, and Bethlehem, where their work was uniformly successful, they came to Pittsburgh with a feeling that, although they were in the heart of the steel industry, their connection with the A. F. of L. would mitigate the hostilities of the steel officials.

Civil Liberty Dead

In their very first attempts at McKeesport, they discovered that the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech, press and assemblage had long been dead in Pennsylvania. They met with similar experiences in Homestead, Braddock, Rankin, Duquesne, Clairton and Monessen. In fact, wherever they went in the State of Pennsylvania, within what is known as the Pittsburgh district, they learned what many in this district had known for a long time, that it was not a case of preserving civil liberties, but of winning them for the first time. It may astound those who do not live in the Pittsburgh district to learn that, *for over a quarter of a century, not a single mass meeting of workers had been held in the borough of Homestead.* We have never enjoyed freedom of speech and assemblage in this district and even today in the city of Pittsburgh, when a meeting is held, in a hall, not to mention a street meet-

ing, we can never tell when the police will break in and order the meeting closed.

The Workers' Demands

The steel committee, despite the vigorous opposition of the steel company officials and the local authorities, proceeded to organize the workers, and, after numerous arrests, succeeded in holding meetings in McKeesport, Braddock, Homestead and Rankin, but found that in Duquesne gatherings were impossible.

The demands of the steel committee are anything but revolutionary, and are as modest as any demands ever made by them. The workers asked for recognition of the union, collective bargaining, an eight-hour work day, an increase of pay, the abolition of physical examinations and the check-off system. Explanation is needed of the last two mentioned. The men object to physical examination because it amounts to a Bertillon scheme on the part of the steel officials. It is used for the purpose of blacklisting any worker who has shown any disposition to oppose the steel owners.

The check-off is a method for collecting dues now in vogue in the United Mine Workers of America. It is a scheme whereby the operator or owner deducts from the pay of the worker the amount of dues he owes to the union, and these dues are paid by the owners and operators to the union. All the radicals in this district are opposed to the check-off system, because they believe that it inevitably leads to the control of the unions by the owners rather than by the men.

Certainly these demands, urged by men who work an eleven-hour day and a thirteen-hour night turn—the customary hours of the workers in most of the mills in the steel industry—are not too great! Every enlightened economist and sociologist and every fairly decent employer has agreed that the eight-hour day is a fair and reasonable day in any industry, and particularly in the steel industry, where the work is so arduous and monotonous, the demand for the eight-hour day is most justifiable.

The United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries, as well as the Independents, never even made an answer to these demands presented by the workers. Judge Gary has been requested time and again to grant a conference to the men in charge of the steel organization, and he refused every request made of him for such a conference. After numerous postponements, the strike was finally called for the 22nd day of September, 1919. The Russians, Hungarians, Croatians, Slovaks, Lithuanians, and Poles, and all other foreign nationalities, or rather, non-English speaking nationalities, responded to the call—this is not surprising as the vast majority of men employed in the steel industry are of the non-English-speaking nationalities.

Effect of the European Revolutions

The present condition of the revolutionary movement in Europe bears a direct relation to the amount of interest manifested in the strike by the foreigners in this country. The Russians and Hungarians have a clearer and better understanding of the issues involved, are more determined to see the thing through, and more ready to make sacrifices for the success of the strike, and are, in fact, in the position of leadership among the foreigners in the present strike. I have spoken with many of the men on strike and I learn from them that the Slovaks and Poles do not understand very clearly what the thing is all about and were it not for the fact that they relied upon the Russians and Hungarians and trusted to their understanding of the situation, they would by this time have gone back to work. Inasmuch as they respect them, however, both for their revolutionary fervor and for their superior knowledge, they are ready and willing to go along with them wherever they may lead.

Had the Russian Revolution not occurred in 1917, I feel that one could safely say that the present strike would not have been possible. For it must be remembered that the conditions prevailing in the steel industries are not worse than they were five or ten years ago and that all the efforts made

in the past, whether by the American Federation of Labor or by the Industrial Workers of the World, were unproductive.

Foreign Labor

This strike has caused great surprise and consternation among the steel officials. Since 1892, the policy of the steel corporation has been to import large numbers of foreigners from Russia, Austria-Hungary and Italy. The theory was that these people were interested only in the amount of money they could make and that as soon as they earned a sufficient amount, they would return to Europe. For a long time the corporation was entirely justified in this belief. However, certain events in Europe occurred which changed the whole outlook of the foreigners in this country.

A European peasant transplanted from Europe to America retained his traditional religious and nationalistic views and when he went back to Europe he could honestly say that he was only a transient in a foreign land. He had not assimilated anything American. When these traditions were destroyed and the religious beliefs of the peasants undermined, we find an entirely different people, a people amenable to new ideas and responsive to new appeals.

The State Police

It was to be expected from the very outset that a strike of such magnitude involving such fundamental issues would call on all of the forces which the steel corporations could possibly command. It is, therefore, not surprising that the Pennsylvania State police should be brought into this district. One must frankly admit that they have succeeded in striking terror into the hearts of many. They are, without a doubt, the most ruthless group of men ever collected in any State of the United States. They seem to possess no sense of human values, for they attack men, women and children indiscriminately. Their exploits of brutality and viciousness are so well known that when they are called into a strike district, the one question asked is, how far will they go?

The appeal that is used that they are necessary to preserve order is absurd. There are tens of thousands in the city of Pittsburgh proper, living in congested districts and the police authorities of the city of Pittsburgh have been able to handle the situation without any ruthlessness or brutality. They have not been compelled to resort to killing or shooting and they have maintained much better order within the city proper than has been maintained in the districts, where the state police are in control.

When these state police are not on strike duty they terrorize the coal miners. That seems to be their particular pleasure and we are going to have them with us as long as the coal mines and steel mills are privately owned, for after all is said and done, they are the special police of mine operators and the steel corporations.

The Union of Crafts

There is another phase of the steel crisis which merits some publicity. That is the form of organization, evolved to organize the steel workers. There are twenty-four International Unions affiliated with the A. F. of L. who have united for the purpose of organizing the steel workers. The men working in the steel mills are classified in the crafts to which they belong, and if there is no particular craft to which they can be placed, they are put into the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Plate Workers.

When the organization is perfected there will be a steel council, patterned after the Packing House Council, which will decide all questions arising in the steel industry. The superiority of the Federated plan, as this is called, over the old plan, is that all of the unions belonging to the steel council sign one agreement expiring simultaneously. However, the international unions control their members working in the steel mills and all agreements must be signed by the international unions.

This federation plan, given as a substitute plan for industrial unionism, is not satisfactory, for at the conference of the Steel

Workers held in Pittsburgh on May 25, 1919, the demand from every section of the country where the steel committee had done any organization work was for a universal transfer and industrial unionism, and I maintain that even should the steel committee at the present time succeed in winning this strike and organizing steel workers under the federation plan, it will take but a very short time when international difficulties develop, inciting a change of form closer to the industrial form.

The demands of the workers in the steel industry are anything but revolutionary. However, the *fact* of a strike in the steel industry is most revolutionary and the profound changes which may result from this steel strike may touch the heart of the whole American labor movement. If it is possible to arouse the steel workers, who have been characterized as apathetic, ignorant and satisfied with their filth and degradation, we may hope for big things in the United States of America.

Present Status of Socialism in America[1]

Harry W. Laidler

"Are Jack London and Upton Sinclair the chief Socialist leaders in the United States?" "Is it true that all American Socialists are millionaires?" "Is Samuel Gompers a Socialist?" were a few of the questions hurled at me by a group of brilliant young guild socialists in England on the eve of the European war.

What ignorance of the present status of socialism in the United States!, I exclaimed to myself. And yet, if these keen young Englishmen had asked a large proportion of the American people the same questions, I doubt if the answers would have been forthcoming with perfect assurance.

On the other hand, these and many other questions concerning the socialist movement in America even the socialist novice in this country would at that time have had little difficulty in answering. For, prior to the war, although genuine divisions existed in the Socialist Party, these divisions were few and easily definable. Socialist leaders were readily distinguished; socialist history was easy to unfold. That history—the history of the socialist fight against "American individualism," against "American plutocracy"—had been a unique one. It dated back to the period before the Civil War when small groups of immigrants gathered together in industrial centers in America and talked of plans whereby the native born American worker could be reached with the Marxian message. The ranks of these socialists were thinned out during the fight against slavery.

The Days of the S. L. P.

Slowly the movement revived again. It took many forms, and, finally, in 1877, emerged into the Socialist Labor Party. This party flourished after a fashion, and, in 1898, reached its zenith with a vote of over 80,000. Friction soon began to develop between the trade union movement and Daniel De Leon and other members of the S. L. P. In 1898, the American Federation of Labor took a definite stand against the discussion of political and economic problems in the union meetings. De Leon declared the winning over of the "corrupt" unions an impossibility, and sprung on a surprised party the idea of a rival labor organization, an industrial as contrasted with a craft union—the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. A bitter struggle ensued between socialists and trade unionists, a struggle which aroused acrimony that time has not as yet completely erased. The Alliance failed to prosper. Heresy hunting within the party became the chief sport.

Birth of the Socialist Party

Hillquit and other active members resigned or were forced out, and formed the Rochester

[1] First of two articles on American Socialism.

branch of the S. L. P. Soon this branch joined hands with western groups led by Victor L. Berger and Seymour Stedman of the Social Democratic Party and by the eloquent and uncompromising Debs of American Railway Union fame, then in the height of his powers. Debs and Harriman were nominated for president and vice-president. The campaign of 1900 was vigorously fought and 100,000 votes were recorded for the Socialist Party. This was succeeded by the Unity Convention in Indianapolis, at which the party was officially born.

The next few years were years of effective organization, and, by 1904, the vote had jumped four fold to 400,000. In 1908, Bryan, the "candidate of the common people," proved too much of a temptation for many whose sympathies were with socialism, and, despite the "Red Special" and big plans, the vote stood still. Another four years passed by. Debs was the presidential choice for the fourth time. It was the year of the birth of the "Bull Moose" party, with their evangelical songs, their shouts of Armageddon, their cry of "social justice" and the "square deal." The vote of the party took another leap forward, totalling 900,000,—some 5.9 per cent. of the total popular vote as compared with 0.6 per cent. in 1900. The party membership in that year reached a high water mark of 118,000.

Direct Action

But though, to all outward appearances, the party was working most harmoniously, within it was being rent asunder. For some years a faction had been developing in the party which declared that the movement should lay chief emphasis on industrial activity, on direct action, and which characterized the party machine as "yellow" and "opportunistic." A battle royal between the "possibilists" and the "impossibilists," "the yellows" and "the reds," the "direct actionists" and the "political actionists," as they were variously called, took place in the 1912 convention. The parliamentarians won out, and the famous article six was thrust into the Socialist Party constitution, providing for the expulsion of advocates of sabotage, violence or other forms of crime. Heresy hunting began again. Whole locals were suspended. The membership fell off, and two years later registered but slightly more than 98,000.

The European War

Then came the European War. For many years socialists had been in the habit of prophesying that a world war was impossible. For in every European country the socialist party was strong, and everywhere the comrades would place their entire strength against war.

The socialists had not stopped the war, although they fought against it prior to its outbreak. After war was proclaimed, in most instances, they joined the colors of their respective nations. Socialists who imagined that every European socialist group had pledged itself to oppose—after the declaration of war—every international conflict, and those particularly who had placed their faith in the German socialists, were heart sick. This attitude was reflected in the resulting apathy within the Socialist Party. This apathy was augmented by the problem of the unemployed.

Benson vs. Wilson

The campaign of 1916 came around. The Republicans were regarded as aggressively militaristic, and as representative of the imperialistic forces of the country. President Wilson "had kept us out of war." He was not militantly in favor of a large preparedness plan. His recent eight-hour decision had gained him the approval of many railroad workers. He had smiled upon certain labor measures urged by President Gompers and the A. F. of L.

The socialists were unable to point to recent socialist achievement abroad. Debs refused because of health and other considerations to run a fifth time for president. The party felt too poor to hold a national convention. The members nominated Allan L. Benson for president, by referendum vote,

largely on account of his sledge hammer anti-militarist articles in the socialist press. Benson had no personal following. He had little knowledge of the machinery of the Socialist Party. He had little ability as a campaigner—though proving an excellent pamphleteer. He concentrated most of his energy on anti-militarism, giving but scant attention to the general economic question. The socialist vote decreased by some 300,000, totalling only 590,294, or but 3.2 per cent. of the total vote.

The St. Louis Platform

Then came America's participation in the war. As the war clouds lowered, the Socialist Party called an Emergency Convention, to be held in St. Louis in early April. The date for the war proclamation was advanced. Socialists found, when they met, that war had already been declared. They had been affirming for three years in their every meeting that, if war broke out in America, they would not be wanting, as were the Majority socialists of Germany. In the spirit of Liebknecht, they drafted the now famous St. Louis platform, proclaiming their opposition to war.

The adoption of this platform was followed by the resignation of a number of prominent writers from the movement, and the organization by them of a Social Democratic League which reached a membership of somewhat over a thousand. Other members became inactive. On the other hand, the ranks were partly filled up, particularly in the larger cities, by a number who were attracted by the party's anti-militarist pronouncements.

This influx was particularly noteworthy in the municipal campaigns of the fall of 1917. In New York, Hillquit, for mayor, obtained a vote of approximately 150,000, and the vote in many other cities jumped 400 per cent. The party membership, however, remained approximately the same as in 1915—about 80,000.

Persecutions

The year following witnessed unprecedented attempts at suppression. As the Executive Committee of the Party declared:

"Within a year after adopting the St. Louis program hundreds of comrades were arrested and an era of persecution set in. 'Patriotic' associations organized a white terror in many parts of the country. Locals and branches were destroyed, party members were boycotted, and in some states they were victims of mobs. Our press was largely destroyed, and the few publications that survived were deprived of their mailing privileges. Government spies dogged the heels of party members, and in some of the larger cities our headquarters were raided by government officials. Some were sacked by mobs."

Eugene V. Debs was sentenced to ten years imprisonment, Victor L. Berger, Adolph Germer, the National Executive Secretary, Louis Engdahl, editor of the party paper, William Kruse, secretary of the Young People's Socialist League, and Irwin Tucker received twenty-year sentences, while "some 2,000 socialists in all were arrested because of their opinions."

Revolt Against Party Officials

With the signing of the armistice, the membership of the party began again to mount upward. The influx came to a considerable extent from the Russian and other language federations of the party, and from certain radical groups who found it difficult to function in more revolutionary organizations. With this influx, ever stronger became the revolt against those in control of the party machinery.

The revolters had many points in their indictment. The party, they claimed, had been too inactive. It had given but lip service to the St. Louis Platform. When in office, many party officials compromised, failed to use their office merely for the purpose of agitating for the revolution, and were lost in a maze of reform measures. The party had not severed its connection with the Second International. It had not joined with the Third International at Moscow and it was failing to adjust its tactics to the new revolutionary temper of the people. Party officials were characterized as the "Scheidemanns," the "Noskes" of the American movement.

In reply to these charges, the "old guard" declared that the American Socialist Party had remained one of the left wing parties of the world; that it had stood—as did few other parties—uncompromisingly against the war; that its "Scheidemann" officials had been given long jail sentences, while many of the left-wing comrades had kept silent or had been supporters of the war; that the party had not sent its representative to the second International and that it had consistently supported the Russian revolutionary movement. If the party had been inactive, that inactivity, the officials contended, had not been the result of unwillingness to serve the cause of the worker, but of governmental suppression, of the absorption of the party officials in court proceedings, of war hysteria on the part of the average American, of the general weakness of the advanced movement in America during war time.

Formation of the "Left Wing"

The protestants, early in 1919, began to form themselves into a separate Left Wing Section. This section maintained its own press, its own organizers, its own dues system, issued its own white cards, and held separate caucus meetings for the purpose of capturing the party. It indorsed a manifesto similar to that of the Moscow International and required the adherence of all of its members to this platform. It flooded the party with new members. It captured numerous branches and voted the money of those branches for the printing of its literature and the conducting of Left Wing propaganda, forcing the "old guard" to a position of inactivity. It made every effort to capture the control of the national machinery by electing its candidates to the national executive committee. It concentrated on the election of a certain few and voted usually as a unit.

Rumors of election irregularities on the part of the Left Wing became widespread. The national executive committee met in late May and decided that the executive secretary ask for the ballots cast by the language federations and that the elections be decided by the Emergency Convention called for August 30, 1919. After a hearing, the committee suspended seven out of the twelve language federations—the Russian, Ukrainian, South Slavic, Lithuanian, Lettish, Hungarian and Polish—some 25,000 to 30,000 members. The way was left open for the federations to plead their cause and ask for reinstatement at the Emergency Convention.

The committee, in suspending the federations, brought three main charges against them: (1) that they had threatened to place obstacles in the way of the proposed amnesty convention if it were not abandoned, and, in so doing, had assumed power to reverse the decisions of the national executive committee; (2) that they had conducted a systematic campaign against the party in the press of the federations, with the ultimate aim of destroying the S. P.; (3) that, by joining the Left Wing Section, they had violated that section of the constitution which forbids "fusing, combining, or compromising with any political party or organization."

The national executive also voted to expel three state organizations—Michigan, Massachusetts and Ohio. The charge against Michigan was that it had voted in violation of the party platform to expel any member or branch "advocating legislative reforms, or supporting organizations formed for the purpose of advocating such reforms." In Massachusetts, the party had voted to strike out the clause in its constitution approving political action. It had also made the suspended language federations an integral part of the state organization. The Ohio organization had affiliated itself with the Left Wing, had united the suspended language federations with the state organization and had resolved to keep the proceeds of the sale of convention stamps for the time being in the state treasury.

Battle over the Communist Party

The Left Wing group continued their activity. They held a national convention in New York from June 21 to 24. This con-

vention was divided into three divergent groups. On the extreme left of the Left Wing were to be found the Russian federations who demanded the immediate organization of the Communist Party. On the extreme right was the Michigan group, who laid much emphasis on parliamentary action, on education and on a proletarian dictatorship of a majority, rather than of the advanced minority of the workers, and who agreed with the Left Wing chiefly in its desire to eliminate immediate demands from socialist platforms. With the federations, the Michigan members also favored the immediate organization of a Communist Party.

In the center was still another group led by Fraina, John Reed, Ludwig Lore, James Larkin and others who, in general, felt that a Communist Party must eventually be organized, but who wished to continue their fight for a Left Wing program *within* the Socialist Party until the Emergency Convention. If, at the convention, all Left Wing delegates were not seated and all suspended or expelled groups were not reinstated, this third group agreed immediately to bolt and, on September 1, to form a Communist Party. But few of this group felt that the granting of their demands was within the range of possibility. Many openly stated that, even though all demands were granted, they would, in any case, form a Communist Party. But by working within the Socialist Party until September, they would be able more effectively to pry away the "revolutionary rank and file from their conservative leadership."

The center, by a vote of 55 to 88, forced through their proposal to postpone the formation of the Communist Party until September. The Michigan group and the federations—the greatest part of the membership—immediately bolted the Left Wing Conference. Thirty-one of the bolting delegates joined together and soon thereafter formed a Communist Party—an "unholy alliance," the critics called it, between the communist and reactionary elements. This temporary alliance the Russians defended on the ground that some such action had to be taken to induce the Left Wing Council to give up their attempt to capture the old party and immediately to join the new organization.

The "New Executive"

Another meeting in the early summer was that of the alleged new executive committee. The Left Wing candidates for executive committee declared that the action of the old committee in holding up the election decision until the Emergency Convention was illegal. They wrote to the various state secretaries, tabulated the results of the election, declared that Left Wingers had won the election, and called together the "new executive committee." The Left Wingers included in this group met in Cleveland, reinstated the suspended groups, began the sale of stamps for "the real Socialist Party convention" in Chicago, and elected Wagenknecht executive secretary. These members likewise decided to continue their fight within the organization. Thus a few months after the organization of the Left Wing movement, the interesting spectacle was seen of three national secretaries—one elected by the Left Wing Convention, one by the Communist Party, and one by the "new executive committee."

The Russian-Michigan group with its substantial membership did not cease their labors with mere organization. They hurled their shafts of ridicule at the centrist elements who thought that anything good could be accomplished by continuing their allegiance with the Socialist Party. Their argument—and, what was more important, their membership—carried weight, and soon Louis Fraina, editor of the *Revolutionary Age*, I. E. Ferguson and others of the Left Wing Council "violated the mandates of the June Conference," rushed for shelter to the bosom of the Russian federations, and began to cry aloud for the support of the Communist Party.

The second article describing the three conventions will appear in the January number of *The Socialist Review.*

The Boston Police Strike

W. Harris Crook

Nine lives lost and about $200,000 of damage to glass and property in Boston city is but part of the price paid by the authorities for refusing to allow the police to affiliate their union with the A. F. of L. Perhaps the most lasting effect is the wreck of the long and well-trained police force and the conversion of thousands of erstwhile easy going labor men into hot rebels against the injustice done the patrolmen by the Governor, the Police Commissioner and the Boston press.

Members of the Boston fire, water and treasury departments for many months have been affiliated with the A. F. of L., but the police were not eligible until the A. F. of L. summer conference amended its constitution. Thereupon some nine hundred patrolmen promptly applied for a charter under the new A. F. of L. ruling and not for thirteen days afterwards did Police Commissioner Curtis lay down his new Police Rule No. 35, forbidding police membership in any organization that would affiliate with any group save the American Legion, the G. A. R. or the Spanish War Veterans.

Conditions of Police Service

This June the Mayor of Boston had granted considerable increases in wage to the police, and yet, even at the time of the strike, the patrolmen were receiving $1,100 for their first year, up to $1,600 for their sixth year of service, for which salary they were expected to render actual active duty of 73 hours on the night shift, with ten hours in addition of station duty, or *eighty-three hours in all!* These were the regular duty hours. For every unusual event, parades, elections, or holidays they had to work overtime for no extra pay or reward. Night shift men were expected in addition to this "stint" to sleep part of the time in the stations. Beds were used by two, three or even four patrolmen in the same twenty-four hours, and in one station there was one bathtub and toilet for 115 men.

Boston city is peculiarly situated in that its police force, while *paid* by the city, is absolutely controlled by the State, the Police Commissioner being the nominee of the Governor and responsible only to him. Moreover, the city and the police force are both largely Democratic in politics, whereas the State and its officials are predominently Republican. There is no question that politics has largely entered into the whole dispute, this being an election year for the Governorship.

On August 20 the police union members balloted for their officers. Three hours after the polls closed several of those elected candidates were charged with disobedience to the Police Rules . . . specifically Rule 35. On September 8 these 19 leading patrolmen were judged guilty by the Commissioner and suspended from the force. In the interim the Mayor had appointed a citizen committee of 34, who attempted for over a week to find common ground for a compromise between the police and the Commissioner. Neither Commissioner nor Governor would heed these suggestions, though they had the editorial support of the local press at the time.

The Strike

Precisely at 5.45 P.M. on Tuesday, September 9, the 1,114 union patrolmen reported at their stations and delivered up their weapons and insignia, and forthwith went out on strike, adjourning to the hall of the Carmen's Union for a meeting. The Police Commissioner had been quite definitely forewarned that suspension of the 19 leaders would be followed by a "walk-out" of the union members, and had ostensibly been taking precautions for a temporary force to protect the city during a strike. As a croix-de-guerre patrolman declared "I didn't want to strike. . . . I went out because they (the 19 men) were no more guilty than I was and I wouldn't be yellow enough to leave them to be the goats for all of us."

For twenty-four hours chaos reigned, starting with perfectly harmless hoodlumism by young boys, and constantly growing in seriousness as the authorities made no effort to check the trouble at the start. Over 400 "loyal" patrolmen and the 96 police officers, with some 500 volunteers and the metropolitan park police were at the instant disposal of the Commissioner, not to speak of the State Guard. The 19 police stations could have had at least 20 "loyal" men apiece, and any incipient riot could have been stopped by prompt action, before the real criminals took courage from the boy hoodlums. Before the strike Mayor Peters had suggested to the Commissioner that he call out the State Guard, for the Mayor himself has no power to call it until after riot has occurred. For twenty-four hours neither Commissioner nor Governor took action. Finally on Wednesday afternoon, September 10, the Mayor of Boston called for the State Guard and it was not until order had been restored that the Governor, with an Ole Hanson flourish, "took over" the command of the police force and the State Guard.

Samuel Gompers' plan for settlement—reinstatement of the strikers and suspension of Rule 35 till the President's Industrial Conference had met on October 6, was rejected by the Commissioner, and both he and the Governor stand pat in their assertion that the police act was "desertion in the face of the enemy" and refuse reinstatement under any circumstances.

Labor Supports the Strikers

Though no general strike such as was feared by the Chamber of Commerce took place, organized labor has assisted the strikers with funds, and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers have declared their intention of making no uniforms for any "strike breaker." An East Boston post of the American Legion, with 700 members present, resolved that the patrolmen should be immediately reinstated, and requested all war veterans to refrain from taking their places!

The Republican Publicity Association declared on September 21 that, if the police win, the country will be "Russianized" and class rule be substituted for the people's rule. Judging by even liberal opinion (as witness *The New Republic*) the majority of the middle class still believes there is a neutral fence upon which to sit, a fence propped up by a police force whose regulations forbid affiliation with labor. Frank conservatives like Governor Coolidge of Massachusetts see clearer. He has declared in more than one way that "there is no middle ground."

It is surely time for every thinking citizen to make up his mind today on which side he stands: with or against the workers. In the meanwhile many American city authorities have hastily come to the conclusion that their own police forces and city employees have, up till now, been grievously underpaid. Such would appear to be one of the effects of the Boston police "desertion"!

The police strike, greatly magnified into a national "law and order" issue, was injected into the Governorship election in Massachusetts on November 4th with the result that the Republicans or "law and order" party were given an overwhelming majority of over 124,000 votes. This result demonstrates how impossible it is for labor's case to be placed fairly before the public when entangled in the political elections of the two old-line parties, and when the press of the whole district is so plainly influenced by tremendous upper and middle-class enmity toward organized labor. This was preëminently the case in Massachusetts. At the time of the election some 800 new police patrolmen had been accepted into the force, and the Governor, newly elected, had become adamant in his refusal to reinstate even the older men among the strikers, though they face starvation and almost certain continued unemployment.

The whole affair has torn away the veil that hitherto had partially concealed the intensely embittered and frequently ignorant class feeling on the part of the middle, the professional and the upper classes of the Bay State.

Seeking a New Way

By Gregory Zilboorg

No word nowadays is so hazy and ill-defined as the word *Socialism.* Twenty years ago the term, as applied to an ultimate social order, seemed adequate enough. Today, however, we are witnessing a new turn of history and friends and enemies alike must acknowledge the fact that social evolution is being replaced by a process of social revolution. The British struggle for nationalization of the mines, the American Plumb plan, the mortal combat in Italy and France against the profiteers, and the Russian communistic wave are only different phases of the same social process. It is strange to note that, at present, in such a vital situation, those who formerly marched under the banner of Socialism are increasingly separated, their organizations split asunder. The question is continually recurring—who is right, who sees the solution most clearly—the I. W. W. with its *direct action,* Lenin with his *permanent revolution,* Scheidemann and Noske with their *gradual development,* or Henderson with his *constitutionalism?*

Evidently we are now witnessing the last phase of the disintegration and collapse of the old socialist movement. The proof of this is the theoretical existence of two Internationals and the practical absence of *both.* Why? Only one answer, it seems to me, is possible—the old socialist movement was based on a false or, at least, on a defective principle—on a mechanistic class organization. From the point of view of methods and tactics, we occupied the same position as the mediæval monks. We tried to read and understand Karl Marx in the same manner as the mediæval scholars read Aristotle and Plato. Therefore, when war or revolution came on the horizon, the representatives of socialist thought began to refer to Marx and Engels as their chief authorities, and the spectacle was seen of George Plekhanov and Albert Thomas declaring that, were Marx alive, he would have adopted the same course as they adhered to, while Lenin and Liebknecht were certain that only they had the correct knowledge of the ideas of our Aristotle of the nineteenth century. We failed to realize that, great as was Marx's intuition and social method, it was but a phenomenon of a particular period, and that, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a genius is possible, but not a prophet. The bankruptcy of our practical socialism is due to the fact that, since Marx and Engels, we tried to *interpret* Marx rather than to seek new forms, and since Lassalle, we endeavored to imitate the organization he began rather than to seek to make that organization more perfect. Therefore we are now at a very serious impasse: socialism is going through its first test of practical life, and it is not at all clear in which direction we should advance. Some time ago Emile Vandervelde published his book, "The State and Socialism." According to him, Socialism does not mean stateism. It is opposed to any kind of centralization. On the other hand, we are witnessing a gigantic attempt to form an overcentralized socialist state, as is the case with Russia. Both ideas are of recent origin. We are now in a period of impulsive achievements, of spontaneous undertakings, and have thus to deal not with an experience which was theoretically analyzed and prepared beforehand, but with a casual application of the existing social forces to the ever changing conditions of a tired humanity. It is evident that such a method and tactics may occasionally bring us to something better, at times to something worse, and, at times, to nothing at all. Social intuition is a valuable thing, social instinct is a significant factor, but, without guidance, leadership and plan, they are only bare psychological facts and nothing more. The advocates of the Moscow International, as representatives of our impulsive socialism, will brand their opponents with the label "bourgeois." Those of the Berne International are denouncing Moscow and calling us to an abstract unity with old methods and old tac-

tics. This latter group is decreasing in number—that is an indisputable fact; the first, although increasing in number, is decreasing in leadership, in scientific foundation, and in creative initiative. We are likely to face a revolution of a fatal character within the socialist movement itself, and if we wish to understand our task, we must first of all analyze this revolution. A revolution, like a war, is not a creative process; it is a destructive blow which throws over the old gods. Which of our old gods have fallen?

(1) *The Mechanistic Organizations.* One of the mistakes of the socialist movement was that it overemphasized class organization as such, with the result that the outbreak of the war put an end to the validity of the organization. The partisans of realistic and idealistic historical conceptions, such as the Russian non-Marxian ideologists, were right in their appeal to the creation of moral values and to the appreciation of labor not only as an economic factor, but also as an ethical value.

(2) *The almost religious cultivation of another mechanistic principle: the principle of majority and parliamentary forms.* It is now, I think, impossible to deny the fact, that, throughout the world, that principle of majority parliamentary representation is violated and the faith in it is lost. The establishment of the Soviet system in Russia is the best illustration of this fact, as is the absolutism affected in France and England despite their parliaments. Ramsay Macdonald, some months ago, in *The Nation,* asserted that the proletariat of England is more and more losing its faith in parliamentarism. This statement is especially significant, because British labor was and is noted for its constitutionalism and traditionalism.

(3) *The materialistic class conception, the overemphasizing of the historical value of the industrial producer, as a bearer of the future values.* Since Marx's discovery of the proletarian, many other social categories have come into being and have acquired a serious significance in our life. Where and how are we to classify nurses, physicians, and advanced intellectuals? During the Russian revolution that problem was not solved; society could not be developed and normally conducted by the industrial producer alone. Psychologically the too narrow conception of producers has developed a kind of a class egotism. And wherever the egoistic element appears, we begin to observe a weakening of solidarity. It is remarkable that after almost seventy-five years in the development of the socialist movement, which seemed to be a new religion of solidarity, we are witnessing a lack of community spirit, we are disunited, while in theory our aims are one.

The orthodox Marxian, and the radical communist find an answer to the problems of the day in a very primitive way. They follow the old formulæ; the first, by awaiting the day that "has to come"; the latter, by making a world revolution.

But from a realistic standpoint both are wrong, because neither the historic (even socialist) fatalism, nor the voluntary molding of history in voluntary forms is possible.

The growth of guild socialism during the last few years is perhaps due to the fact that the syndicalist idea is based on the conception of solidarity rather than of organization. Organization, rights, are to be a result of solidarity and duty, and not an end in themselves. Karl Marx was formally right when he said in 1878 that "a proletarian has no fatherland," but he would be right substantially had he said, "a proletarian is a citizen of all the fatherlands." He was correct in proclaiming "the right of all to leisure," but he would be equally correct proclaiming, "the obligation of all to work." There is more than a philosophic difference in phraseology, there is a difference in the main ethical conception on which two generations were educated, just those generations which have to complete the terribly difficult task of our time.

Résumé of chapter from forthcoming book entitled "The Passing of the Old Order in Europe" published by Scott & Seltzer.

Freedom in the Workshop

Felix Grendon

Socialism brought into the field of politics the new idea that government must consider human beings not merely as consumers or men in the street, but also as producers or workers on the job. Syndicalists have taken the hint and gone the Socialists one better. They have pointed out that men are producers first and consumers second. So enamored are syndicalists of this discovery, which was always implicit in socialism, that they now assert that it is only as producers that men and women need to be organized at all. They have turned an incurable blind spot on the consumer. In carrying their pet theory to extreme lengths, they are like the Christian Scientists who, finding out that there is no such thing as matter apart from spirit, conclude that spirit is the only reality and that matter is simply delusion of the mind which a puff of faith can blow away like thistledown. Similarly, the syndicalist sees nothing in man but a producer; he looks on the consumer as a figment of Adam Smith and other false prophets of capitalist economics.

Contrast with this naïve view the teachings of the Soviet leaders and the British Guildsmen. The Soviets are applying syndicalism in one way to Russian conditions and the Guildsmen are proposing to apply syndicalism in another way to English conditions. Soviet and Guild alike aim at a society which is at once a community of makers and a community of users, which satisfies both the needs of man as a consumer and his requirements as a producer, although, with an eye to the speedy abolition of industrial slavery, the accent is on the producer.

A study of the additions to political theory made by the Soviet, the Guild, or the Socialist proposals, calls attention to two developments which appear in the working out of all three types of State. One of these developments is a radical change in our conception of individual liberty. The other is a radical change in our attitude towards work.

The Political Freeman

Under capitalism, the classic formula of the freeman has been his inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Nothing is said, observe, of his alienable right to employment and a decent livelihood. Now what does this formula come to, in practice, for the average factory hand, trade union man, or lesser salaried employee? It comes to this. He may elect what Congressman he chooses—provided the Tammany gang or the Albany gang do not stack the returns. He may think what he likes, provided no Secret Service man divines his thoughts or discovers his name in a Rand School file; he may say what he believes in the public forum, provided he is game for a raid from the patriots of the Union League Club; and, above all, he may eat, drink, be merry, and die, provided his wages can stand the strain.

As tradition has it, liberty is conceived as a state in which a man exists during those hours of the day when he is merely a citizen, when he is at leisure, when he is not working for his living, when he is a consumer of food, clothes, amusement, or transit. Government, apart from safeguarding the industrial interests of the employing class, serves or professes to serve the vast majority of men chiefly in their relations *outside* the workshop. Our political campaigns show this emphasis on the consumer in their appeals to the full dinner pail, prosperity, free trade, and similar issues. It is illustrated again in our American hero-worship of the business man, that is, the man who distributes goods or provides for the needs of the consumer. No longer is the feudal gentleman the glass of fashion and the mold of form; that place has been vacated in favor of the bank president or corporation director. And the robber baron with a petty *provincial* jurisdiction has completely yielded to the financial captain with *international* scope and powers as the hero of our standard books and plays.

It is the consumer, then, whom government has hitherto professed to serve. It is the man in the street whom our Belascos of politics regularly feature as the star of that great romantic melodrama: "The land of the free and the home of the brave."

The Workshop Slave

But how many hours a day does the ordinary consumer enjoy his vaunted freedom? Well, say a man's working time is eight hours, and his sleeping time eight hours, and allot three hours to the time spent in going to and from business and in getting over the fatigue of work and the horrors of our rapid transit system—that foots up to nineteen hours and leaves five hours of leisure out of the twenty-four. During five of his sixteen waking hours he may be said to be a citizen-consumer and nothing else. These are his five hours of freedom, the five precious hours during which he may gaze with rapture on the statue of liberty enlightening Ireland, Shantung, and Kolchak's dominion. Or, he may revel with fierce pride in the one right which the Espionage Act leaves undisputed to an American freeman: the right to crack open a Socialist skull or a Socialist safe if he doesn't like the looks of it. Even this solitary right may be made too much of, however, and our freeman may become like the woman who was taking her boy to the hospital with his head jammed into a saucepan. In the car, on the way, the passengers sympathized with her obvious distress. "You see," she said with tearful apology, "it's me only saucepan!" The obvious moral is that over-attachment to a single right, no less than to a single saucepan, may cost us dear.

Still, it cannot be denied that the citizen, as consumer, has at least theoretical rights and liberties. Until the Constitution expires in Burleson's dead letter office, he certainly has the right to protest against the activity of the food poisoners and the extortion of the profiteers. He may even, if he dare to presume so far, ask American mine owners the question Bob Smillie recently asked the English mine owners: "Who gave you the perpetual ownership of these billion dollar mines?" And if he is met with the answer returned by one English Duke, namely, that the mines were the gift of the Deity, he may reply as Voltaire did to the priest who pushed his way into the bedroom where the great author lay ill. Asked from whom he came, the priest answered: "From God." "Then show your credentials!" said Voltaire curtly. The citizen as consumer may take Voltaire's tack and say these malapert things. During his four or five hours of leisure this, theoretically at least, is his right.

But during his seven or eight hours of work as a producer, he is unencumbered even with these theoretical rights. Whilst he is selling his labor power he is, or has been, almost as completely divorced from any of the liberties associated with republican freedom as a mule in a transport or a private in the army.

For example, suppose that a worker does not like the ventilation of his workshop, or desires better washroom facilities, or wishes a slight rearrangement of his hours, or prefers his vacation in January instead of in June, or resents injustices in the system of promotion, or hits on an economy benefiting his fellow workers rather than his employer, or dislikes the hectoring powers of the foreman, or questions the infallibility of the manager—we know that there is nothing in his charter of liberties to deter him from giving voice to these objections, dislikes, resentments, and questions. But we also know that if he should put these liberties to the test, the action would entitle him to the instant liberty of leaving the establishment.

The question then comes up: can you exercise a man in the treadmill of a slave in his eight hours of working vigor daily and expect him to act like a spirited freeman in the four or five hours of his leisure? The answer is that this will be possible when a first class training in burglary is a man's best preparation for an honest calling. And the masters know this perfectly. They know that when you have kept a bank teller in a cage for many hours daily throughout many years, you will produce a creature who is a con-

firmed slave in the cage and an unrivalled slave-driver out of it. They expect, these masters do, that a citizen will be just as coy, certain, and soft to rule in his few hours of ease as habit has made him in his many hours of work. And their expectations are met up to the hilt. The man who has passed through a long course of being deceived, robbed, browbeaten, and soft-soaped in the workshop, why wouldn't he let himself be lied to by his newspapers, cheated by his merchants, bullied by his tradesmen, demoralized by his amusement procurers, and tricked by his politicians to their heart's content? An apprenticeship in slavery during the better part of each day does *not* equip a man for the creative enterprise of freedom during the remaining part.

In short, liberty in the works is the indispensable condition of liberty in the community outside the works. This is the reality with which the British Guildsmen and the most ambitious British Labor people are now at grips. It is the problem that the Russian Soviets must solve if they are to endure. But before we look into this question of liberty in work a little more closely, let us glance a moment at the question of the worker's attitude towards work.

Happy Work vs. a Wretched "Good Time"

"In a broad sense," said the sculptor Rodin, "an artist is one who finds joy in what he does. In the broadest sense," he added, "there is a little of the artist in everyone." This definition faces the possibility of joyous creative work for everybody. But what a hollow mockery this possibility becomes when we think of the working conditions of the vast majority of mankind. We are told that, in the middle ages, handicraftsmen everywhere *did* find happiness in their work. If so, between these medieval craftsmen and the modern American freemen there is a great gulf fixed. For in the Twentieth Century the almost universal feeling towards work of nearly every description is one of unrelieved loathing.

A prime reason for this loathing is, of course, the complete absence of self-determination in the workshop, the reduction of the worker to the slavery of a voiceless, soulless labor commodity. There are other reasons. The staggering disproportion between the wages of the worker and the dividends of the profiteer, the nerve-racking discomforts of travel to and from the workshop or office, the slave-driving, sweating, and petty overseering —all these conditions make work an odious repression of the creative faculties instead of a glorious expansion of them.

Two consequences stand out. One is the cult of having a good time. The ritual of pleasure-seeking is indefatigably practised as a relief from the depression of work-time slavery. Nothing is more heartrending than this by-product of our competitive anarchy. People get more strenuously wretched over having a good time than over the hardest kind of work; indeed, when we watch them in that supreme purgatory of pleasure, Coney Island, we feel that the pleasures of people are sometimes a startling index to their miseries.

Besides the cult of pleasure there is another consequence and that is the cult of bad workmanship. The practice of sabotage in its more insidious forms, such as "soldiering" or loafing on the job, has become well nigh universal. Such is the demoralizing effect of the slave-system in the workshop, the office, and the schoolroom, that "an unfair day's work for an unfair day's pay" is now virtually a national slogan. Good workmanship has become a myth.

Now this is a serious state of affairs for a civilization like ours. A society which depends on an intricate series of subtle and delicate adjustments can be dislocated with ease. It does not require a General Strike to do the trick. A chronically inefficient postal department, or a telephone service that usually leaves the subscriber unheard, unhonored, and unstrung, will go far towards precipitating the catastrophe. The fact is, our social system of infinitely complicated machinery run by aggressively reluctant workers is like a gigantic mammal with an impoverished blood supply. Unless our workers suffer a change of heart in the mat-

ter of workmanship, that is, unless they are given cause to change their policy, the system will collapse from sheer anemia.

A Change of Shirt

Observe, unless our workers are given cause to change their policy. But, as Bismarck said, to get a change of policy you must have a new policy, just as to get a change of shirt you must have a new shirt.

Well, the Labor people *have* a new policy in the offing, and that is their proposal to relieve the employers of the nation's industries and run these industries themselves. But, say the present incumbents to the workers of the country, you are not fit to manage the industries; even your Russian comrades cannot do so without the aid of their former masters. Your workmanship is rotten, your capacity for self-control feeble, and your experience in creative direction nil. And this criticism is not unjust, though it comes with a poor grace from the very masters who have unscrupulously kept their workmen in chains and whose own bad workmanship, incapacity, and misdirection have brought the social fabric to its present deplorable pass.

However, the fact remains that there is nothing in the transfer of Industrial Ownership to the workers which, *of itself,* will bring about the redemption of society. "The right of rebellion," said John Stuart Mill, "is the right to establish a higher rule, not merely another rule of the same grade." But what grounds have we for assuming that the rank and file of the workers are equipped to establish this higher rule? It must be remembered that at the beginning of the twentieth century the largest extension of democracy in politics is completely under the thumb of the most tyrannous boss rule on record. If political democracy is compatible with boss rule at the top, *industrial* democracy is compatible with boss rule at the top. If the management of our industries were thrown into the hands of organized labor tomorrow, the boss rule of the Gompers gang would put us all under a groaning tyranny that might give points to the boss rule of the Tammany gang. In Soviet Russia at the present time there is a cast iron Boss rule, and, in the midst of it, some of the worst profiteers are, from reliable reports, playing merry rings around the provincial and urban Soviets.

Wanted: A New Cradle of Liberty

What is the way out? It lies, if anywhere, in the strengthening of an impulse that bids fair to revolutionize British Industry and that is arresting the thoughts of wide-awake people throughout the world—and that is the impulse towards local self-government in business, in the professions, and in the industries. Local industrial government means that a society must be built from the bottom up, not from the top down. It means that democracy begins in the workshop below, not in some national Central Executive Committee above. It means that questions of rest, shop hygiene, recreation, vacation, promotion, time-book arrangements, discipline, benevolent work, and the like—in so far as they affect a local workshop, school, hospital, or factory—shall be met with decisions of the actual working members of the unit involved, not with decisions imposed on the unit by a superior machine of governors. It means, in brief, that liberty in the workshop is the indispensable first step towards liberty in the community.

Local government in industry is by no means entirely in the stage of theory. Shop stewards in the machinists trades in England represented this movement even before 1914. The exigencies of the war caused further British experiments. There were formed shop steward committees charged chiefly with wages and trade union policies; also works committees dealing with many points of self-government. And everyone has heard of the Whitley joint committees and councils in which an astonishing number of matters once the exclusive prerogative of the management are now handled jointly by masters and men.

All this shows the new revolutionary impulse alive. These joint councils do not, of course, give the employees *full* independence,

as the most mettlesome of the Labor leaders know quite well. They provide the kind of freedom Americans give the Filipinos, the kind the British give the people of India. They give employees the kind of liberty exercised by the man who was thrown out of an inn window and who, when he had picked himself up from the dirt, shook his fist at the triumphant landlord and said: "I won't sleep in your inn another night." Nevertheless, industrial liberty is at least in its infancy in England. Here it is still in the period of gestation.

One of the richest absurdities of the prevailing system is the contrast between the estimate of a man's *admitted* sagacity as a citizen worker and his *supposed* capacity as a citizen consumer. The garment sewer is held unfit to express an opinion on the simplest question of shop practice, the teacher's very livelihood depends on an "instinctive obedience" to the prejudices of some school Pontiff, the trainman's advice is not thought worth the asking by the management from one year's end to the other. Yet, in the political field, we call these men "The Sovereign People." They are the voters to whom we look for sound opinions on world politics. They are expected to determine whether President Wilson, in the disposition of the Saar Valley, remained true to his fourteen principles or to a French national vendetta. They are to detect whether all the red tape of the League of Nations was really necessary before Great Britain could hand Japan the Chinese province of Shantung.

Freedom Begins in the Workshop

What can be clearer than that a man who is held unfit to exercise a voice in ruling his own working group will show no troublesome eagerness to exercise a voice in ruling the world? And this, in fact, is the principle on which the master classes confidently act. There is no counterblast to this Junker principle save in the new Labor policy of giving a man a full share in dealing with the workshop conditions that confront him in his own workshop. This is the departure which, if pushed far enough by a determined labor movement, will knock the bottom out of the Junker confidence. Look at the Russian crisis, for example. What feature of the Soviet revolution has already frightened the masters most? The confiscation of property? No. That mischief is serious, but not irreparable. The owners can plan to sit in the tall grass and hatch one counter-revolution after another until arms and riches bring the sheepish multitude in tow again. But the practical training in self-government that each man may get right in his own shop or office, the training in judgment and self-respect that threatens to convert the sheep into independent men—this is the possibility that hits the uneasy spot in the Junker's conscience, this is the peril that makes the manifestoes of the Soviet government jar on his nerves like the rattat of a drum in a sick man's room.

The point to grasp is that our political structure provides no *locale* in which the modern citizen can secure a training in direct all round democratic government. This explains why the political apathy of Americans is so stupendous and why their unlimited capacity for spineless obedience is a tale to deafen the ears. An approach to a democratic training place did indeed exist, in the colonial age, in the townships of New England. No such approach existed, at that time, in the townships of Old England. What was the consequence? The townsmen of Britain submitted tamely to King George's Stamp Acts while the colonial townsmen resisted and brought about the American Revolution.

King George has been succeeded by the billionaire profiteer and the Stamp Act by reckless price boosting. But the colonial townsman has no successor. The geographical political unit served its turn amidst the agrarian conditions of the eighteenth century, but it fails dismally to equip citizen workers for resistance to tyranny amidst the industrial conditions of the twentieth.

In the face of this failure, how is the training in social liberty to be restored? Plainly, the restoration cannot begin in the public

places where men no longer assemble. It *can* begin, it *has* begun in the working places where men assemble for many hours every day. The workshop, not the town meeting, must become the cradle of liberty. For the workshop is the only unit that promises the citizen actual experience and first-hand training in the problems of liberty and self-government. No other training-place is at present available. Under the existing economic system the workshop is specifically the place where the interests that prevail are the interests by which men are united, just as the geographical district is specifically the place where the interests that prevail are the interests by which men are divided. If there is to be another American Revolution against another and greater tyranny, that revolution must begin in the workshop.

It may be pointed out that the movement towards self-government in the working unit need not wait upon collective ownership, although the complete success of the first depends upon the achievement of the second. But the abject extent to which American teachers, for instance, permit a Prussian bureaucracy to deprive them of a voice in the conduct of the separate schools (to say nothing of the whole school system) is quite unnecessary. Nothing but the most deplorable inertia prevents them from getting at least as much self-government as British machinists enjoy under the Whitley scheme. The movement for local autonomy in industry is, in fact, the backbone of the movement for collective control, for it must not be forgotten that collective ownership of the national industries without self-government in the industrial unit would be as effective as a dirigible without its motors.

In short, liberty in work must precede, or at any rate, be concurrent with liberty in leisure. This is the first condition of liberty in an industrial state. It is also the first condition of the joy of good workmanship. Not until every professional man and handicraftsman has a voice in determining the essential conditions of his work will there be a general return to that joy in work which Rodin spoke of, and which is man's chiefest right. The love of good workmanship is inherent in human nature and depends only on favorable circumstances for its development. Given a citizen who becomes acquainted with freedom amidst the hard give-and-take of self-government in his workshop capacity, and you may count on him to *insist* on the acquaintance, in any purely political or social capacity. In other words, the citizen who is a freeman in his hours of work will remain a freeman in his hours of leisure. What is more to the point, he will then be qualified to use his leisure in cultivating that superiority of purpose, sacrifice, and concentrated achievement that will make the society founded on real liberty in the workshop as superior to the society founded on *nominal* liberty in the voting booth, as a constitutional republic is to a despotic monarchy.

I. S. S. Convention

The Eleventh Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society will be held in New York on December 29th, 30th, and 31st.

The Central event of the convention will be a dinner at which the subject of discussion will be "The Revolt of American Labor and Its Meaning." Specific phases of the revolt will be presented by prominent leaders in the steel and mining industries, and finally the Socialist interpretation and solution will be given.

A reception on the opening night will afford an opportunity for the delegates and guests to get to know each other personally before settling down to the business of the convention. There will be no formal program for the reception, but some of the younger people who are actually taking part in the industrial struggle will be asked to talk on the possibilities open to college students for constructive service in the labor movement. Another session will be given over to expert opinion on the question of productivity. Write for information to Room 931, 70 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.

The Socialist Review

Vida D. Scudder

To start a SOCIALIST REVIEW in this year of grace is an inspiriting adventure. For the attitude toward socialism is changing like the light on a landscape in a summer shower. Ten years ago, the readers for such a REVIEW would have been few and the general public would have reviled it without consulting its pages. Today, one hopes for better things. Revolution sweeps over Europe. Here at home, it breaks out in agitated episodes—Seattle, Paterson, Lawrence—or, more ominously, appears suave and resolute in the Plumb plan, a purely American invention. What a plan! It bears no labels, is guileless of dangerous affiliations, disclaims intention of violence or strike, proposes "a revolution by due course of law" carried out through the accredited methods of democracy. This amazing plan, whatever its fate, is a clear evidence that labor has at last reached its majority, has shown its capacity to offer a constructive solution, conceived in a spirit of large statesmanship, for the snarls and tangles of our capitalistic, profiteering system of society.

An excellent time to introduce a socialist review. And what kind of a review shall it be?

Well written, of course; with all the force, wit, incisiveness, which radical pens can furnish; a Via Media, most wisely, between the Left and Right of the radical movement. But further?

Nobody can answer. Magazines, when spirited, often take the bit in their teeth and run away from—or rather with—their editors. That is their impish way. Still, it does no harm, while we are getting into our pace, to discuss the road and the goal.

First: the time is past for solid disquisitions on socialist fundamentals. The REVIEW should not argue for the co-operative commonwealth, but report the progress of co-operation. Nor should it expound the economic interpretation of history. To do so is still taboo in the public schools, despite the insistence on the doctrine by Daniel Webster and other worthies; but it does not need defence. Congress in its own despite speaks in these terms, and the press "talks prose" all the time without knowing what it is doing. Socialist business is not to plead for the economic method of interpretation, but to use intelligently the clue it puts into our hands.

In like manner, it will not stress the other watchwords of our movement. We are not called on to defend or denounce the class struggle, for we shall have our hands full chronicling it. "Collective ownership of the means of production,"—"Government control of monopolies,"—"production for use, not for profit,"—readers will not wish to be bored by these phrases. They have done good service, these old war cries, and their use is not over; but we shall leave them to others—to our comrades in the rear, whose appeal is to the great masses—(they still exist)—that shudder when socialism is mentioned, and need elementary instruction in how to spell it.

For this REVIEW plans to take its place in the van rather than the rear. Organ of socialist men and women with an intellectual training, it faces the future; and its first business will be to report the signs of coming times. They are of thrilling interest, these signs, and they are ignored, perverted or smothered in the newspapers.

The SOCIALIST REVIEW will not be the first journal to recognize them. Honored comrades precede it. But it will differ from *The Survey,* for it will leave on one side the praiseworthy philanthropic work of social salvage which is the primary concern of that brave organ. It will differ from the *Liberator,* for while it flies the Red Flag as dauntlessly as they, alongside of Old Glory, it sees larger and more varied groups gathered under that glowing protection. It differs from *The New Republic,* for it is not liberal but radical, from *The World Tomorrow,* for the stress is secular, from *The Nation,* for it is

concerned less with showing how rotten things are than with noting the new life springing everywhere from the muck. It differs from all of these; to each and all it owes a debt, but it claims a place among them as being akin and yet distinct.

From the high land of communal vision the REVIEW will present month by month a fresh, a co-ordinated survey of the advance of the workers of the world to power: careful, as true internationalists, to report progress all over the earth. This chronicle of industrial and social change, we hope to make of solid value. It will be the chief feature. But we shall hope to report not only the actions of hand and machine, but also the reactions of mind and soul. It is the central contention of socialists that economic change produces new mental life. This life is far more important than the material base of it; the interesting thing is not what one eats, but what use one makes of the strength supplied by the food. The old accusation that socialism was concerned wholly with material improvements was as senseless as to call a man a materialist because he wanted his breakfast before he sat down to compose his symphony. Now it is an amazing proof of the force of the "élan vital" that even while the social struggle goes on, before it has reached its climax, this new life of art, of faith, of affection, begins to appear, all over the field of the world. It is like lilies springing as the snows melt, poking their green blades up through the very edges of the snow, on the western mountain slopes. This REVIEW will be keenly cognizant of the new growth; and will be proud indeed to help it flourish.

This growth, amazingly rich, is cultivated in varying fields or schools of socialists that quarrel with a healthy intensity. Progress is tentative, uncertain; again and again, we find ourselves at cross-roads, and pause, hesitate, debate. Votaries of each school have a right, if they can afford the luxury, to their own organ. Once in a while, some special socialist possesses for a brief period an organ all to himself; nobody is so full of vitality, so complete an individualist as a clever socialist. But this REVIEW does not mean to be the organ of any school or faction. It will seek to express every phase of our movement. A Via Media we called it; but that is inaccurate. Let us rather hope that it will prove a House of Reconciliation.

In brief, every radical view which can be defined as socialism is to find free outlet in these pages. Here the Marxian shall lament and denounce the attempt of soviet Russia to telescope the purgatorial stages of economic progress; he shall present the paradox of a good revolutionist insisting that a great nation must resign itself to a long, slow period of capitalistic exploitation in order to bear out the sacred formula of the prophet. Here, soviet sympathizers shall stand up pluckily under their round berating, insist on the right of history to accelerations, and tell the dramatic truth about the audacities and handicaps of their experiment. Here, the administrative socialism, to borrow a phrase from Mr. Wells, shall plead its cause and register its triumphs; while syndicalists shall point out vigorously the dangers lurking in state control, and the guild socialists shall have ample room and verge enough to build a Commonwealth of their own. Here, people who derive their faith in a fraternal world from the teachings of Jesus shall speak their mind, side by side with comrades who hold the Christian creeds to be enemies of progress, and organized Christianity a vicious instrument of exploitation. Controversy, we hope, will not threaten these pages, but debate may thrive in them, and every good socialist and true, if he can write well enough (it is to be a severe IF!), shall be encouraged to give a reason for the faith that is in him.

Above all, the people who are doers, not arguers, shall talk. They will tell the progress of the new experiments in industrial democracy, not failing to point out the many pitfalls for the ingenuous therein. They will report the encouraging possibilities of scientific management when used to serve the masses. The REVIEW will not do all the things it wants to do, no, nor half of them; but it expects an exhilarating journey.

An Experiment in Conscience

M. C. Otto

It was a snatch of an exasperated father's outburst, overheard by chance, that precipitated the problem in my mind. "Do you hear me?" the irate sire scolded into the back of his disheveled, shuffling offspring, as he pushed him into the house. "How many times have I told you to do what you know to be right, no matter what the other boys do?" And the door which the father slammed behind him seemed symbolic of the finality of his moral creed. A neighbor tells me that I stopped in front of the house and stared at the door. Very likely. But my mind had jumped over miles and years and I was really gazing into the frankest, steadiest, most self-possessed brown eyes I have ever met. And as I walked on I was thinking not of what I had just heard but of the possessor of those eyes, a youth who had tried to apply this father's philosophy to life—with very unhappy consequences.

How distinctly I recall my first clear awareness of him! It happened in a university class room. He came into my life at the other end of an acute question, leveled at me like a spear. I remember noting his red hair, his intelligent, sensitive face, his cleanliness and health. But what impelled me to go below a ready-to-hand answer was the way he looked at me. It was a man looking at a man, not a pupil looking at a professor. In time I did something to analyze that look; discovered the subdued fire in the calm eyes, the suggestion of irony about the expressive mouth, the strength of the finely formed chin. I discovered, too, that he owed much to those capable looking shoulders. At this first encounter I simply felt instinctively the advisability of caution; that what I said would not be the end but the beginning of discussion. So it proved—then, and many another time. Nor will I say that I always enjoyed it. He was too keenly analytical of one's theories and one's facts, too nimble-minded in attack and defense, too persistent in following up logical implications, to be an unfailing comfort in a class room. Besides I suspected him of finding secret delight in professor baiting! Little by little, however, the central impulse of his being penetrated through his gestures—an uncompromising, at times almost quixotic intellectual honesty. He wanted to know the truth about life, and consequently was impatient of shams, of sentimentalism, of mental quackery. And his insistence upon intellectualizing life was not always controlled by a nice sense of proportion nor by a sweet reasonableness toward the cherished beliefs of his opponent. His very objectivity, his natural tendency to treat problems impersonally, resulted in his everlasting stepping on the toes of some prejudice or other. And while I reassured myself—for I came to like the fellow—that he would outgrow his rashness as he would his youth, I could not but wonder, even in those days, what end he would make if he carried this uncompromising allegiance to facts into the world.

College Days

His record in college was a brilliant one. He completed the four years' course in three, with a break of twelve months at the end of his sophomore year, during which he was engaged as an editorial assistant on a well-known philosophical monthly. He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, and at the conclusion of his course was chosen Rhodes Scholar to represent his Alma Mater, the University of Wisconsin, at Oxford. His undergraduate days had been characterized by alert and ardent leadership in the more serious and progressive student enterprises. He was not the kind that the rah rah boys would slap on the back and ask for the makings, for although totally without moral or religious dogmatism, he was almost austere in his personal habits. Moreover, he was too iconoclastic and outspoken, and too disdainful of popularity to be anything like a general favorite. But he was in no sense friendless or alone.

The three years at Balliol, Oxford, were thriving, formative years. His letters were full of the joy of new friendships, of sunny afternoons on the river, of hospitable weekends at English country houses or by the sea in Ireland, of the beauty of the Scotch Highlands, of the charm of Irish maidens, of intimate gossip about authors and statesmen. It was all very like the testimony of another who was not far from him in time or space: "Exquisite peace and quiet, long days of rich pleasure and sweet nights of rest, kindliness and laughter and the friendly word of casual acquaintances . . . and over all the enduring beauty of the world." Below it all, the educational methods and customs of Balliol, indeed the very stones themselves, brought him into intimate touch with the rich past of English life. Vacations spent in France, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy enlarged and clarified his outlook. But the most deep-going effect of these years was naturally one very closely related to the central motive of his life; he got a living appreciation of man's long struggle for freedom. Nay, more; he became identified with that struggle. The first sign of his dedication was a change in the tone and content of his letters. There was less of laughter and adventure, more of problems and discussions. Gradually, deep mental agitation crept into them, until in time, his letters became little else than records of his religious, moral and social unrest. It was a period of doubt and perplexity common enough to many lives, but one to which he had been a stranger. Could a man believe in any form of vital social idealism and maintain his intellectual integrity? Was not all hope of moral improvement a form of self-deception; in other words, sentimentalism? "I must find an answer to this question," he wrote. "I must get out of this apologetic attitude in the matter of living a good life, or one of these days some stronger temptation will send me sprawling in filth."

Then followed, with all the omens of spiritual dawn, the enthusiastic avowal of Fabian socialism. He had been mildly interested in socialistic ideas while still at Wisconsin, but his conversion was now due to some of his Oxford tutors, to his reading of Shaw, the Webbs, and others, and to his residence at a college settlement in the London slums. After that his buoyancy returned with a rush, and to the end of his stay abroad he was full of tales of his experiences as a propagandist of the new faith, and of keen, witty criticisms of emotional schemes of social amelioration. It was no accident that the one memento of his Oxford days that he brought home for himself was a magnificent portrait of George Meredith—arch foe of sentimentalism and friend of a new social order. That was in the autumn of 1914.

Meanwhile the war had broken out. For a brief time he was on the verge of volunteering in the English army. His Balliol classmates were going—comrades of the three biggest years he had known. It was a hard tug, and there was genuine anxiety on this side. He fought it out alone, and on intellectual grounds. In his view the contest did not concern the people of any of the contending nations. He regarded it as a struggle between the Anglo-French-Russian imperialistic orbit and the Austro-German-Turkish orbit, and he condemned both. He came home opposed to the war.

Back in America

He came home—though he did not then know it—to give his philosophy crucial trial. For a year he was at work preparing for his doctorate and winning his spurs as a teacher at the University of Illinois. Happy, expansive days! It was Balliol adapted to the Middle West. Merry voices on the tennis courts at sunrise; cross-country runs in the mellow afternoons; lively teas with students and younger instructors, at which age-worn perplexities were neatly pigeon-holed.

It was not to be expected that those responsible for the preservation of institutional respectability would look with approval or even complacency upon a group of young men and women who, however artless and high-minded, approached the institutions and cus-

toms of society in a spirit of free inquiry rather than of reverence. It must be admitted, moreover, that the leader of the group appeared to take mischievous delight in irritating those in authority. His friends were therefore not surprised to learn that his tenure in the university was uncertain. "The conditions of retaining my instructorship," he wrote to one of his friends, "have been made clear to me: no stirring up discussions in student publications, softer pedal on my social ideas, less cocky in challenging opinions of reverend signiors." If he agreed to this he was to have an advance in salary and the privilege of giving a course of his own. "At the same time," the letter went on, "I am offered the post of western organizer for the Intercollegiate Socialist Society at a better salary. If I had not lost my heart to the comrade with whom I have talked of marriage, and if you were not so certain that much can be accomplished for fundamental social reconstruction by my staying in philosophy, I believe I'd give the Intercollegiate a trial."

But with 1917 the war moved nearer to America—and nearer to him. Little by little he became the animating spirit of a group of radicals who opposed America's entrance into the conflict. They engaged anti-war speakers, they circulated anti-war literature, they organized themselves as a speakers' bureau—nine instructors, representing economics, history, sociology, English, and philosophy, and two ministers, a presbyterian and a unitarian—and answered the calls that came pouring in. No great imagination is required to picture the consternation this aroused. But that is a story in itself—of enthusiastic audiences, of petty persecution, of honest but vain endeavors to win these hot youths from their errors. To this little group those busy and dedicated months will always remain (to adapt one of President Wilson's noble phrases), among the great memories of their lives. It all slithered out when America joined forces with the Allies.

War and the Draft

Not, however, for the youth with the intelligent, sensitive face, and the steady brown eyes with a touch of fire in them like light at the bottom of a pool. Many times he had quoted with full approval words which he had discovered before he was twenty in an essay by William James: "In point of fact the *highest* ethical life—however few may be called to bear its burdens—consists at all times in the breaking of rules which have grown too narrow for the actual case. There is but one unconditional commandment, which is that we should seek incessantly, with fear and trembling, so to vote and to act as to bring about the very largest total universe of good which we can see." Here was the chance to stand by his conception of morality. Here was his chance to support a cause he thought to be right "with good humored inflexibility then most when the whole cry was on the other side," as Emerson puts it. Most of us do not feel called upon to translate our moral thrills into social fact. He did. He was subject to the first draft, and when the time came he wrote on his registration blank, "If drafted, I can not serve, as I cannot patriotically support this war."

For some reason the Draft Board, as a rule very jealous of its secrets and very efficient in keeping them, lost this one to the public. And from then on Carl Haessler's name began to figure in the newspapers as a conscientious or political objector.

Still, the academic year ended quietly enough. He was granted his Ph.D by the university, and left for the summer vacation, with friendly good-byes to his colleagues, quite unaware that his connection with the university had already been terminated. The news reached him, however, by mail almost as soon as he arrived at his home. "I understand," wrote the head of his department, himself plainly facing a moral issue and attempting to face it squarely, "I understand that you will not accept service if drafted under the registration; that is a question of conscience for you. Now I am firmly convinced that your attitude in this matter puts the question of your appointment in a new light. You have raised a question of con-

science for me. I would not say or do anything that would seem to infringe upon your freedom of thought or action. But I do wish to make clear my position and to say that I cannot recommend anyone for a position in the department who holds that view."

What to do now? He had spent years preparing himself for the academic field, and here at the very beginning the door seemed to have shut. For, of course, his dismissal from Illinois, for the time at least, closed every other university to him. But he wanted still to keep his academic connections, and so carried out his design of applying for membership in the Western Philosophical Association.

The executive committee of this organization refused him admission. His "reported declaration of intention to resist the draft," which the committee "on the basis of the available information" felt obliged to construe as "rebellion against the government," constituted "an insuperable obstacle to membership in the organization."

Meanwhile he had turned, at first with regret, but later with growing satisfaction and zeal, to work on a metropolitan socialist daily. His ability, his devotion, his good will, quickly won him a place in the respect and affections of his new associates. Now, too, his bride, a graduate of Vassar, came to join in his labors. But while there was much in his many activities to give life zest, he lived constantly under an ominous shadow. His brother went to the front in France, his parents were unable to sympathize with what seemed to them his wrongheadedness, and he knew that he would soon have to face the call of the government. The day came. It was a cheery but somewhat leaner young man who responded.

In Camp

The local press, with which he had had many a bout, was quick to announce the result. Confronted by the reality, ran the report, Carl Haessler had, as predicted, collapsed in his defiance and had entered the service. He had, so to speak, decided to "pluck up drowned honor by the locks." The facts, however, were far different. His status had not been officially determined. And while he was doing the most menial and dirty camp work, his sense of humor triumphed in notes like this:

"Do you remember Samuel Butler's caution to teachers in 'The Way of all Flesh,' to be careful lest their lives be some day written by some pupil of theirs who had not been too high in their grades? What has befallen me would tickle old Butler's heart into an alarming fit of humorous moralizing. My captain is a man whom I flunked in logic at Illinois, and who had to drop out of the university in consequence. At least that is what he told his brother officers when he asked to have me put in his company. I just faintly remembered him. He issued orders to 'ride' me, but a curious undercurrent of rough indignation among the regulars made them take me under their wing instead."

The issue was put squarely up to him perhaps a month after he had left for camp, and news of it came in a letter to his wife:

M. G. Co., 46 Inf., Camp Sheridan, Ala.
Friday, June 21, 1918, 8 p.m.

Dearest:

After being put in quarters under guard, I was first released from guard and then told that all restrictions were removed but that a uniform would be issued to me and I would be expected to do military service. If I refused that would mean being put into the camp stockade, courtmartialed and sentenced, possibly to 25 years. The uniform is on my cot now and when I get up tomorrow morning I shall have to make my choice.

Darling lover, you know now what my decision will be but I want you to have the reasons as they now appeal to me before you on paper.

(1) I regard this war as tragically unnecessary and motivated originally by commercial and imperialistic considerations. From the patriotic point of view, no citizen looking at this war in this way can do his best by the country unless he refuses to assist in such a war in any way and unless he does what he can to make such wars impossible in the future by moral and intellectual leadership.

(2) From the socialist point of view, this war is largely unjustified and an aspiring socialist leader must stand by his colors and must not hesitate to do himself what he would like the rank and file to do. If radicalism is to crumble at the first bellow of the war drum, radicalism is worthless and a fraud.

(3) From the preaching-teaching point of view, how can I ever talk to my followers again if I

now recede from fear of the consequences? I shall have muzzled myself forever and more thoroughly than any prison term could do. I might almost as well die as voluntarily stop myself from teaching and preaching.

(4) There remains a dross of personal feeling, of resentment at being sanctimoniously ordered to help in an unholy war, of pride in keeping to my convictions while they are mine, of hope even perhaps (to tell the whole truth) of capitalizing martyrdom, and a "Siberian record," of resolve not to disappoint those who have come through me to believe in radicalism, of determination not to give aid and comfort to the capitalist enemy by surrendering, and so on.

—

But on the other side . . . there is a terrific pull at my heart. What could we not do together after the war! I would be sure to come back since both Lieut. ——— and Lieut. ——— have already offered me safety-first jobs.

But dearest, how can I commit soul-suicide while in good health and good spirits and with a clear perception of the situation? If my opinion of the war had changed I would have put on the uniform long ago, but I will not do it while I have the strength to resist and still believe the war a crime on the part of our country.

So now, beloved wife, I must close this letter. I hope the courtmartial may come soon and my fate be decided and settled without delay. I have been well treated so far, with courtesy and respect beyond my expectation. . . .

CARL.

Courtmartial

The courtmartial took place in August. The following statement, which was Exhibit A in the courtmartial, is copied from the official report of the proceedings:

"I, Carl Haessler, Recruit, Machine Gun Company, 46th Infantry, respectfully submit the following statement in extenuation in connection with my proposed plea of guilty to the charge of violation of the 64th Article of War, the offense having been committed June 22, 1918, in Camp Sheridan, Ala.

The offense was not committed from private, secret, personal, impulsive, religious, pacifist or pro-German grounds. An admixture of quasi personal motives is admitted, but they were in no sense the guiding or controlling factors. I have evidence for each of these assertions, should it be required.

The wilful disobedience of my Captain's and of my Lieutenant-Colonel's orders to report in military uniform arose from a conviction which I hesitate to express before my country's military officers but which I nevertheless am at present unable to shake off, namely, that America's participation in the World War was unnecessary, of doubtful benefit (if any) to the country and to humanity, and accomplished largely, though not exclusively, through the pressure of the allied and American commercial imperialists.

Holding this conviction, I conceived my part as a citizen to be opposition to the war before it was declared, active efforts for a peace without victory after the declaration, and a determination so far as possible to do nothing in aid of the war while its character seemed to remain what I thought it was. I hoped in this way to help bring the war to an earlier close and to help make similar future wars less probable in this country.

I further believe that I am and shall be rendering the country a service by helping to set an example for other citizens to follow in the matter of fearlessly acting on unpopular convictions instead of forgetting them in time of stress. The crumbling of American radicalism under pressure in 1917 has only been equalled by that of the majority of German Socialist leaders in August, 1914.

Looking at my case from the point of view of the administration and of this court, I readily admit the necessity of exemplary punishment. I regret that I have been forced to make myself a nuisance, and I grant that this war could not be carried on if objections like mine were recognized by those conducting the war. My respect for the administration has been greatly increased by the courteous and forbearing treatment accorded me since having been drafted, but my view of international politics and diplomacy, acquired during my three years of graduate study in England, has not altered since June, 1917, when I formally declared that I could not accept service if drafted. Although officers have on three occasions offered me noncombatant service if I would put on the uniform, I have regretfully refused each time on the ground that "bomb proof" service on my part would give the lie to my sincerity (which was freely granted by Judge Julian Mack when he and his colleagues examined me at Camp Gordon). If I am to render any war services, I shall not ask for special privileges.

I wish to conclude this long statement by reiterating that I am not a pacifist or pro-German, not a religious or private objector, but regard myself as a patriotic political objector, acting largely from public and social grounds.

I regret that, while my present view of this war continues, I cannot freely render any service in aid of the war. I shall not complain about the punishment that this court may see fit to mete out to me."

Signed: CARL HAESSLER.

A true copy.
Captain, Inf. R. C. 46 Inf. Judge Advocate.

The result of the trial was unknown until late in September, when the prisoner communicated the news to his wife. "Miracle Woman," he wrote, "I am sure your brave spirit will need all the strength you can summon . . . The prison officers read out to me that I am to be 'dishonorably discharged, to forfeit all pay and allowances due and to be confined as the reviewing authority may direct for a period of twelve years at hard labor.' The sentence has been approved in Washington and is to be served in the Disciplinary Barracks Ft. Leavenworth, Kans., where I go within the next month. The sentence began July 18, and with good behavior will expire Oct. 18, 1926. Eight years sacrificed of our common life for the sake of our common ideal. I would not murmur at giving more, but I doubt the wisdom of social arrangements that make such stupid sacrifices inevitable . . . I have no word against the army as such. It is the cause the army is made to fight for that I reject, more emphatically now than in June of last year when I resolved that I would not lend myself to such an undertaking."

In October, 1918, then, Carl Haessler was imprisoned in Fort Leavenworth. Last June —the reason can only be guessed at—he was transferred to Alcatraz. His spirit, however, was not broken by his imprisonment. It glows with something rich and eloquent in a letter not intended for the public eye. "If you have a philosophy that can sustain you through this ordeal," he had been asked by one very dear to him, "do pass it on to us." Let his reply be our parting word:

"You and I are not mere creatures who wish to live at any cost. We would invest our lives for rich social returns. Both of us groped and fumbled about in the world for many years before we came to a realization of the direction in which our enterprise had to be prosecuted. We began to see that the vast capitalist structure of modern civilization, by which the favored rich became still richer by waiting for interest and dividends to come in, had to be sapped and undermined. This we began valiantly and persistently to do until the big machine turned on us and on a million others, and we were separated. But the work goes doggedly on. Even now our great investment looks sound to me, of a long-time soundness."

Problems of the Revolutionized Order

Notes on the Conference of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society at Highland, New York, June 24-30, 1919.

Harry W. Laidler

Members and friends who attended the June conference of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, even though they did not find the solution of all the problems of the "Revolutionized Order," were unanimous in feeling that the discussions, led by well known social thinkers, had greatly helped to clarify in their minds many of the vital issues at stake.

The first two sessions of the conference were concerned with present conditions and some of the movements leading to a better order of society. Florence Kelley, President of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, who had recently returned from a trip to Europe, illuminated all of the subsequent proceedings by the vivid searchlight she turned on the present disorders abroad.

Florence Kelley on Europe's Needs

Mrs. Kelley spoke of the tragic conditions in Bohemia, as a result of the allied blockade, which was causing the starvation of thousands of little children. In Vienna hundreds were starving every day, and their bodies, wrapped in newspapers, were taken at night in street cars to the burial places. The Hoover committee, she declared, had adopted the practice of sending food when hunger had become so great as to develop a hunger typhus, the spreading of which would endanger other countries. Nevertheless, supplies generally reached the countries after many thousands had died, and were given in such insufficient quantities as to prove no safeguard against starvation.

Even in such neutral countries as Switzerland, it was difficult, if not impossible, to secure milk and butter. The inhabitants were compelled to eat black bread, coal was scarce, and trains were few. All of the Swiss were hungry. And yet they invited 5,000 Viennese children to take a vacation in Switzerland during the summer so that the children would not actually lose ground physically. "One feels in coming back to the United States," declared the speaker, "how gross is the expression of its wealth as compared with the poverty abroad."

America, she asserted, was now the deciding power in the world, and was drunk with power. The war had definitely developed capitalism out of feudalism.

Harry W. Laidler briefly summarized the main events in the world of socialism and labor during the past year—the revolutions in Germany and Hungary, the elections in England, the spread of radicalism generally on the continent, the growth of industrial unionism and the general strike idea, and, in certain instances, the increasing interest of workers in independent political action. On the other hand, he dealt with the attempt on the part of the ruling class everywhere, under the pretext of stamping out Bolshevism, to repress every attempt of the workers to gain a higher status.

Direct Action by Workers and Capitalists

Direct action and co-operation—two roads that increasing numbers are taking for the achievement of their desires—were the subjects of the Wednesday morning session. Professor Herbert Ellsworth Cory upheld the thesis that, with the passing of the years, direct action, as practiced by the workers, is becoming more humane in its nature, while the direct action of the capitalists is becoming more ruthless. He pointed to that form of sabotage employed by the workers which consisted in merely obeying all of the rules of the companies, or in performing work in a more artistic fashion than maximum profits permitted. He dwelt on the development of the spirit of brotherhood among the workers, as illustrated during the recent Lawrence strike, when the Belgians, nearly penniless,

invited the German strikers, also nearly penniless, to a joint entertainment in order to show that they were not enemies, but friends. Those advocating the "dictatorship of the proletariat," he contended, constituted the first army in history which placed direct reliance on an appeal to reason as a military weapon.

Co-operation in the Northwest

Dr. James P. Warbasse, president of the Co-operative League of America, just returned from the Northwest, gave an optimistic picture of the growing power of labor in Seattle and vicinity, particularly emphasizing the growth of co-operation. The general strike in Seattle had developed among the workers a feeling of power formerly not in evidence. The workers in that section were rapidly turning their attention to co-operation. They owned their own markets, slaughter houses, and fish canneries, and distributed their own milk. In some of the suburbs, the carpenters were giving their services free to the building of co-operative halls. In Burin, a "Free Speech Hall" was being built.

The Soviet and Russia

There followed, at the various conference sessions, stirring discussions on the problems of the future order, the nature of the state, of democratic management, and of economic efficiency.

Santeri Nuorteva of the Soviet Bureau, formerly Socialist member of the Finnish Parliament, contended that the dictatorship of the proletariat was a necessary means of ushering in the new social order, but that it was not a necessary part of that order. He continued:

"No class has ever relinquished power voluntarily. Classes that have ruled wield a great influence even after they have been overthrown. In Russia, after the Soviet revolution, there were hundreds of thousands of officials of the old system who began an organized policy of obstruction. Many opponents of the Soviets have systematically attempted to burn up the foodstuffs and blow up the bridges and factories, and this has had to be stopped. The rule of the Bolsheviki is the rule of the majority. When everyone able to work becomes a producer under the socialist state, the Soviet rule will become the rule of the people as a whole."

(*Concluded in January issue*)

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, OF

The Intercollegiate Socialist

Published at New York, N. Y., for April 1, 1919.

State of New York, } *ss:*
County of New York, }

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Alice Kuebler Boehme, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that she is the business manager of the Intercollegiate Socialist, and that the following is, to the best of her knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher—Intercollegiate Socialist Society,
70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Editor—Harry W. Laidler,
70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Managing Editor—Harry W. Laidler,
70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Business Manager—Alice Kuebler Boehme,
70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

2. That the owners are: (Give names and addresses of individual owners, or, if a corporation, give its name and the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of the total amount of stock.)
Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City; membership approximately 1,600. The principal officers are: President, Florence Kelley, 289 Fourth Ave., New York City; 1st Vice-President, Evans Clark, 62 Montague St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; 2d Vice-President, Vida D. Scudder, Wellesley, Mass.; Treasurer, Mary R. Sanford, 90 Grove St., New York City.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.)
There are no known bondholders, mortgagees or other security holders.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the six months preceding the date shown above is ———. (This information is required from daily publications only.)

ALICE KUEBLER BOEHME,
Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 26th day of March, 1919.

JOHN MARTIN.
[Seal] (My commission expires March 30, 1920.)

Book Reviews

Russia and Germany at Brest-Litovsk. By Judah L. Magnes. Rand School of Social Science. $1.00.

Rabbi Magnes' little book will be welcomed by all who want to understand the present situation in Russia. Until the original documents of those vivid weeks, wherein a "Tilsit" peace was forced upon a helpless and disorganized Russia, can be obtained, this careful collection of the actual day to day events, discussions and decisions at Brest-Litovsk will prove invaluable. This is the first time that a connected and detailed account of the negotiations has been published in this country, and our debt to Rabbi Magnes is enhanced by the fact that he has allowed the events to speak for themselves, expressing no judgment and drawing no conclusions, although he has been particularly careful to include that evidence which tells against the Lenin government alongside much that is favorable. There is no attempt at literary style, but the very method of recording the progress from day to day, with no connecting links of verbiage, makes this story dramatic to a degree. One only regrets that there could not have been included the details of those last critical hours reported by Raymond Robins, when Lenin waited in vain for news of aid from the Allies, before finally giving his ratification speech. Much of Robins' evidence is, however, included.

The story bears witness again and again to the immense courage of the Russian delegation, headed by Trotzky, as it faced the German diplomats and generals. Time after time they stood fast by their ultra-democratic demands, as if their delegation "stood victorious and could dictate conditions," protested the junker General Hoffmann! Trotzky's extreme frankness and most undiplomatic behavior was always outwitting his opponents, as is demonstrated by the frequent concern shown in their quoted speeches. It is impossible to read through the pages of this record without exposing once for all the hollowness of the conventional "German gold" explanation of the Brest-Litovsk "peace." Throughout Trotzky shows his refusal to deal with Germany on anything but international and class principles, and just as clearly is seen the utter inability to meet that attitude on the part of the German delegation, in spite of their overwhelming physical superiority in military power.

After the dusty mass of purely propaganda literature, weekly, monthly and in book form, that has cluttered up our national minds and bookshelves, Rabbi Magnes' quiet, factual record of events as they actually happened is a draught of clear spring water.

W. H. C.

Russia in 1919. By Arthur Ransome. N. Y.: Huebsch. $1.50.

The author of this much-reviewed book has "tried by means of a bald record of conversations and things seen" in European Russia from January 30 to March, 1919, to portray to the non-Russian world that "gigantic experiment" in social revolution which we as a world "are allowing to pass abused but not examined." In spite of his regrets that his lack of training in either capitalist or socialist economics has lost him many opportunities that a trained man could have utilized to the full, Ransome's careful, first-hand evidence is invaluable to those of us who, unable to visit Russia ourselves, dare not trust propagandist "news" from either side. Ransome's 232 pages are a record of startling achievement and grim pluck in face of constant bitter cold, pestilence, starvation and extreme war-weariness. To save what they could of their Baltic fleet Russian engineers widened and deepened their canal systems from the Baltic Sea to the River Volga—and that in the worst stress of blockade and civil war. Since war and blockade alike withheld the needed materials for setting industrial Russia once more upon its feet, substitutes must be and have been found. Wood and parafin lacking, the Bolshevik inventors turned to waste paper and wool-grease, excellent matches being the result. Another invention permitted them to use old machines (intended for cotton only) in the textile industry with a fifty and seventy-five per cent. admixture of flax. As cotton was held up by the blockade, and 25 per cent. admixture of flax was the utmost previous attainment, this was a real conquest of hostile conditions by "Bolshevist" brains.

In education, sixteen universities exist in place of the six of pre-revolution days. New polytechnics and innumerable libraries have been opened. The number of students and readers has vastly increased. All education is free, and the workers crowd to the lecture courses in spite of the appalling cold of the lecture rooms. Serious books and political pamphlets sell and are read by the thousands, and the Soviet Government is steadily reprinting the Russian classics at most reasonable prices—even including the complete works of Plekhanov, Lenin's old rival. A milliard roubles have been assigned for feeding school children and even supplying the most needy with footgear and clothing. All this, again, in spite of constant civil war on their borders and the Allied blockade.

Agriculture has not been overlooked, and notwithstanding the refusal of the Allies to let Danish seeds through the blockade (though the Russians had paid for them), plans are afoot for

ultimately using "English and German engineering assistance" to "turn Russia into an effective grain supply for all the working-men's republics of the Continent"!

Constantly Ransome is struck, after six months' absence, with the disappearance of armed men, the firm establishment of the revolution, and the fact that the people at play and at work are "settling into their places in the new social order." One of the great causes for this increase in the settled nature of the revolution is seen in the real sharing by the governmental leaders of the actual hardships that their people have also to undergo—unlike some of our more "democratic" nations nearer home.

Ransome's book fills in many gaps in our knowledge; on the "Third" or Communist, International for instance—where he was the only non-communist present. The debate on the famous Prinkipos proposal of January 22, 1919, when read alongside the Bullitt report is exceedingly interesting. Ransome shows that the Soviet Government never received a direct invitation, and finally on February 4, 1919, Chicherin, Commissar of Foreign Affairs, sent a long note to the Allies by wireless. The Soviet view, expressed by Bucharin and later by Lenin, that "the hostility of the different countries varied in direct proportion to their fear of revolution at home" is a strikingly true summary of what the "Big Five" had actually said in the debate of January 21 over the Prinkipos proposition! (Bullitt Exhibit No. 14). Lloyd George and Wilson were plainly ready to meet even the Soviet Government, but Clemenceau, and even more Sonnino for Italy, were bitterly hostile as fearing the effect of such "recognition" upon their own revolutionists.

In a book so crowded with the very facts we lack in the daily press, there is a welcome plenty of personal description of the "Red" leaders. Of one man only have we space to quote—the arch-leader of Soviet Russia, Lenin. "More than ever," declares Ransome after an interview, "Lenin struck me as a happy man . . . This little, bald-headed, wrinkled man, who tilts his chair this way and that, laughing over one thing or another, ready any minute to give serious advice to any who interrupts him to ask for it, advice so well reasoned that it is to his followers far more compelling than any command, every one of his wrinkles is a wrinkle of laughter, not of worry. I think the reason must be that he is the first great leader who utterly discounts the value of his own personality. He is quite without personal ambition. More than that, he believes, as a Marxist, in the movement of the masses which, with or without him, would still move. . . . He is, for himself at any rate, the exponent, not the cause, of the events that will be forever linked with his name."

W. H. C.

Nixola of Wall Street. By Felix Grendon. New York: The Century Company. 1919. 12mo. 384 pp. $1.50.

Mr. Grendon's spirited and sympathetic study of the volatile "business girl" is a readable example of that purposeful frivolity which our young literary radicals affect when they call Bernard Shaw "Master." Other reviewers have already compared Mr. Grendon to the early Shaw, of the novels, and on the surface the likeness is sufficiently obvious; the dialogue often achieves the true Shavian tartness. But if the comparison is pressed to include defects, we can find in the disciple, also, that rather cheap flavor which marred the youthful work of the master, in style and substance. The older Shaw would know how to make his Nixola both vulgar and winning, a daring and wholly human combination. The young Shaw might have made her only vulgar, as Mr. Grendon has done. The picture of the Settlement Headworker is another example of this type of craftsmanship. Settlements are fair game; they have weathered a good deal of virulent criticism from conservatives, and they will probably lift their heads "bloody but unbowed" from the onslaughts of the radicals; but Mr. Grendon's attack is unfair, in that it focuses upon the eccentricities of an individual, not representative of her class. When an author dislikes his characters they invariably revenge themselves by defeating his artistic purpose.

But beneath the frivolity and the farcical plot there is sober criticism of the machinery of modern life: of that twentieth century fetich, efficiency; of the ban upon freedom of speech in universities and colleges; of the unhappy relation of business to art; of the amateurishness and patronizing ineptitude of settlements. Now and then there is a constructive note, sometimes Ruskinian; as when Mr. Grendon puts into the mouth of Harland, his type of the best there is in big business, these words:

"The purpose of a big business should be nothing less than feeding, clothing, and housing the nation in the fittest, healthiest, and handsomest manner." Or when he makes his gay young promoter of business for art's sake say that: "As soon as people attached as much importance to a decent standard of living as they now pretended to attach to paintings, statues, and other objects of fine art, they would transfer the inhabitants (those who escaped chloroform) to suitably laid out suburban and rural sections. At present, however, people did not know the meaning of a decent standard of living. At the root of the trouble was the fact that society separated business from actual life. Socially considered, business was the business of living well, just as art was the art

of living nobly. The aim of business should be nothing less than to provide people with decent houses, decent food, decent clothes."

This is not a new note, in literature, but it has a genuine ring, in the midst of this sardonic little story, and it bears repetition.

But the author's most abundant enthusiasm goes out to Woman,—the new one, of course. The book is frankly feminist in its celebration of the charm, the intelligence, the ability of the modern girl, whether she be the hard, bright, selfseeking Nixola, or the tender, selfless, but equally untrammeled Madge. All the moderns celebrate Woman,—Bennett, Galsworthy, Wells, Shaw,—and beneath their close analysis, which is always courteous, often tender, sometimes ardent, runs their unconscious disrespect. So beneath Mr. Grendon's generous praise and enthusiasm there yet lurks—disrespect. No true woman can really feel complimented by the picture of either Madge or Nixola. And yet, no one would deny that the author's championship is honest.

Indeed, the final impression which one takes away from the book is of honesty of purpose; this, too, he shares with his master, Shaw.

F. C.

College Notes

Enthusiastic letters have been coming in from students all over the country who are anxious to get the I. S. S. work for the year under way, and numerous requests have been received from the college chapters during the past two months for courses of study, and speakers to address their meetings.

The *University of California* boasts a fine new chapter of the I. S. S., to be known as the "Social Science Club." Maurice Frocht, organizer of the chapter, carried on a splendid publicity campaign, and reports that the first meeting was a "grand success." Over one hundred students signed the membership list and joined in electing the following officers: President, Grace Stearns, '19; Vice-President, Catherine Russell, '20; Corresponding Secretary, Sant Mondell, '22; Treasurer, T. A. Knopf.

The *Wisconsin* Chapter awaited only information regarding new dues and subscription regulations, to go ahead with their plans for the year. David Weiss, their correspondent, writes that with a registration of over 6,000 students, and a greater tolerance of liberalism than during the war, the outlook for the year is very hopeful.

The *Adelphi* Chapter, which has been named the "Social Problems Club," has planned a course of study for the year, and is arranging to have a number of well-known speakers at their meetings. The officers are: Victoria Hess, Chairman; Theresa Shulkin, Secretary.

The *Radcliffe* chapter is planning a series of semi-open meetings during the year. Vera Mikol, the Secretary, writes: "We anticipate a year of increasing activity, and hope that with the advice and support of the I. S. S. we may make the chapter a very vital institution at Radcliffe." Elizabeth Boodey is Chairman of the Radcliffe Socialist Club.

The *C. C. N. Y.* group have sent representatives to confer with Dr. Laidler concerning their year's program, and expect to have good meetings. Vincent Mannino is their President, Alexander Klein, Vice-President, and Walter Wolff, the Secretary and Treasurer.

The group in the *University of Pittsburgh* have formed an Economic Club, which their Secretary, Miss Eva Shamberg, writes "is I. S. S. *in spirit*, if not in name." They hope to have I. S. S. speakers address them during the year.

The Secretary of the *Columbia* Chapter, Alfred Sachs, writes: "There is, indeed, much interest in socialism and labor on the campus." They will hold a reorganization meeting in the near future.

Alumni Chapters.

The *New York Alumni Chapter* has elected the following officers for the year: President, James W. Alexander, Princeton; First Vice-President, Grace Scribner; Second Vice-President, Devere Allen, Oberlin; Secretary, Louise Adams Grout; Treasurer, Jessica Smith, Swarthmore; Delegate to the Executive Committee, Leland Olds, Amherst.

The Saturday "Camaraderies" have started, and will be held as usual during the winter. Among their first speakers the chapter was fortunate in securing William Z. Foster, of the steel workers' organization, and W. N. Ewer, Foreign Editor of the London *Daily Herald.*

The *Boston* Chapter, of which Miss Helen Henry Hodge is Secretary, held a reorganization supper in early November, with Mrs. Florence Kelley as the chief speaker.

The *Los Angeles* Chapter is holding regular meetings. At their first gathering ten-minute speeches on a variety of subjects were delivered by well-known speakers. Mr. J. H. Ryckman is President of the chapter; Miss Esther Yarnell, Secretary.

The *Chicago* alumni decided to reorganize last spring. Among their members are Mrs. Elinor Karsten, Miss Jennie A. Wilcox, Mrs. Amy Walker Field, Miss Ellen Gates Starr, Edward M. Winston and Irwin St. John Tucker.

Socialist Review Calendar

AUGUST

30th. BRITAIN. Widnes election. Arthur Henderson turns hostile majority of 8,500 into a 1,000 majority for labor, in a constituency always reactionary heretofore.
BOHEMIA. Executive Committee of the Trade Unions (300,000 members). 120 delegates demand expropriation of private industrial resources, and socialization of industry.

SEPTEMBER

1st. Communist Party formed at Smolny Institute, Chicago.

2nd. Seceding delegates from the Socialist Party form Communist Labor Party in Mechanics Hall, Chicago.
Mme. Breshkovsky leaves Prague for Russia.

4th. Socialist Party of America in emergency convention at Chicago adopts manifesto.

5th. CHILE. General strike in Santiago, in sympathy with brewery labor.
U. S. A. Senator Borah declares in Senate "The women and children of Russia are being starved by a blockade maintained against Russia by the Allied governments."

6th. *New York Times* reports British and American banks negotiating a loan of $50,000,000 to Kolchak. Kidder, Peabody and Company representing the American group.

8th. Horace Traubel, Walt Whitman's biographer, dies.

9th. 1,114 Boston police patrolmen go on strike in protest against the suspension of their 19 leaders.
Postal employees of New York and New Jersey ask minimum salary of $1,500 for postal clerks (average now $1,045) and maximum of $2,300.
John Mitchell, 10 years president of United Mine Workers, dies, leaving an estate of a quarter of a million.

10th. BRITAIN. Trades Union Congress rejects by ratio of 58 to 1 the government scheme, and demands the nationalization of the coal mines.
VIENNA. Cable to *Manchester Guardian* reports appeal to European labor from Hungarian proletariat protesting a "mediæval white terror," massacre of non-Bolshevik workers by the Friedrichs government, suppression of press and leaflets.

11th. FRANCE. Special congress of Socialist Party by 8 to 1 vote prohibits all electoral ententes with other parties.

SEPTEMBER

SANTO DOMINGO. Acting president declares that "individual liberties have been greatly diminished in Santo Domingo by the action of the American military government. There is no freedom of the press, no right of assembly, and the people cannot take any initiative to modify the situation."

12th. BRITAIN. Trades Union Congress resolves to call special conference of labor to decide form of action if Government refuses trade union demands for repeal of conscription, and withdrawal of troops from Russia.
IRELAND. Sinn Fein Parliament suppressed in Dublin.

15th. Secretary Newton Baker tells House Military Affairs Committee that American soldiers cannot be withdrawn from Siberia at once as such withdrawal would leave Siberia open to anarchy, bloodshed and Bolshevism.

18th. FRANCE. Jean Longuet in Chamber of Deputies characterizes the peace as one of "force and violence like those terminating conflicts in the past."

19th. FRANCE. The C. G. T. at Lyons demands nationalization of industries under control of producers and consumers. Orders transport unions to refuse to carry munitions for Kolchak or Denikin.

20th. U. S. A. Cleveland convention of the United Mine Workers of America demands the "immediate nationalization of the coal mining industry" by purchase of private mines at actual valuation determined by accredited agents of the Federal Government; mine workers to receive equal representation upon all administrating councils or commissions; a working alliance with the railroad brotherhoods for purpose of securing adoption of the Plumb Plan, with subsequent use of said alliance to achieve nationalization of mines.

22nd. Steel strike begins.

23rd. Cleveland convention of United Mine Workers of America demands 60 per cent. wage increase, six hour day underground, and five day week. If Coal Conference (labor and operators) does not meet demands national coal strike on November 1st.

24th. Report on packers' profits . . . held up by Hoover . . . produced by Senate resolution. Shows that the "Big Five" made profits 2¼ to 3 times as large as in pre-war days.
MACON, GA. Labor elects Mayor Toole at the primaries, and defeats his opponent who

SEPTEMBER

stood for the deunionization of the local police.

25th. *New York Times* reports "authoritatively" from Washington, D. C., that U. S. A. has assumed responsibility for assisting Omsk Government (Kolchak) forces, "the other powers taking care of Denikin."

RUSSIA. 13 Bolshevik commissars reported assassinated by bomb in the Kremlin, Moscow.

26th. *New York Times* Rome cable reports a million Italian workers on strike, and general fear of civil war.

27th. British railroad strike. 600,000 men out.

Emma Goldman released from Missouri Penitentiary.

28th. OMAHA CITY mob wrecks County Court House, lynches Wm. Brown, Negro, and nearly kills Mayor Smith.

29th. NEW YORK CITY police demand minimum salary of $2,000.

30th. ARGENTINA. General strike in province of Mendoza, in support of Teachers Union who demanded resignation of Provincial Director of Schools.

OCTOBER

1st. NEW YORK CITY. 250 printing firms lock out 10,000 press room men whose unions have been disowned by their International as too radical.

ARKANSAS. Race riots, 3 whites and 7 Negroes killed.

Berkman released from Atlanta.

2nd. *New York Times* Rome cable reports Socialist Deputies in Italian Parliament just dissolved have addressed manifesto to the nation condemning the war as "death to all liberties."

NORTH DAKOTA. State Banking Board declares Scandinavian-American Bank of Fargo insolvent, and orders it placed in receiver's hands. Townley of Nonpartisan League asserts this a dodge of political opponents.

3rd. RUSSIA. Soviet Government issues wireless message declaring that peace with Allies on terms reported by Bullitt still stand. "We do not wish to impose communism on anybody."

4th. GEORGIA mob burns two negroes alive.

Hadji Lasket, one of band of Russians arrested in Stockholm for belonging to a political murder band, confesses that murders were directed against Bolshevism.

6th. WASHINGTON, D. C. National Industrial Conference opens.

OCTOBER

BRITAIN. Railroad strike ends, on following terms: (1) Work to be resumed at once. (2) Negotiations to be resumed, and completed by December 31. (3) Wages stabilized till September 30, 1920. (4) Minimum wage to adult railroad men of $12.75 per week while living cost is 110 per cent. above pre-war rates. (5) No discrimination against strikers, nor by them against non-strikers. (6) Wage arrears to be paid on work resumption.

GARY, INDIANA. 2,000 steel strikers parade without permit, led by hundreds of discharged soldiers, captains and privates side side by side, a dozen combat divisions' insignia showing, and American flag at head. Mayor Hodges calls Federal troops, Gen. L. Wood, with machine guns and overseas troops declares martial law, and commands all discharged men to take off uniforms.

7th. WEIRTON, W. VA. 150 Finns, alleged "Reds," rounded up, made to kiss American flag and driven out of town by heavily armed police and deputies. No resistance was offered.

SAARBRUCKEN: Saar district. French troops crush miners' strike. Strikers demanded same increase of wage other non-occupied German coal areas were giving.

8th. General Petlura forms coalition ministry in Ukraine. Denikin's troops attack Ukrainians.

Hugo Haase, leader of German Independent Socialists, shot in Berlin, just before he was to expose the government Baltic policy in the National Assembly.

9th. NEW YORK CITY. Mounted police ride down and brutally club peaceful parade of 5,000 Russian workers on Fifth Avenue. Parade held to protest against the starvation blockade on Russia.

BRITAIN. Premier Lloyd George publicly breaks pledge to adopt the Sankey report (Coal Mines) in conference with miners' leaders. Declares nationalization not in interest of the state.

Cardinal Mercier before New York State Chamber of Commerce says radical socialism menaces Belgium. "We are all together, you with me and I with you, to do what we can to keep up respect for the legitimate rights of property."

10th. Philip Gibbs cables from Brussels of war millionaires' luxury and soldiers' and workers' poverty and unrest.

NEW YORK HARBOR. 70,000 longshoremen out on strike, in spite of union officials, demanding one big industrial union.

OCTOBER

GARY, IND. Stockade is built for Federal prisoners by Leonard Wood's army. Prisoners ("radicals") may be put to work street cleaning, or deported, reports Col. Mapes.

11th. BREST, FRANCE. 4,000 arsenal workers on strike parade with red and black flags.

MARSEILLES, FRANCE. General strike resumed.

SICILY. Peasant revolt assumes serious character. "Red Guards" armed with machine guns established.

13th. LONDON cable reports British Socialist Party decides by overwhelming vote to join Third International (Moscow).

14th. NEW YORK ferry strike ends with 9 per cent. increase in pay.

15th. DUBLIN. Sinn Fein Convention held secretly in defiance of Government orders.

18th. VIENNA cable declares Burgomaster Reumann appeals to U. S. for help: "We have been rendered a city of mendicants. 75 per cent. of the families in the city are now living in one or two rooms."

15th. ONTARIO Province Government severely defeated by farmer-labor combination at elections.

22nd. WASHINGTON, D. C. Gompers and labor group withdraw from Industrial Conference when employers' group refuse to accept resolution adopted by Public and Labor.

24th. WASHINGTON, D. C. Senator McKellar, Dem., introduces bill to deport aliens not naturalized after five years, and to provide penal colony on Philippine Islands for "anarchists."

House Elections Committee denies seat in Congress to Victor Berger by 8 votes to 1.

28th. WASHINGTON, D. C. International Congress of Working Women.

29th. WASHINGTON, D. C. A. F. of L. issues joint call with Railway Brotherhoods for conference, in the Capital on Dec. 18, of the 112 international unions' officials, Brotherhoods' officials and Farmers' representatives, in order to agree on program to protect rights of wage-earners.

International Labor Conference meets.

SWITZERLAND. Socialist Party gains 19 seats, giving Party 39 seats in a House of 184 members.

NOVEMBER

1st. U. S. A. Coal strike begins.

3rd. SPAIN. Employers lock out workers in Barcelona to crush labor organizations, which include professional men as well as laborers.

4th. NEW YORK Socialists elect 4 aldermen for city and 5 assemblymen for the State.

NOVEMBER

6th. NEW YORK. Nation Press, printer of the *Socialist Review*, gives 40-hour week, wage increase on basis of final settlement, and establishes profit-sharing and a "shop council."

NEWFOUNDLAND Government defeated by opposition, dominated by Fishermen's Protective Union (labor).

RUSSIA. Soviet Government makes peace offer to Allies and asks for conference in neutral country.

7th. BERLIN. Hugo Haase, President of the Independent Socialist Party, dies of wounds received at hands of assassin on Oct. 8.

U. S. A. Nation-wide drive on "reds" by police and federal authorities. Hundreds released after being badly beaten up by the police.

8th. INDIANAPOLIS. Julge A. B. Anderson grants Government a mandatory injunction in Federal Court ordering officials of United Mine Workers of America to call off the Coal Strike before 6 p. m., Nov. 11, or take the consequences.

9th. WASHINGTON, D. C. Executive Committee of A. F. of L. denounces Government action on coal strike, and gives full support to miners.

11th. U. S. A. leaders call off coal strike.

I. S. S. Convention to be held in New York City during Christmas Holidays

Intercollegiate Socialist Society

The Intercollegiate Socialist Society was formed in 1905, "to promote an intelligent interest in Socialism among collegians and educated men and women generally." It is an educational, not a political propagandist organization. It exacts no creed of its members, and welcomes to its ranks all who are genuinely interested in securing more light on Socialism and allied subjects.

Present and former students of colleges and other institutions above the grade of high school are eligible to active membership in the Society; non-collegians are eligible to auxiliary membership.

The annual dues of the Society are $3, $5 (contributing membership) and $25 or more (sustaining membership). The above classes of members are entitled to receive *The Socialist Review*, and other publications of the society; to a 10% reduction on books, and to all privileges of alumni chapters.

For special membership rates to undergraduates in college chapters, communicate with the Society.

Socialism Is the Most Important Mass Movement in the World Today

YOU MAY DISAGREE ABOUT SOCIALIST IDEALS, BUT YOU CANNOT DISAGREE OVER WHETHER YOU SHOULD TRY TO UNDERSTAND THEM.

JOIN

The Intercollegiate Socialist Society

70 Fifth Avenue Educational Building New York City

You may help the Society in the following ways:

(1) By becoming a dues-paying member;
(2) By sending contributions;
(3) By aiding in the organization and the strengthening of undergraduate and graduate chapters;
(4) By obtaining subscriptions for *The Socialist Review.*

Workers for the World State

The great war of armies has ended. But the greater struggle for freedom of thought and expression has only begun.

Men of good will in every country are gathering for the battle for a great ideal.

But that the objective may be gained, it is imperative that there be concerted action. Defective understanding of the problems of one part of the field of battle by another will retard the advance.

The intelligence, and above all the liaison system must be as perfect as possible.