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Foreword to the Fourth Edition

The lectures in this book were delivered in Masonic Temple, Chicago, during the five Sundays in March, 1918. On March 9, the day before the second one was delivered, announcement was made by the United States District Attorney of Chicago that I had been indicted, together with Victor L. Berger, Adolph Germer, J. L. Engdahl and William F. Kruse—all officials of the Socialist Party—for conspiracy to obstruct the draft. In spite of this, however, the lectures were not interrupted, and were delivered to increasing crowds. They were printed some months later in pamphlet form, one lecture at a time, and subsequently were bound up in book form; which accounts for the system of paging, each lecture being numbered by itself.

It will be seen that at the time of their delivery, the German Empire was at the height of its apparent military success; the Allies were fighting with their "backs to the wall," as General Haig confessed; and the only danger to the Kaiser's armies seemed to be the Russian revolution, which lay like a thundercloud to the East. Brest-Litovsk had resulted in the inclusion of large areas of Russian territory, filled with revolutionists trained in the hard school of the Czar's terrorism, within the empire of the German Kaiser. It was a fatal error. The infection of Bolshevism spread, and in November the German sailors mutinied, the German Socialists of Berlin and Wilhelms-hafen revolted, the Kaiser was chased out of Berlin into Holland, and the armistice was signed.

Readers will perceive that many references in this book to events as they stood when the lectures were given are out of date now, just a year later; but the general texture of the book remains true. The demand for it has increased with every month. The first edition, ready in July, was speedily exhausted; new editions were printed in September and in January, and these have all gone. Meanwhile the sentence of 20 years in Fort Leavenworth has been pronounced and our appeal is on its way to the Supreme Court.

Other books supplementing the philosophy of history here set forth are on their way through the press. The roots of the present situation, which lie so deeply in the past are bringing forth fresh fruit every hour. But out of the wreck and confusion of the world-downfall, one fact emerges more and more surely, and one strength grows stronger hour by hour; the Internationalism of the League of Nations, which is an international collection agency for gamblers' war debts, is giving way before the Internationalism of the working classes of the nations united in a co-operative commonwealth of Socialism.

Long live the International!

IRWIN ST. JOHN TUCKER.

April 1, 1919.
Lecture 1.

The German Idea: “Deutschland ueber Alles”

Origin of the Kaiser idea in the empire of the Roman Caesars; Speculators in ancient Rome.—How Augustus came to power.—Invasion of the Goths.—The German Caesars.—Pope and Emperor.—The Reformation and the Thirty Years War.—Napoleon I. and III.—Crowning of the German Kaiser.—A New Religion Necessary; the Religion of Valor.—Treitschke; Wagner: the German Socialists.
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THE GERMAN IDEA

"Deutschland ueber Alles"

INTERNATIONALISM—the relation between nations—always has been the supreme problem of the world. Now more than at any other time its solution insistently demands the agonized attention of all intelligent persons everywhere. For the present world war arises out of the unstable balance between groups of national powers, as all past world wars have revolved around the question of the relations of nation to nation.

In the past the question of Internationalism has always been one of Imperialism. There has been hardly any other idea of the relation between nations, save that one nation should dominate all others, imposing its will and its tribute upon them. In its extreme form this idea of Imperialism dominates Germany today. Understanding Germany becomes a supreme necessity of the hour. Admitting that the Germans are all crazy—even admitting that they are crazier than the rest of us—it is of vital importance to discover what made them crazy.

When I was a small boy there was a crazy woman in one of the small towns near my home, a woman of whom all the children stood in terror. We shrank into the shelter of boxes and barrels whenever she came near. Not until years later I did find out why she was crazy. Her father had been wealthy, and left quite a bit of property to her brother and herself. Her brother, desiring to enjoy it all, shut her up for fourteen years in a small wooden outhouse, throwing her food through a hole in the wall, allowing her no heat in winter. At the end of those fourteen years, when she was eventually set free, she was hopelessly insane. We did not know it then; but there was a reason for her insanity. There is always a reason for insanity, even though it lie far back in the mists of heredity.

When one reads such quotations as these following, taken from the German press and from some of their best known writers, it is hard to believe at first that they are seriously meant:

"The German soul is the world’s soul; God and Germany belong to one another."—"He who does not believe in the Divine mission of Germany had better hang himself, and better today than tomorrow."—"Germany is chosen, for her own good and that of other nations, to undertake their guidance. Providence has
placed the appointed people, at the appointed moment, ready for
the appointed task.”—“It was the hidden meaning of God that he
made Israel the Forerunner of the Messiah, and in the same way
he has by his hidden intent designated the German people to be
Israel’s successor.”—“We are the supreme people.”

But these sayings are types of what the German people were
taught to believe; and the fact that the British, French and
Americans were all saying practically the same things simply
intensifies our horror at the blasphemy of the Germans.

This with which we have to deal is no sudden thing. Modern
Germany appears to the diplomats of Europe as an upstart nation,
born since 1870. But her own vision looks back over her history
in Europe through centuries of dazzling if barbaric splendor.
Before Bismarck; before Napoleon; before Luther; through
glorious centuries the Germanic race, headed by their hero-kings,
—Otto, Conrad, Frederick,—ruled Europe by imperial decree.

H. S. Chamberlain, a transplanted Englishman, says boldly:
“Just such a systematic transformation of the world as Augustus
effected Germany must now undertake—but on how much nobler
a plan!” And even with the name of Augustus there comes a
glow of pride. For it was German legions under Arminius that
halted the victorious march of the Roman conqueror of the world.
The crown of Augustus now rests, it is the boast of the Germans,
on the head of Wilhelm, who succeeds not only to the crown but
to the name of Caesar; and with its Germanized form of “Kaiser”
now terrifies the world.

It takes a historian to understand the present. We have a
historian as President; and the future will be grateful to Woodrow
Wilson for his foreign statesmanship, based on impartial accurate
historical knowledge. It is to his deep comprehension of the issues
involved—in other lands—that is due his conception of the method
of obtaining a permanent peace; namely to divide between the
German rulers and their people, and by encouraging the growth
of radical and revolutionary sentiment in Germany to overthrow
the imperial-militaristic group, and to bring about the democratiza-
tion of Germany. With this aim the People’s Council is in hearty
accord; and has so expressed itself, openly and unequivocally,
whenever the Berserker rage of our war-mad politicians has suf-
fered it to meet and formulate its views.

The People’s Council, however, takes one further step; and
that is that the radical forces in Germany can be encouraged only
by the encouragement of radical forces in this country. We are
organized to focus together the radical American sentiment on
the task of bringing to an end the evil thing out of which Im-
perialism, with its attendant Militarism, must continue to spring,
until it is destroyed; namely, Capitalism, or Monopolistic Privilege,
which lies at the root of Empire.

In these lectures I shall endeavor to trace the course of the
great evolution, which has resulted in the World War. For so
tremendous a catastrophe could not have been hatched in the
brooding of a night. We must look far back in history, and under-
stand many hidden things in the past, before we can begin to comprehend the present; and upon our comprehension of the Present rests the salvation of the Future.

THE SHADOW OF ROME.

Bounding the horizon of all Europe as we look back into history lies the tremendous shadow of Rome. Without a comprehension of that Empire’s history it is impossible to comprehend any modern European state. The very words which are so much in men’s minds today—“imperialism”; “internationalism”; “Empire”;—even “Kaiser”—are all Roman words, and derive their meaning from that gigantic phenomenon of Rome which determined the course of all subsequent history in the lands which were touched by its power.

At every great crisis in history, the story of Rome renews its fascination for the minds of men. Like a great shadowy drama perpetually reenacted in the clouds, the events that took place in the Forum and on the battlefields of the City by the Tiber hover over Europe during every epoch in its slow and bloody evolution.

When the French Revolution shattered the framework of Feudalism, men’s minds naturally reverted to Dictators, and Triumvirs, and Consuls. Jefferson and Washington were fascinated by the thoughts of Brutus, of Cicero, and of Seneca. Even modern Britain feels their power.

S. K. Ratcliffe, an English labor lecturer recently in this city, saw me one night with a copy of Guglielmo Ferrero’s wonderful history of the “Greatness and Decline of Rome”, from which I shall quote extensively, under my arm.

“Oh yes”, he said, “Ferrero. That is the only modern book which Lloyd George has ever read. He presents copies of it to all of his friends. He says it proves conclusively that all of the great men of modern Britain were living in ancient Rome—with the exception of Lloyd George.”

I remarked that perhaps Lloyd George felt, but did not want to say, that Lloyd George was really Augustus Caesar come back; and Ratcliffe replied with a twinkle, “Do you know, I have often thought that myself.”

Kaiser Wilhelm II. has said, many times, that five men in history have deeply influenced him; Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Theodoric II., Napoleon I., and Frederick the Great. This chain of great names establishes the connection between the empire-possession of the Roman Caesars and the empire-obsession of modern Germany. So far as I know the chain of the Caesar-idea has never been traced continuously down; but there is an unbroken descent of the claim of world-dominion from Julius Caesar of Rome down to Kaiser Wilhelm of Berlin; a claim which gives the clue to the troubled and disastrous history of the Middle Ages, and which alone explains the tremendous thing we now are witnessing. The roots of the madness of Kaiser Wilhelm lie buried deep, deep in the constitution of ancient Rome.
In the middle of the fifth century before Christ,—that is, from 450 to 400 B. C.—Rome, the future Mistress of the World, was a raw Wild Western community on the extreme outskirts of the civilized world occupying an area of some 400 square miles—ten miles by forty—with a population certainly not exceeding 150,000 persons. These were dispersed over the countryside, divided amongst the seventeen rural tribes. The community was composed mainly of free peasants; the aristocrats were simply well-to-do farmers, who came to town once in every few months or so to do their shopping or to cast their votes. The government was thoroughly Republican, consisting of two Consuls, elected annually, in pairs, so that they could keep watch upon each other; a Senate representing the wealthier classes and former office-holders; an Assembly of Tribes, whose members were called Tribunes—"one from the tribe"; and an Assembly of Centuries, the two assemblies corresponding roughly to our House of Representatives. The Knights, or the Capitalist order, was formed of the sons of Senators together with the plebeians of wealth and distinction. All these various bodies kept watch upon one another to prevent anything from being done contrary to the general welfare; with the natural result that in the early days, very little of anything was done by the central government at all.

A PRIMITIVE MONOPOLY.

Rome's beginning of greatness lay in one simple and significant fact. She commanded the salt supply for Central Italy. Her location was originally determined by the fact that the main road down the peninsula crossed the Tiber just at that point, where the road from the Salt-Pans of Ostia met it. The oldest road of Rome's great network of highways was that to Ostia, and was called the "Via-Salaria"—Salt road; Salary Way. The word "salaria" originally meant "salt allowance"; salt-money. In view of the prevailing scarcity of sweets, our weekly wages might seem like more if we called them "saccharary"—sugar money.

Salt and timber were the only exports of Rome until comparatively late in her primitive history. Her rise roughly dates from the settling of the nomadic tribes down to agriculture as a means of living. For roast meat, the food of all nomads, contains its own salt within it, but cereals and all agricultural products require salt to make them eatable. As the roving tribes of the interior therefore became tillers of the soil they required salt, and Rome controlled the salt supply. By virtue of this monopoly she was able to make advantageous alliances and treaties with all towns and tribes of Central Italy.

But that which made Rome's dominion permanent was her military system, and, as a part of that, her strict ideals of family discipline. Colonies of her young men were settled in all parts of the peninsula, where they established the same system. Admira-
tion for these stern virtues led to their imitation by other cities; and thus Rome's influence grew.

Her expansion brought her into inevitable conflict with the great trading power of the Mediterranean, Carthage, about the year 250 B.C. Rome's methodical forces of patience and tenacity were pitted against the wealth and quick witted ingenuity of the mistress of the seas. In this great conflict it was found that the Roman State, with its limited number of magistrates and its complicated system of checks and balances, while ample for the needs of a small agricultural community, was entirely unable to cope with the sudden and imperative demands of a world war.

RISE OF THE SPECULATORS.

Consequently the state entrusted the building of its war-fleets and the equipment of its armies to private contractors and middlemen. A host of speculators arose. The situation was almost exactly similar to that of our own government, when finding itself unable through its War Department and its Navy Department to meet the sudden emergencies of our entry into the Great War, it called upon the private contractors to do its work for it. The Hog Island Navy Yard steal, the Army Uniform scandal, the Beef Trust investigation, and the amazing profits reaped by members of the National Council of Defense from the contracts which they let to their own firms, are illustration of what happened in ancient Rome, though there on a smaller scale.

Roman speculators, middlemen-contractors, and munitions-making firms, reaped huge harvests from the Punic Wars. The conquest of Magna Graecia, of Sicily, of Corsica, of Sardinia, of Gaul and eventually of Carthage, increased greatly the income and the expenditure of the State. Whenever there was war the speculators and contractors grew rich; hence they sighed for war and ever for more wars. By the peculiar electoral system of Rome this plunder was not confined to the court and the king's favorites, as in the despotic states of the East. Every one got a share of it. Successful generals divided their plunder with the Senate as a matter of course. The voters came in for their share through the huge sums offered by candidates for office. There was not the opposition of the working classes to war which we find in modern states, due to the fact that in our time labor must pay all war's expenses through taxation and enforced loans, while the enterprising contractors and investors who speculate in war and war's profits reap all the benefits. War in ancient days was based on the theory that the loser paid all the costs.

It became far more easy to get rich through plundering a town or province while in the army, and then coming home to invest one's gains in a munitions or equipment firm, and securing a fat contract for army supplies, than by the slower and no more honorable process of earning it on the farm. Shares in munitions-supply companies sold at a premium on the Forum. But of all the
forms of investment, the most popular was the tax-farming syndicate. Whenever a new province was conquered, the Senate assessed its yearly tribute at such and such a figure, and then turned the collection of this sum over to the highest bidder. Whatever the tax-farming company could extort from the luckless inhabitants over and above taxes was theirs to divide. Hence shares in the successful bidder for the taxes of a new province sometimes sold for as high as 1,000 per cent. Those were wild days on the Stock Exchange in the Forum of ancient Rome.

Speculation in lands was also an extremely popular and profitable method of getting rich quick. Speculation in slaves brought undreamed-of wealth. With all of these new opportunities opening out for the enterprising youth, what wonder that the farm lost its attractiveness, and the young men crowded into Rome?

Free labor also was underbid and underworked by the armies of slaves who tilled the farms of the wealthy. A free peasant could not meet the competition of slave labor; and he with his family also packed off to Rome. There the price of land increased with population. Tenements of wood, many stories high, were packed with the slum-dwellers of ancient Rome. Tiberius Caesar lived in a palace which fronted on a street less than seven feet wide. What manner of filth and squalid wretchedness obtained in the tenements inhabited by the very poor it is impossible for us to imagine. But at least these very poor had their share in the distribution of the plunders of the successful generals.

The driving force behind the Roman armies was, then, the greed of the middlemen-contractors and the speculators. But how was it that their armies were so successful?

Rome's method was scientific. It was known as "state-devouring". For a long term of years her statesmen devoted themselves to weakening the Eastern states by fomenting internal dissensions. No matter which side was in the right or whether either side was in the right, they always championed the cause of the weaker party; on the general theory that the weaker party would be glad of so powerful an adherent as Rome, and would make concessions to hold her support. But as soon as the weaker party triumphed and became dominant, Rome's statesmen would desert her former friends and again champion the weaker side. By this means, almost without striking a blow, they made Rome the dominant power in the whole chain of kingdoms to the Eastward.

Then came the bequest of Attalus, King of Pergamus, who on dying willed his kingdom to the Senate and People of Rome. Why the wily old monarch took this step it is hard to say, unless he knew that Rome would conquer his people anyhow, and desired to avoid the bloodshed of a disastrous war. In any event, the vast plunder of Asia Minor opened the eyes and whetted the appetites of the Roman people. Trainloads of luxuries and treasures were transported to Rome on caravans of donkeys and mules. Later on the King of Bithynia followed the example of King Attalus; and Lucullus sacked the Kingdom of Pontus.
These vast treasures kindled the appetites of the Romans to an insatiable fury. Until that time Rome had been a crude rough town, seeming to the cultured dwellers of the East very much as Carson City, Nev., and Cheyenne, Wyo., seem to the Brahmins of Boston. With the tide of barbaric splendor which came rolling in from these new acquisitions to the east, Rome's face was set eastward and her armies were launched at one after the other of the great states, to bring them to the dust, and their treasures to Rome.

**ROME'S METHOD OF GOVERNMENT.**

And here again we confront a puzzle; how did Rome, with her comparatively small armies, crush so many barbarian hordes sent against her?

Ferrero estimates that at the time of Rome's greatest expansion, her army did not consist of more than 200,000 men, and her governing staff was not over 2,000 men. There are that many office holders in the Chicago City Hall, not including the County Building. How did Rome govern the world with so few?

Ferrero's answer is this; every ancient kingdom had a horde of parasites and bloodsuckers who clustered around the king and his court; an army, an national priesthood, a nobility. Rome dismissed all of these parasites, disbanded all armies save her own, closed all the palaces, and in the place of the swarm of office-holders and petty nobility established one provincial governor with four or five secretaries. All the graft that was paid had to be paid to him; otherwise, people could do very much as they pleased. People knew who was boss, and who had to be bribed; but after they had settled with the Roman, they were through. Rome's army was small, compared with the vast extent of her dominions. But through her system of roads, this army could be moved with lightning speed against any force which opposed it, and concentrated on any point which was threatened.

At the heart of this vast expansion there still lay the Senate, the Assemblies and the Consuls, rapidly revolving from year to year. Still the gift of the generalship and the imperatorship lay in the hands of the Roman electorate. Still the Senate was theoretically supreme. It was the general Lucullus who laid the foundation of the Empire by his sudden assertion that the Imperator, the commander-in-chief on the field, was supreme and independent of the Senate. Lucullus was on the march against Mithridates, king of Pontus. The campaign was at crucial stage, when Lucullus received word that the Senate was about to recall him and substitute another general. Lucullus thereupon announced that as Imperator, as commander-in-chief on the field, he knew more about the needs of the case than did the Senate. He therefore negotiated a treaty with Mithridates, plundered several cities, and came home laden with vast riches, only to find the gates of the city shut in his face because of political differences within. Whereupon he remarked, in Roman, "All right, friends, the more fools
you” and turned with his caravan of gold and jewels to his own estate, where out of the proceeds of his plunder he built himself the most splendid mansion known in Roman history. From the crest of the hill overlooking Rome he spent his declining days in unimaginable luxury, meditating on the follies of a democracy.

But the precedent established by Lucullus, that the Imperator could declare war, make peace and sign treaties on his own initiative, became the foundation principle of the Imperium Romanum. With the increase in the value of the prizes to be fought for at Rome, the strife between the parties became ever more and more keen. Sulla, leader of the standpat Republicans, was elected Dictator, or as we would say Speaker; and proceeded to kill all the Democratic party leaders. This was some years after Marius had been elected Speaker by the Democrats, and had proceeded to kill all the party leaders of the Republicans. This left a shortage of leaders, with power resting in the hands of the men who could control the army.

ENTRY OF CAESAR.

And now Caius Julius Caesar enters upon the scene—Caesar, the man whose name has become synonymous with autocratic and military empire. Few things are stranger in history than the chain of events by which a young man ambitious only of becoming a lecturer and author and of keeping out of debt was transformed by force of circumstances into the central pivot of the world’s history. Caesar, trying to back out of debt, backed into an empire.

The older histories seemed to be written on the assumption that Julius Caesar in his young days said to himself: “Go to, now; on my fortieth birthday I will be master of Gaul; then I will cross the Rubicon; then I will become emperor; after that, although I will be assassinated on the Ides of March, all future emperors will call themselves by my name.” But nothing is further from the truth. Caesar studied elocution and poetry; he ran up huge debts partly for clothes for himself, and partly for the ancient equivalent of flowers and candy to all the debutantes in Rome and over most of the East. In order to get out of debt he simply had to get elected to office; but all his schemes failed and every one of his efforts met with disaster until he formed an alliance with Clodius, a disreputable son of a wealthy family, a sort of Harry K. Thaw of his time.

Clodius, for a lark, disguised as a woman and attended a meeting, held in Caesar’s home, of an anti-birth-control society to which most of the fashionable matrons of Rome belonged. He was discovered, and a huge outcry resulted. In order to protect himself from exile, he organized a sort of Tammany Hall among the tenements of Rome, a voting society which virtually controlled the polls in the same way as the River Wards of Chicago or the East Side of New York control the elections in those cities. It was by the backing of this Tammany Hall that Julius Caesar finally rose to power.
Does it seem absurd to say that the mightiest empire of the world rose on the shoulders of a Tammany Hall? But stranger things than that have happened even in recent times. If one reads the history of the Democratic convention in Baltimore in 1912, one discovers that it was the river wards of Chicago, the Cook County Democracy, which nominated Woodrow Wilson to be President of the Human Race.*

The Chicago News on July 3, 1912, declared "Wilson Victory due to Illinois". Roger Sullivan was given the credit for having nominated the winner. "Thank God for Wilson"—why not thank Roger Sullivan for Wilson?

In any event, Caesar received the backing of Clodius and his Tammany Hall; and Caesar made a coalition with Pompey, the idol of the army, who had enriched every soldier as the result of his plunder in Syria; and with Crassus, the richest man in Rome. Crassus was a combination of Vincent Astor and J. P. Morgan. His fortune was largely based upon purchase of the estates of the proscribed, or exiled, for little or nothing. He organized certain of his slaves into a company of skilled firemen, and whenever a conflagration broke out he with his slaves would be promptly on the scene. Crassus would offer the owner of the burning building or of the buildings immediately surrounding it some ridiculously low figure for his property—say ten dollars for a $5,000 house—and the owner was usually glad to get anything for it, because there was no fire-fighting system and no fire insurance in ancient Rome. Whereupon Crassus sent his slaves in to save the building, and reaped the difference as profit.

There is no positive proof that Crassus set houses on fire in order to buy them cheap, but there are abundant accusations to that effect. But inasmuch as he was for a long time in control of the courts which would have to try such a suit nothing ever came of such accusations. It was also freely charged that many of the exiled persons whose goods Crassus bought in cheap were

*It will be remembered that on the first day of that memorable convention William J. Bryan fired a bomb by introducing a resolution barring J. P. Morgan, August Belmont, and Thomas F. Ryan from the convention, on ground that they represented predatory wealth. The vote on this was 889 to 196, Belmont and Ryan voting for it in a cynical mood. Bryan then dominated the convention.

On the first ballot on nomination for President, Champ Clark had 440½ votes; Woodrow Wilson, 324; Oscar Underwood, 117, and Judson Harmon, 148. On the tenth ballot Charles F. Murphy, leader of Tammany Hall, flopped to Champ Clark, bringing him very close to the nomination. There were conferences at the end of the first day between Charles F. Murphy, Roger C. Sullivan, Thomas Taggart—worthy representatives of a great national party!

Bryan asked Wilson to repudiate the alliance between Murphy and Clark; Wilson refused. Bryan thereupon announced that he would support no man whose nomination depended upon the support of the New York delegation, or who did not condemn the unholy alliance of Wall Street gold with Tammany votes. Wilson still was mute.

On the 43rd ballot, Roger C. Sullivan cast the votes of the river wards of Chicago for Wilson; this carried with it the votes of the entire Illinois delegation; and on the 46th ballot, Wilson was declared nominated.
exiled at his request; and this is highly probable. In any event this combination of an arson trust and real estate gambling business soon made Crassus the creditor of a majority of Senators and most of the judges, so that he could be sure of getting a quick majority on anything he desired.

Thus the first Triumvirate was in reality a combination of the Army, Wall Street and Tammany Hall, and swept everything before it. Caesar as the politician of the group consistently championed the demands of the lowest of the poor, and thus commanded their votes. Crassus held the threat of foreclosure over the Senators; Pompey backed up his colleagues with the military power.

Caesar at last saw his chance to get rich. He wanted to set out at once on the conquest of Parthia and bring home its unimaginable spoils to pay off all his creditors. But the way was temporarily blocked by a foolish political squabble, and Caesar set out for Gaul instead. In order to keep himself before the eyes of the populace, he invented the daily newspaper. In several quarters of Rome he had large walls whitewashed and on them had daily bulletins written of his exploits and victories, so that his name was always on the lips of the vast throngs who gathered around them, like the crowds around the baseball bulletins of today. His book "De Bello Gallico" was written as a source of campaign material, to be used in the consular elections. It was Caesar who first perceived the necessity of control of the press, that secret of modern political power, the prize for which British and German finances strove in America until British finance won.

The conquest of Gaul was only a temporary and distasteful interlude in Caesar's career, taken up because there was nothing else to do at the time; but the ultimate result of it was to keep the Empire centered at Rome. For the tremendous pull of the East would have swung the administrative center over to some such site as Constantinople centuries before it did change, had not Gaul developed into the granary of the empire.

But while Caesar was in Gaul, quarrels arose between himself and Pompey. Caesar was heavily in debt, and there were those among his creditors who accused him of swindling. Now it was a principle of Roman law that no official could be tried during his term of office. That was one reason why all terms of office were limited to one year. Caesar's term as General ran out in March, 49. He was anxious to be elected Consul while still holding office as General, in order to avoid being summoned to trial as a private person. The Senate refused to extend his term; and Caesar crossed the Rubicon at the head of his troops to enforce his claims for an extension. Pompey and the Senate, alarmed and dismayed, abandoned the city and fled to Greece. Caesar on arriving at Rome found that all the office holders had abandoned their jobs. He simply had to become dictator and to hold all the other vacant offices, because nobody else would do any work, being all afraid of him.
Caesar, however, was still in debt; and he was arranging to go on his long deferred expedition to Parthia after the final defeat of Pompey, when he was assassinated. His debts never were paid in full.

Caesar's assassination left Marcus Antonius and Octavianus Caesar, his adopted nephew, rivals for his post of supreme command. After twenty more years of bloody struggle, Octavianus defeated Antony at Actium. The story of this defeat as told in "Anthony and Cleopatra" by Shakespeare, is far from the mark. The truth is revealed by Ferrero in his book "Characters and Events in Ancient Rome", where he shows that Anthony had married Cleopatra in order to become King of Egypt, with the intention of transferring the seat of the world's empire to Alexandria. When this intention became known to his generals and men, they deserted him in the heat of battle and left Octavianus undisputed master of the world.

GROWTH OF IMPERIAL POWER.

Octavianus took the title of Augustus Caesar merely to indicate that he was the chief of the magistrates. He was given the title of "princeps", or first judge, in common parlance, a title of republican usage and conveying no other idea than that of precedence over his fellow citizens.

Every five or ten years Augustus would come up for re-election, and his was the only name proposed. It was quite similar to the Democratic convention at St. Louis in 1916, when only one name was presented for the Presidential nomination, and that of a man who had taken office on a plank pledging him to a single term; and when the platform for the new campaign was brought to the Convention in the pocket of the Secretary of War.

Augustus was never elected emperor, in our modern sense. He simply was appointed to all the offices in the cabinet jointly, and reelected to them every few years for the rest of his life. He controlled the roads and the finances, the army was under his direction, and he supervised the judicial system as Chief Magistrate. He also was voted the "tribunician power" and the control of the Food Administration; he became pontifex maximus, or official keeper of the national conscience. Augustus used to boast that he "held no office which was contrary to the spirit of republican Rome." This was true; the only difference was that he held all of these offices at once.

In fact the foundation of the Empire of the Caesars was closely analogous to the system adopted by this country at the beginning of the war, when Mr. McAdoo, the Secretary of the Treasury, became Director-General of the Railroads, president of the Federal Reserve Bank system, president of the Federal Farm Loan system, ex officio chairman of the Emergency Shipping Corporation, chairman of the Federal Finance Corporation, in addition to being son-in-law of the President and heir apparent to the Democratic crown.
"Augustus", says Ferrero, "governed as little as he could. He passed as few laws as the empire could get along with. He devoted himself chiefly to reorganizing the finances and to building roads." Under these conditions the Graeco-Roman empire developed a volume of trade that was amazing. The Mediterranean was at peace. Fleets of merchant ships crossed it without fear of pirates. Caravans of traffickers moved along the great military roads without molestation from bandits. All boundaries were down, and commercial relations between the provinces bound the furthest limits of the empire together with links of gold, stronger than bands of steel.

Into this great unity there came a new element, the religion of Christianity. In every great city Christian churches were formed, gradually drawing into themselves the best minds of every community. A long and bitter conflict developed between the religion of the Emperor, which was the religion of the ruling classes, and the religion of Christ, which was the faith of the great proletarian masses. In the year 312 Constantine declared that Christianity was the faith of the Empire. The bishops became officials of the government; and it became fashionable to go to church.

In the vast extension of the empire, with the ultimate granting of Roman citizenship by the emperor Caracalla to all natives of its territories, the idea grew up of the unity of the human race, with its two natural heads, the emperor as the natural civil head, and the Pope, head of the church, as the natural spiritual head. When Constantine moved the empire's capital to Constantinople, he left the Bishop of Rome in the ancient city as the most important personage thereof. When the Goths invaded Rome and came to the gates of the imperial city, Pope Leo went forth to meet them; and the barbarians, awed by patriarchal presence, left the city untouched. This greatly increased the prestige of the Church.

Ferrero tells how Nero roused the bitter antagonism of the Romans by bringing all the splendors of the East into the imperial palace, thus abandoning the ancient tradition of Republican simplicity, quite as much as by his insane vanity in going off on the Chautauqua platform. It hurt the Roman pride to see their Emperor appearing on the stage between a juggler and an acrobat to win the applause of the populace by his latest popular chorus, very much as it hurt the pride of the American people to see W. J. Bryan, when Secretary of State, and their Vice-President, sandwiched in at popular entertainments between a black-face minstrel show and a performing monkey. But what hurt them worst was his importation of the ostentation and display of Eastern monarchs into the sober palaces of the old aristocracy. For our ideas of Roman luxury are greatly exaggerated. Augustus passed a law (18 B. C.) forbidding the expenditure of more than $10 altogether on a banquet held on a festal day; on Kalends and Nones as much as 300 sesterces or $15 might be spent, while the outside limit on a bridal banquet was $50. When computed
in sesterces these amounts seem large; but a Roman sestertium equalled an American nickel. A ten-dollar dinner sounds imposing when we refer to it as having cost two hundred sesterces. But Nero's feasts were like a Newport, R. I., debut.

It was Nero who started the fashion of burning Christians to distract attention from his own follies. It was he who condemned St. Paul to death. But the religion of Paul and the luxury of Nero joined hands in later days, says Ferrero, and the splendor of the East decorated the temples of the Nazarene.

**INVASION OF THE GOTHS.**

Along the Northern border of the Roman empire the German tribes hung, dark, sinister and menacing. They had never been conquered by the Roman armies. Augustus sent Varus against them, and when he received the news that his armies had been exterminated by the German hordes under Arminius the old man walked up and down his palace halls all night, wringing his hands and crying "Varus, Varus, give me back my legions!" In the fifth century after Christ the invasion of the barbarians began, and disaster overwhelmed the Empire. Yet the Goths did not invade the Roman empire to destroy it, but to enjoy it. They saw that the Southern lands were filled with a luxury which they themselves longed to possess, and they flocked in their millions out of the cold darkness of their native forests into the warmth and light of Rome. They came in like a bull into a china-shop, seeking culture, desiring only to enjoy the china. It was not their fault that the china broke beneath the weight of their admiration. Everywhere the Gothic chieftains adopted the titles and customs and laws and religion of their foes. The Romans had invaded the Eastern kingdoms, plundered them and taken their treasures westward to Rome to enjoy them. The Goths had nowhere to take the treasures they conquered, so they settled down to enjoy them where they found them.

In the inconceivable wreckage which then enveloped the world, the theory of world-citizenship which had developed within the circle of the Roman empire persisted. The idea of a single human race with its natural and rightful heads, the Emperor or Caesar as the civil head and the Bishop of Rome as its spiritual head, fascinated the minds of the rude tribesmen. They set up Caesars in Rome and deposed them again, until Odoacer compelled Romulus Augustus, the boy who had inherited the double diminutive of his ancestral name "Little Augustus of Little Rome", to resign; and thus for a time ended the line of Western emperors who rivalled the claim of the Caesars of Constantinople. This was in 476. Thereafter the Gothic chieftains theoretically owned themselves the subjects and liegemen,—or rather, the Western representatives—of the power of the Caesar who ruled in the East, until the great day of Christmas, in the year of 800.

Theodoric the Ostrogoth, greatest of all the barbarian conquerors, sought to weld German and Roman into a new people.
While he professed deference to the Eastern Caesar, he sought to combine in Italy the superiority of his own people in valor, energy and truth, together with the Roman supremacy in the arts of civilization. Into the ancient polity and statecraft of Rome he attempted to breathe the spirit of a fresh life, and without endangering the military supremacy of his own Goths, to raise to the level of their conquerors the degenerate population of Italy. From his palace at Verona—known to the German literature as Berne, and commemorated in the Nibelungen Lied, Theodoric issued equal laws for German and Roman. Two consuls were named, one by the Goth, the other by the Greek. Agriculture and the arts were revived in the provinces, the study of letters was renewed at Rome. "The last gleam of classical literature", says Bryce, "gilded the reign of the barbarian."

This Theodoric was one of those whose career so fascinated the mind of Wilhelm II., with the careful, patient ideal of welding together Germanic vigor with Roman culture.

Meanwhile in the East conditions went from bad to worse. After a long line of degenerate weaklings on the imperial throne of Constantinople, the empress Irene blinded her son Constantine VI., deposed him from the purple, and assumed the imperial title in her own right—the first instance of a woman coveting the name of Caesar. In a curious way the struggle between the Eastern and the Western Church over the use of images or of ikons; the personal grievances of the Pope against the Lombard chieftain; and the various divorces and remarriages of Charlemagne, King of the Franks, worked together to produce the great event of Christmas Day, 800, when Pope Leo, during the celebration of mass in St. Peter's Church in Rome, set the crown of Caesar on the head of Charlemagne and hailed him as the successor of Augustus.

Thus began the line of Frankish Caesars. Charlemagne dominated Europe from the midst of his army. But he was succeeded by a line of sons without power or wit, whose titles indicate the small esteem in which their subjects held them; "Charles the Bald"; "Charles the Fat"; 'Lewis the Child!'

But from the weakling hands of the degenerate Carolingian line a greater House seized the crown of the Caesars, and with Otto and Conrad and Frederick in the place of imperial power the Germanic race asserted its claim to the headship of the world, and a German Caesar ruled Europe.

All during the wild welter and confusion of the Dark Ages and the gradually crystallizing order of the Middle Ages, two men shone as guiding stars above the chaos; they were the Pope and the Emperor. In them was kept alive the theory that the human race, above all its petty divisions and wars, is an indivisible unity, with its two rightful heads, the Emperor or Caesar as its civil head, the Pope as its spiritual head. These two heads were, it is true, always quarrelling; but their quarrels were those of two departments of the same government, each admitting the rightful claims of the other but jealous over the prerogatives of its own administration.
And this theory was supported by one of the sayings of Christ, which was taken to mean that God has given this present world to Caesar reserving the next world to himself. Yet Jesus meant nothing of the sort. The Scribes and Pharisees, seeking to entangle him in his talk, asked whether it were lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not. “Whose image and superscription is on the tribute money?” he asked. “Caesar’s,” they replied. “Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s,” replied Christ. To any one who knows his Old Testament, it is evident that in the mind of the speaker was the saying of the First Chapter of Genesis that man was made in the image of God; and that his superscription is upon his chosen people, whose boast it was that “by His name we are called.” What Jesus meant, therefore, was that since Caesar’s image was on the money, he might have his money; but that to render man, on whom is the image and superscription of God, subject to Caesar by means of that money, was blasphemy and apostasy.

But down through fifteen centuries of the Christian era the theory of the indivisible Empire, as the organized Human Race with the Pope and the Caesar at its head loomed in the background of men’s minds as a fact as indisputable as the joint shining of the sun and moon. No one thought of disputing it. Battles raged and heresies spread, as the parties wage their fierce electoral battles at the polls of our Republic, without questioning the validity of the national constitution. This conception persisted for a far longer time than any other theory of the human race, save, possibly, the very similar Chinese conception of the Emperor as the Son of Heaven and of China as the circuit of the world.

RISE OF THE REFORMATION.

Then came the Reformation, to shatter this fundamental theory. On its religious side, the Reformation was a challenge to the spiritual supremacy of the Pope. But a consequence quite as important in the minds of the men of that time was that it challenged the temporal supremacy of the Emperor. The Lutheran states had not merely rejected the religious mandates of the Bishop of Rome; they had seceded from the world-union headed by the Emperor. Religious freedom was the last thing Luther sought or desired, as witnessed by the intolerance which he displayed toward all who dissented from his own opinions. But he was made use of by many princes who desired to shake themselves free from the shadow of the Roman Empire which still held the imagination of men in its grip.

The result of the quarrel between Lutheran and Catholic princes was, eventually, the Thirty Years War, in which the Hapsburg Emperors strove to reduce the Lutheran states again under their control. This frightful period lies behind the consciousness of every German, says Treitschke, even to the present day.
Bayard Taylor paint the results of that fearful struggle. In his "History of Germany", P. 409, he says:

"Thirty years of war! The slaughters of Rome's worst emperors, the persecution of the Christians under Nero and Diocletian, the invasions of the Huns and Magyars, the long struggles of the Guelfs and the Ghibellines, left no such desolation behind them. At the beginning of the century the population of the German empire was about thirty million. When the peace of Westphalia was declared, it was scarcely twelve million. Electoral Saxony alone lost 900,000 lives in two years. The city of Berlin contained but 300 citizens, the whole of the Palatinate of the Rhine but 200 farmers. In Hesse-Cassel, 17 cities, 47 castles and 300 villages were entirely destroyed by fire; thousands of villages in all parts of the country had but four or five families left out of hundreds, and landed property sank to about one-twentieth of its former value. The horses, cattle and sheep were exterminated in many districts, the supplies of grain were at an end, even for sowing, and large cultivated tracts had relapsed into a wilderness. Even orchards and vineyards had been wantonly destroyed, wherever armies passed. So terrible was the ravage that in a great many localities, the same amount of population, cattle, acres of cultivated land and general prosperity, was not restored until the year 1848, two centuries afterward!

"This statement of the losses of Germany, however, was but a small part of the suffering endured. During the last ten or twelve years of the war, both Protestants and Catholics vied with each other in deeds of barbarity; the soldiers were nothing but highway robbers, who maimed and tortured the country people to make them give up their last remaining property. In the year 1637, when Ferdinand II. died, the want was so great that men devoured each other, and even hunted down human beings like deer or hares, in order to feed upon them.

"In character, in intelligence, and in morality, the German people were set back two hundred years. All branches of industry had declined, commerce had almost entirely ceased, literature and the arts were suppressed."

The German language was destroyed; French and Spaniards and Italians and Swedes thronged all over the country, and those who remained of the noble families scorned to speak the tongue of Luther. Horror covered the land, a horror which has not yet been rooted out of the background of German minds.

The Peace of Westphalia, signed in 1648, was the first recognition of the States-system, under which Europe is governed today, since the days of Mithridates, King of Pontus. There were three hundred petty principalities between the Alps and the Baltic, each with its own laws, its own court, its own little army, its separate coinage, its own diplomacy. This vicious system paralyzed the trade, the literature and the political thought of Germany. It was thought a disgrace to acknowledge oneself a German. It is the reaction from this condition that gave rise to the obnoxious self-assertiveness of modern Germany of which travelers complain.
Between 1648 and 1848 Germany recovered herself a little, reduced her states to twenty-nine, and increased her population to what it had been at the outbreak of the Thirty Years War, more than two centuries before. Meanwhile the Empire, now pertaining to the House of Hapsburg, became a thing of solemn and ridiculous trifles. "There was nothing to remind Europe of the Empire any more, save a feudal investiture now and again at Vienna, a concourse of solemn old lawyers at Wetzlar puzzling over interminable suits; and some thirty diplomatists at Regensburg, the relics of that Imperial Diet where once a hero-king, a Frederick or a Henry, enthroned amidst mitred prelates and steel-clad barons, had issued laws for every tribe from the Mediterranean to the Baltic," says Bryce, in his History of the Holy Roman Empire. "Questions of precedence and title, questions whether the envoys of princes should have chairs of red cloth like those of the electors, or only of the less honorable green; whether they should be served on gold or silver plates, how many hawthorn boughs should be hung up before the door of each on May-Day—these and such as these it was their chief employment to discuss."

One brief flare-up, in the person of the Emperor Joseph II.; and then the Hapsburg line of the Roman Caesars vanished. Joseph II. was the first German-Roman emperor since Charles the Bald to keep Christmas at Rome; and it is said that the streets echoed to the cry, "You are in your own house; be the master!"

The Pope, having incurred the Emperor's displeasure, undertook a journey to Vienna to mollify Joseph, and there met Kaunitz, his minister. The Holy Father offered his hand to Kaunitz to be kissed; but Kaunitz shook it cordially, inquiring after the pontiff's health.

RISE OF THE NAPOLEONS.

Meanwhile another Emperor had arisen in the West. The French Revolution had followed the shadowy grandeurs of the Roman Republic until Napoleon, having gathered all power in his hands, proclaimed himself Emperor of the Franks, like Charlemagne, and summoned Pope Pius VII. to Paris to bestow on him the crown of Charlemagne. On December 2, 1804, the splendid ceremony occurred; but at the crucial moment Napoleon took the crown from the Pope's hands and put it on his own head—thus thinking, doubtless, to avoid the age-long quarrel which the Pope had waged with the German Roman Emperors over the meaning of the fact that the Pope's hands had placed the crown on Charlemagne's brow.

Napoleon believed firmly that the "same destiny which had made France the center of the modern world, had also appointed him to sit on the throne and carry out the projects of Charles the Frank, to rule all Europe from Paris, as the Caesars had ruled it from Rome." (Bryce, Holy Roman Empire, P. 293.) It was his intention to eject the Hapsburgs from their ownership of the
ancient title of Roman Caesar and to claim that for himself and for his heirs. The Hapsburg emperor, seeing what was coming, forestalled it; and on August 6, 1806, the Emperor Francis II., last of the Hapsburg line, laid down the crown of Augustus. Just a month before, the Confederation of the Rhine, comprising sixteen German states, had formally withdrawn from the Empire, leaving it nothing but an insubstantial name.

Napoleon's dream of resuming the power of the Frankish Charles was shattered at Waterloo, where the armies of Prussia and of England broke his imperial strength. Then came a period of years in which there was no Caesar save the Russian Czar, heir of the crown of the Caesars of Constantinople. But Napoleon III., elected from his prison cell to be President of the French Republic, organized the slum proletariat of Paris very much as Clodius had organized that of Rome, and placed on his own adventurous brows the crown of Empire. To him the glittering dream of the Caesardom appeared and lured him on to Sedan, where the power of France was crushed and drowned in blood.

Bryce, in the Holy Roman Empire, P. 307, gives a picture of what England thought of France when France and England were at war. It reads now with curious similarity to the things that England is saying about Germany:

"There can be no doubt that France represents and always has represented, the imperialistic spirit of Rome more truly than those of the Middle Ages who claimed to be her legitimate heirs. The French people have a deep-rooted belief that to them it naturally belongs to lead the world and to control the policy of neighboring states; like her, they regard war as not a sometimes necessary evil, but as a thing to be enjoyed for its own sake, a noble, perhaps the noblest employment of human force and genius."

"The tendency of the Teuton was, and is," (writes Bryce) "to the independence of the individual life, to the mutual repulsion of the social atoms as contrasted with the Keltic and the so-called Romanic peoples, among whom the unit is more completely absorbed in the mass."

Curious, curious! how completely Bryce's idea of the two peoples has reversed itself since the days when this was written, just prior to 1870, and what this same Bryce is writing now.

In its original draft his history announced the end of the dream of Caesarism with the abdication of Francis II. in 1806. But hardly was the ink dry upon its pages when the stupendous events of 1870 compelled a revision. For in the very hall of Versailles where the French emperors had held their brief and not inglorious reign, William I., King of Prussia, was hailed by his military chiefs as Caesar of the new Empire, and the title "Deutscher Kaiser" rang in the ears of the world as the rallying cry of a new Empire.

For the German Kaiser claims to be the heir of all the Roman Caesars; and has succeeded to the dominant idea of the Middle
Ages, that the world is normally a unity with one rightful temporal head, the Kaiser. Just as the Roman people ruled the world beneath the authority of their Caesar, so the German people hope to rule the world beneath the authority of their Kaiser. For, mark well; the title of the ruler of Germany is not “Emperor of Germany;” for that would limit his sway to the German states. No, but modelled on the tremendous assumption of old that the Roman Emperor was ruler of the world, the Kaiser’s title is “German Emperor”, with the rest of it only partially concealed, known to all men; “German Emperor—of the world!”

THE HOUSE OF HOHENZOLLERN.

But how does it happen that the crown of the Caesars is hereditary in the House of Hohenzollern? History gives the reason. Far back in the early Christian days, an order of monkish knights, similar to the Knights Templar, was formed under the title of the Teutonic Knights to win the pagan districts along the Baltic for the Church and the Empire. They partly conquered, partly exterminated the pagan Lithuanians who inhabited the Mark of Brandenburg in East Prussia. Albert, the last Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights, dissolved the order on the advice of Luther, who said that they performed “no useful service in the eyes of God or of man.” The Mark of Brandenburg was governed then by a Lutheran Margrave until 1700, when Frederick, Margrave of Brandenburg, made a trade with the Emperor whereby he was granted the title of King of Prussia in return for sending troops to Spain. Pope Clement XI. protested furiously against the idea of a heretical king, but the need of troops counterbalanced the Pope’s protest. This made him the only king in the Empire, with the exception of the King of Poland. The King of Prussia had thus a tremendous moral advantage over all his fellow-margraves and grand dukes. This advantage was followed up; Frederick William I. scrimped and saved during his whole life time to accumulate money on which Frederick II., sur-named the Great, might make a strong bid for dominance.

In 1806 Prussia attempted to unite the North German States into a league with her sovereign at the head with the title of Emperor. But the defeats of Jena and Auerstadt laid Prussia at the mercy of Napoleon, who treated her with insolent scorn, disbanding her armies and humiliating her king. And when the reaction came and the French were tossed back beyond the Elbe, it was the Prussian armies that led in the onslaught.

When the Revolution of 1848 shook the sovereigns of Europe on their thrones a second attempt was made to revive the Germanic Empire, and the title of Caesar again was offered to the King of Prussia, Frederick William IV. But he, a weak monarch, refused it, fearing the jealousy of his fellow rulers. Then came the Iron Chancellor, Bismarck. Seizing his opportunity he forged a telegram which made the French people and the Germans fly at
one another's throats; and in the bloody thunder of the iron ring of cannon at Sedan the German Empire was forged anew, and the title of Augustus and of Tiberius was conferred upon William I., German Caesar.

**MUSIC AND REVOLUTION.**

Among the revolutionists of 1848 was a brilliant young musician named Richard Wagner. Wagner and his bosom friend, Michael Bakounin, both of them philosophical anarchists, were leaders of the revolutionary group in Dresden, where Wagner held the position of conductor of the Royal Opera, at a salary of $1,125 a year. The young musician escaped to Paris, where he wrote quantities of pamphlets headed "Art and Revolution", and planned the great music dramas which were to be the vehicle of the Revolution to the world.

Bernard Shaw, in "The Perfect Wagnerite", explains how Wagner worked out his theories in music.

"In 1848," says Shaw, "the middle class, discontented, made common cause with the starving wage-working class. In 1849 the uprising reached Dresden. Wagner appealed to the King to champion the cause of the debtors, but without success. When the revolution subsided a price was set on his head, and he fled with Michael Bakounin and Roeckel. A proclamation branding Richard Wagner as a "politically dangerous person" was issued by the Dresden police."

Wagner wrote the "Nibelungen Ring" to express his disgust with the existing Church and State.

In "Das Rheingold" there are as yet no men on earth; the world is waiting for man to come and redeem it from the curse of the gods. Godhood means to Wagner infirmity and compromise; manhood means strength and integrity. Siegfried was the Human Hero who was to abolish all the wretched old phantoms and laws. "The most inevitable dramatic conception of the nineteenth century, says Shaw, "was that of a perfectly naive hero, upsetting law, order and religion in all directions." Brunhilda was the sleeping conscience of God, whom at the command of Freya, the State, he surrounds with the imaginary fires of a fictitious hell lest Man awaken her. Siegfried's mission was to establish in the place of Law and Order and Religion, the pure unfettered action of humanity, doing exactly what it likes, because it likes to do what is for the good of the race. When the play begins, the thread of fate snaps in the hands of the Norns—man henceforth is to weave his own destiny!

These fine conceptions lie at the heart of the first three plays of the Ring. But the Revolution of 1848 collapsed in ignominy. Wagner saw all his dreams of the triumph of pure humanity brought to naught. And when the triumphal hosts of the new German Empire marched back from Paris, they entered Berlin to the strains of a "Kaiser-Marsch", written by this same old ex-revolutionist Wagner!
THE NEW RELIGION.

Yet a temporal unity is not enough. A Caesar demands a Pope. The German Kaiser was in a dilemma. He could not, being a Lutheran, be the head of a Holy Roman Empire whose official religion is the Catholic faith. He could not be the head of a Lutheran Empire, because so many of his subjects were Catholic. He could not, indeed, be the head of a Christian Empire at all, because the memory of the bloody divisions of the Thirty Years War still hung with a background of horror on the mind of every German. Hence the necessity for the creation of a new religion, a moral unity binding together the people of the New Empire beneath the headship of the German Kaiser of the world. This religion, a renewal of the ancient warlike faith of the German savages who destroyed Rome, the German philosophers named the Religion of Valor.

Hence arose the remarkable vigor of the German critics in undermining the historical bases of the Christian religion, culminating in the assertion of Prof. Drews of Berlin, four years before the war, that there never had been a historical Jesus. And hence arose their even more remarkable insistence on the world-mission of the German people. This can be understood in its beginning as an attempt to overcome the self-depreciation, the shame of being a German, which the Thirty Years War had left as its deepest inheritance. But the reaction carried them to extreme lengths.

Treitschke, greatest of German historians, thus boldly outlines the German conception of their mission.

"What," says Treitschke, "is that highest ideal? It is world-dominion; it is world-empire; it is the hegemony of a planet. It assigns to Germany in the future a role like that which Rome or Hellas or Judea or Islam have played in the past. That is Germany's hero-ideal.

"Just as the greatness of Germany is to be found in the governance of Germany by Prussia, so is the greatness and goodness of the world to be found in the predominance there of German culture, of the German mind, of the German character!

"This world-dominion of which Germany dreams is not simply a material dominion. Germany is not blind to the lessons inculcated by the Napoleonic tyranny. Force alone, violence or brute strength, by its mere silent presence or by its local manifestations in war, may be necessary to establish this dominion; but its ends are spiritual.

"The triumph of the Empire will be a triumph of German culture, of the German world-vision in all phases and departments of human life and energy; in religion, poetry, science, art, politics and social endeavor.

"The benefits to be derived therefrom are truth, instead of falsehood, in the deepest qualities of the human mind; sincerity instead of hypocrisy.

"It is reserved for us," the proud boast goes on, "to resume in thought that creative role in religion which the whole Teutonic
world abandoned fourteen centuries ago. Judea and Galilee cast
their dreary spell over Greece and Rome, when Greece and Rome
were already sinking into decrepitude, and the creative power in
them was exhausted; when weariness and bitterness waked with
their greatest spirits at day, and sank with them to sleep at night.
But Judea and Galilee struck Germany in the splendor and
heroism of her prime.

"Germany and the whole Teutonic people in the fifth century
made the great error. They conquered Rome, but dazzled by
Rome's authority, they adopted the religion and the culture of
the vanquished.

"Now, while preparing to found a world-empire, Germany is
also preparing to create a world-religion.

"And what is that world-religion? The governing idea of the
centuries from the fourteenth to the nineteenth is the wrestle of
the German intellect not only against Rome, but also against
Christianism itself. Now this new religion comes on the world
to rescue us from its power. Germany's religion is the Religion of
Valor."

It was in accordance with this new "religion" that the
exaltation of the army and of its officers, high-priests of the new
religion, was the dominant note in Germany before the war. No
effort was lost to persuade the people that the army officers were
holy and elect beings. As the power of Roman Caesars rested on
military supremacy, so should the power of German Caesars.
But of a priesthood of this religion it is required that they be
found faithful. The officers of the Army of Valor must them-
selves be valorous. And of the officers of the German army it is
told by many witnesses, that whenever heavy fighting is to be
encountered the commissioned officers find important business in
the rear while the non-commissioned officers and the men go into
the maelstrom of battle. Of many regiments it is reported that
the whole personnel of the rank and file has been changed three
or four times, every private having been killed or captured, with-
out a single change in the staff. This is recounted in the book
called, "A German Deserter's War Experience", but is borne out
by many other eye witnesses. They who are the priests of the
religion of Valor are themselves cowards, is the testimony from
the battle-line. The reverse side of Valor is Cruelty, which
inevitably goes with it. Cowardice accompanies brutality, whether
preached by a Roosevelt or a Kaiser.

But behind the splendor of this revival of the pagan gods of
Germany there lies the same cause that drove the Empire of the
Romans to cover the continents with its power—the greed of
speculators. Germany's dismemberment made her weak and
powerless at the time when England, France, Russia and America
were dividing between them the surface of the habitable globe
for exploitation. Between 1870 and 1914 Germany's commerce,
industry, population, and wealth increased many hundred fold.
She sought her "place in the Sun", her share of the exploitation
of the undeveloped countries, only to be blocked at every turn.
South Africa, Egypt, Morocco, Persia, India, South America—all were barred to her. According to Frederic C. Howe, in his book, “Why War”, and to H. N. Brailsford, in his book, “The War of Steel and Gold”, this European war was inevitable from the day that England and France, having entered into an agreement with Germany to respect the independence of Morocco, made at the same time a secret treaty between themselves to give Morocco to France while England took Egypt. When that became known, Germany became convinced, says Howe, that only through war could she obtain her share in the spoils ofcapitalistic imperialism. Her Berlin to Bagdad railway was the wedge she strove to drive into the fabric of British imperialism, to enrich herself out of its spoils.


“If I cannot love the typical modern German, I can at least pity and understand him. His worst fault is that he cannot understand that it is possible to have too much of a good thing. Being convinced that duty, industry, education, loyalty, patriotism, are good things, he indulges in them at all occasions, shamelessly and excessively.

“The German Socialists do not care a rap whether I am a Socialist or not. All they want to know is, Am I orthodox? Am I correct in my revolutionary views? Am I reverent to the revolutionary authorities? They ask, “Do you believe that Marx was omniscient and infallible, that Engels was his prophet, that Bebel and Singer are his inspired apostles, and that Das Kapital is the Bible?” And when I reply, “Of course not”, they shout “Blasphemy!” When a German becomes a Social Democrat and throws off his chains, he promptly puts on a heavier set.”

And yet, says Shaw, “I learnt my art and my revolution from the speakers of the universal language, music; from Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Wagner. For their sakes, Germany stands consecrated as the holy land of the Capitalist age, as Italy of the Renaissance, France of Chivalry, and Greece of the Periclean age.”

Every nation when it finds itself in the fullness of its young strength develops some new art. England developed her Shakespears; Italy her painters and sculptors. Germany discovered music.

But the great art of Wagner which was to speed the revolution has, by the irony of evolution, been made the handmaiden of that capitalistic culture which he so despised. All of the great musicians, says Shaw, were anarchists. If those who pay high prices for front seats at the opera really understood what the classic music was all about they would hang the composers in effigy.

It was the work of the great musicians of Germany which made perfect the unity of the German people, as Shakespeare united England with the bond of a common speech. It is worth
noting that Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the Englishman who goes far beyond most Germans in proclaiming the world-mission of the German people, married the daughter of Richard Wagner.

CAPITALISM AND CAESARISM.

Casting back into history, we see that Julius Caesar, founder of the line, came into power as the professed champion of the poor of Rome against the capitalists. Napoleon came into power as the champion of the Revolution against the autocratic kings of Europe. The Hohenzollerns came into power as the champions of the overridden, desolated peasants of Germany against the oppressors of Austria and France. Historically, every dictatorship, every imperialism, has risen as the protector of the poor against their middle-class oppressors, and has ended by being the representative of those same capitalistic and middle class oppressors.

For example, when Wilson became President, his cry was all of the New Freedom; of unlimited competition between the small business men and of an end to the oppressive power of the trusts. As the natural result, the small business men became so oppressive in their turn that Food Dictators, Fuel Dictators, and Railroad Dictators were necessary to protect the people against rapacity. Now it appears that the Packing Trust placed their representatives in the posts of power in the Food Administration, and the first act of the Fuel Dictator Garfield was to increase the already excessive profits of the coal mine owners.

The only cure, the only answer to Imperialism is Industrial Democracy. In the days of Bismarck Socialism began to rear its head in Germany and to threaten the overlordship of the Kings. Bismarck first attempted to crush Socialism out by persecutions, exactly as the Roman Emperors sought to root out Christianity by torture and the lions. And just as Constantine took over Christianity to be the religion of the state when he could not extinguish it, so Bismarck took over Socialism. Both were ruined in the process. Christianity became imperialized, and German Socialism became kaiserized. The state sought to head off the power of the working-class by doing for them that which they sought to do for themselves. The answer is plain; industrial democracy alone can defeat the coming of Caesarism.

German brutalities, the frightful, fiendish cruelties of the invading hordes in Belgium and Northern France, are viewed by the philosophers of the Religion of Valor very much as the surgeon views the pain of the knife, which is to relieve a sufferer from some torturing malady. "German kultur, German character, is to save the world. The world objects to being saved; does not, in fact, know that it is ill. It must therefore be forcibly brought to a realization of its dependence on Germany for its salvation by the policy of Schrecklichkeit!" Barbarous as this is, Germany is not the first nation which took the position that inferior races must be tamed by cruelty before they can be "civilized." American In-
diands, Hindus, Boers, Filipinos, have all felt the weight of Schrecklichkeit. What outrages us is that the Germans seem to regard the rest of us as we regard the Indians. Schrecklichkeit—Frightfulness—has always accompanied Imperialism. It is true that the Germans reduced it to a science as no other nation has ever done. But then the Germans reduced everything to science as no other race had ever done.

German capitalism, according to Brailsford and Howe, spent most of its surplus capital at home, developing German industries. The dominance of capitalism was menaced by the growing power of Socialism. Hence the German state took over Socialism and made it a State Socialism, as Constantine took over Christianity and made it a State Christianity very different from the original. The German State did do a thorough job. It abolished slums, abolished unemployment, made municipal government a science. Poverty was as near wiped out as can ever be under a capitalist government. But with all this, it was the State which did it; not the workers which did these things for themselves. The Hohenzollerns did give their people prosperity; but they did it to keep their people quiet. When the great drive began by which German capitalism sought to obtain its share in the loot of the undeveloped countries, German capitalistic imperialism had in its service a vast armed force of well fed, well trained, perfectly equipped soldiers to hurl at the ranks of the encircling foe.

Control of the press and control of the educational system had planted deep down in the minds of all these soldiers an unshakable conviction of the greatness of the fatherland and the imminence of its peril. Toward the East loomed the frightful specter of the Russian ogre; to the west lay England, that Fafnir-dragon which girded the world, covering one-quarter of the habitable territory of the earth’s surface with its twisting coils; to the south and west lay France, which under its Louis and under its Napoleon had trodden the face of prostrate Germany into the dust of humiliation and defeat.

Industriously harping upon every string that could stimulate hatred of the prospective foe and unreasoning devotion to the Fatherland was the German Press: subsidized and controlled by the Krupp gun factory and the militarist government. Germans looked abroad from beneath their autocracy, which if it rode them with an iron yoke at least gave them clean streets and food; they looked abroad and saw England with one third of its population always on the edge of starvation; England with its great cities cursed with slums and poverty such as the world never saw before. They saw democratic America, in the first two years of Wilson’s rule, covered with marching armies of homeless unemployed; sething with strikes and industrial cruelty. They saw Russian Czardom subsisting on the millions loaned by the thrifty peasantry of frugal France. Their autocracy played its hand well. It posed before them as their defender from all the ills that so plainly abounded in the capitalistic democracies surrounding them.

And Capitalistic democracy leads as inevitably to empire now as it did in the days of Rome. A Capitalistic democracy means
that the proletariat, reduced to poverty and misery beneath the iron heel of industrial dictators, demands and will in time produce a political dictator to restrain its industrial oligarchs. And then, when the political dictator has come under the power of the industrial or capitalistic oligarchy, comes, inevitably, inescapably, the Revolution.

Imperialism is the result of Capitalism; and Capitalism—or if you prefer another name, monopolistic privilege—lies in the control by private hands of public necessities. This accumulates in these private hands surplus capital, which demands imperialistic expansion for investment. This is the modern equivalent of the ancient system of speculating in the plunder of conquered lands.

The madness of the Germans is rooted deep. It is no passing hallucination, no mere current fantasy that will vanish away with the summer. The dream of Caesarism began in Rome. "Aut Caesar aut Nullus"—"either Caesar or nothing" was the saying of the ancient General who staked his all upon the attainment of imperial power. "Weltmacht oder Niedergang"—"World-might or downfall"—say the Germans today.

Germany can never again be defeated as she was in the days of the Thirty Years War. If she could recover from that, she can recover from whatever punishment her defeat may now entail. There is but one sure plan; imperialism can be overthrown only from within by the cutting of the root of that which brings it into being—monopolistic privilege; Capitalism. Only by the strengthening of the hand of the radical and Socialist forces in Germany can the terror be removed from the face of the earth; and that can be done only by strengthening the Socialist and radical forces in every other land; focussing their strength and multiplying their vigor, until from every nation the evil canker of Imperialism is cut out, and the whole world becomes a brotherhood.
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THE BRITISH IDEA

"Britannia Rules the Waves"

IN the Daily Tribune of Saturday, March 9th, a British diplomat is quoted as saying:

"It appears not to be understood in America that India is seriously menaced. With safe access to the trans-Caucasian regions Germany would be empowered to compel the world to contemplate the possibility of the overthrow of the British Empire in India."

To most Americans the natural reply to such a statement would be "Well, what of it?" But to an Englishman such a possibility is almost like confronting the repeal of the Law of Gravity. For the British Empire began with and is built upon the conquest of India. From that flows the necessity of Britain's command of the sea. And from that also comes the peculiar horror with which Germany's Berlin-to-Bagdad railroad is contemplated. This railroad is not like other railroads; it is not like the Cape-to-Cairo railroad, nor like the Canadian Pacific. It is not merely a commercial enterprise; it approaches close to blasphemy. For if the railroad line connecting Europe with India is built, the command of the seas will not merely be taken away from Britain. It will be rendered useless. Britain may command the seas for all eternity, for all Germany cares, if the railroad into India is once built; for it will be worthless. Goods—and soldiers—can be shipped quicker and cheaper into England's great Indian market by the Berlin-to-Bagdad railroad than by the steamship lines; and the great Empire on which the sun never sets would be left holding an empty bag.

It is this peculiar quality of horror which the Berlin-to-Bagdad railroad seems able to inspire that lends all its meaning to President Wilson's Flag-Day speech on June 14, 1917, implying that this country went into the war to prevent Egypt, India and Persia from regaining their freedom from English rule. To any one who knows any history at all, this would seem like a paradox.

Why should the United States plunge into the world-war in order to keep the British yoke upon these three countries? The story of England's occupation of Egypt is a story of treachery, cruelty and outrage. Her strangulation and partition of Persia, in company with Russia, is still fresh in our memories as a blot on the record of the so-called "Anglo-Saxon" race. And India from
time immemorial has been the rich pantry from which her needy political younger-sons have been regaled with jam. Why should we, a country that until recently loved to tell the story of its own Revolution, join in forcing these peoples back under an alien yoke?

Yet when one asks questions such as these, he is met with an attitude closely resembling that of an old-time Presbyterian elder toward a Higher Critic. It is not merely that the elder is unconvinced by the Higher-Criticism. His very soul revolts at the idea that there should be wretches impious and sacrilegious enough to analyze the Bible. So is the devout Britain-worshiper aghast that any one should seek to investigate the historical foundations of the British Empire. Whether it is good for the natives who are ruled, or good for the British who rule, or good for the rest of the world; how the Empire came to be, and why; who laid the foundations and who built the superstructure, are topics as horrible as discussion of the date of the Second Isaiah and of the four-ply structure of the Hexateuch, to the old-time orthodoxist.

It may seem ungracious to investigate the foundations of an Empire which is battling even now for life. But the bitterest foes of British Imperialism are those who are battling for British Democracy—the workingmen of England. It is impossible to understand the World War without understanding that queer conglomerate, the British Empire.

**THE TRIAL OF THE SEA.**

Kipling's poem, "The Last Chantey" shows admirably how the commercial problems of the hour are projected into heaven and into hell by devout sharers in the benefits of the order that is. You will remember that the Book of the Revelation in picturing the Judgment Day, says that when the rule of God is made perfect "There shall be no more sea." The reason of this is that the Jews disliked the sea intensely. To them it was a symbol of disorder, rebellion, anarchy, violence and sin.

But if the sea were to vanish, England's greatness would be gone. To Kipling this is an intolerable thought. Consequently in this poem he puts the sea on trial and triumphantly acquits it.

Thus spake the Lord from the vault above the cherubim, Calling to the angels and the souls in their degree; "Lo, earth hath passed away On the smoke of judgment day. That our word may be established, shall we gather up the Sea?"

To plead for the sea he brings the soul of Judas, "who betrayed Him;" the stout apostle Paul; the slaves that men threw overboard; the gentlemen adventurers; the whaling-ships; and the "jolly, jolly mariners". At the last the Word of the Lord in the Book of Revelation is overborne by the plea of all these classes.
Then stooped the Lord, and he called the good sea up to him,
And 'stablished his boundaries to all eternity;
And them that have no pleasure
To serve the Lord by Measure,
May enter into galleons, and serve him on the sea.
Sun, wind and rain shall fail not from the face of it,
Stinging, ringing spindrift, and the fulmar flying free;
And the ships shall go abroad
To the glory of the Lord,
Who heard the silly sailor-folk, and gave them back their sea!

Back of this inspiring epic of the Judgment Day lies the un-
doubted fact that if the sea were abolished, there would be an
end to the profits of the overseas carrying trade which pays
such heavy dividends and interests to the speculative investors
of the British Isles. There is no manner of doubt, in the mind of
a typical British capitalist, that the chief interest of the Lord
Almighty is the guaranteeing of the dividends of Consol-
dated Securities. An Oxford Professor, J. A. Cramb, in an ex-
traordinary book called “Germany and England”, published
just before the outbreak of the world war, goes so far as to say
that God’s real name is England. And this is additionally curi-
ous because this book is mainly written to discredit the German
assumption that God’s real name is Germany. Says Prof. Cramb:
“Like an immortal energy, this undying spirit links age to
age. It is the true England, the true Britain, for which men
strive and suffer in every zone and every age.... Call it God,
call it Destiny, but name it England, for England it is!”

He describes this immortal energy in the following terms:
“To give to all men within its bounds an English mind; to
give to all who come within its sway the power to look at the
things of a man’s life, at the past, at the future, from the stand-
point of an Englishman;.... to diffuse within its bounds that
high tolerance in religion, that reverence yet boldness before the
mysteriousness of life and death.... that love of free institu-
tions, that pursuit of an ever higher and higher justice and
larger freedom which, rightly or wrongly, we associate with the
temper and character of our race, wherever it is dominant and
secure—that is the conception of Empire and of England which
persists....”

It is in just such language as this that the Germans talk.
Let us investigate the roots of the British Empire a little, and
see if beneath the high-flown rhetoric we can discern the causes
that actually did impel the Empire to its enormous growth. It
now covers one-fourth of the habitable globe and extends over
one-third of the human race, most of it alien in temper and
spirit. In spite of its beneficence, these alien races are in con-
stant revolt against the Empire’s spiritual holiness. Continual
revolts are reported from South Africa. Conspiracies and re-
volts in India are always being sternly repressed in the interests
of Indian freedom. Ireland, nearest neighbor of England, hates
the Empire most of all the “subject races.”
THE ROAD TO INDIA.

It must not be forgotten that it was largely on account of India that our war of Independence was fought. For that matter, it was entirely on account of India that the Western Hemisphere was discovered. All through history, the Trade of India looms as the dominant factor in the rise and fall of empires. Egypt and Assyria strove for the control of the overland route to India; Babylon became great because she dominated the sea traffic by means of her canals. Alexander of Macedon fought and destroyed Persia in order to gain control of the Trade with India. Rome's empire was divided between West and East because the capital was moved to Constantinople in order to command the trade with India. Because of the interruption of the Trade with India by the Mohammedans, the Crusades were fought and Columbus sought the westward route to India by sea. And as a side issue arising out of the Indian tea trade, the War of the American Independence was fought.

This tea trade, developed by the East India Company, was stimulated in the American Colonies for the profit it brought the monopolists. A high tariff was levied, which made it a profitable thing to smuggle into the Colonies. One of the leading smugglers of New England was John Hancock of Boston. In order to counteract the smuggling traffic, the tariff on tea was lowered so that there was no longer any profit in smuggling it. Whereupon John Hancock headed a party of Boston men, dressed up as Indians, who dumped all the smuggled tea into Boston Harbor in order to keep up the profits on the smuggled tea. And then the Revolution began.—But another, and a vastly different cause, kept it alive: of which we shall say more later.

How did the British Empire begin? At first thought it seems strange that it ever should have had a beginning, so much a part of the natural order of things does it appear. To those citizens of the Roman Empire who saw the invasion of the Goths and the destruction of the Eternal City, it seemed that the end of the world had come. They had grown up in the shadow of the World-City, and all they knew of law and order lay in the domination of the world by the Senate and People of Rome. So has it been with Britain. “Britannia rules the waves” seems to be as much a Law of Nature as “Two and two are four.”

Lloyd George, in a speech at Glasgow, June 29, 1917, tells how America is in the war to fight for liberty until the war is won, and when the war is won “Britannia will rule the waves.”

It may be that this is correct and right. Certainly a large proportion of Americans seem to think so. Let us examine into the foundations of this great Beneficence, then, and see how it came into being in a world in which there is so much of evil.
A PEOPLE SEPARATE AND APART.

The British Isles are a fleck of land out beyond the Western edge of the great Eurasian continent, the mightiest stretch of land that rears its tremendous width above the waters. By virtue of their geographical separation from the mainland they have always been cut off from close contact with the great currents that perpetually shaped and changed the borders of European countries. England was a country apart, and the people naturally came to think of themselves as a people separate and superior. England could only be invaded by sea, and her defenses therefore were also on the sea. Defending herself by ships, she had no need of a great army for defense, and consequently could use that army for purposes of invasion.

When Rome withdrew from Britain in order to employ her legions in defending the Imperial City from the invading Goths, the British Isles were left defenseless, for the native armies had been destroyed and disbanded by Rome. The pagan Norsemen swept in upon Britain, as a part of the great general movement of the Northern people from their frozen forests into the circle of warmth and light which formed the Roman Empire. Christianity had come to Britain very early in the Roman occupation. Linus, one of the first Popes of Rome, is said to have been one of the family of King Caractacus, British hostage in Rome. By the invading savages of the Northern seas, the Celtic Christians were driven into the barren mountain fastnesses of Wales, where they maintained their religion for centuries. Out of their struggle against the enveloping barbarism came the legends of King Arthur and his Round Table, which has remained the sole mythology peculiar to the English-speaking folk—and it came from the Celts.

England was a pleasant land in the eyes of the barbarians. Warmed by the soft currents of the Gulf stream, her fertile fields and rich forests were a perpetual temptation to plunder. Hence the successive invasions of Danes, Jutes, Angles, Saxons, and finally of the Normans, that strange race which had combined the rough virility of the Northern fjords with the culture of fallen Rome. William the Conqueror invaded England by sea in 1066—the last invasion which the “inviolate shores” have suffered, until the fleets of the air cruised over London, dropping their bombs from the sky.

Under the Normans England began to play the role of conqueror, and in her turn to invade. She attempted to establish her dominion in France, and for three centuries and more maintained her footing there, with Calais as the center of her power. But she was driven thence by a girl, Joan of Arc, who rallied the shattered and stricken forces of the Dauphin and, led by her miraculous voices, chased the English armies across the sea. For this she was burnt, by order of a board of British bishops, for witchcraft. Calais was retained, at the cost of a terrific expenditure of money and men, until the time of “Bloody Mary.”
It is reported by the Associated Press that Postmaster-General Burleson, Thought-Censor of the American people, ordered barred from the mails a paper containing a statement to the effect that Joan of Arc was burnt by the British, on the ground that “it might discourage recruiting.”

One result of the French wars was the creation of the House of Commons. Edward I., finding that he was running short of ready cash, summoned a convention consisting of two knights and two burgesses or merchants from each district and town. To them he said, in effect: “I need more money, and I must get it from you. It takes too much time and energy to send my soldiers out to collect what I need, and besides all my soldiers are required at the front. So I want you to decide on how much you will give me without a fight. If you do not give me enough I will come and seize more; but of course if I take too much there will be a rebellion; it is up to you to decide how much you will part with peaceably.” The merchants were extremely unwilling to come; but when they were assembled, they made it a condition that if they were to furnish the money, they must be given some share in the government. Out of this beginning Parliamentary government arose.

WARS OF THE ROSES.

In 1459 began the Wars of the Roses, which for thirty years shed the best blood of England in a bloody and fruitless struggle to decide whether the second cousin of a sister’s son or the nephew of an illegitimate daughter had the better right to the throne of England. After every battle, historians tell us, the victorious side massacred all the leaders on the other side, so that the battlefields were piled high with the mangled limbs and severed heads of England’s nobility.

After more than a quarter century of this insanity the rival houses contracted an alliance by marriage, and Henry VII. was crowned king. Henry VIII. came to the throne as a youth with the allegiance of both houses firmly cemented; a prosperous people and a full treasury gladly hailing his rule.

But Henry found the old nobility of England slaughtered in the Wars of the Roses. He created a new nobility, and then faced the necessity of endowing his nobles with lands to maintain their estate. In order to equip them thus, he began the wholesale seizure of the lands of the Church, which at that time had accumulated in its possession more than one-third of the lands of England.

Commissioners were sent around the country to inquire into the moral status of the monasteries. Every monastery that was possessed of large estates and rich revenues, was ordered dissolved, and the land confiscated and given to Henry’s favorites. In 1536 and 1539 Parliamentary decree were passed dissolving all the monastic houses. This left in the hands of the king exhaustless resources of lands for the bribery of such legislators or nobles as might prove unwilling to do all of his commands.
For nearly a century England had been troubled by the question of succession to the throne. Henry had been married, by his father's order, to the Princess Catherine of Aragon, widow of his elder brother Arthur—a marriage forbidden by Catholic law, but for which a dispensation had been granted by the Pope. The peace of the country depended on the birth of a son. Several children were born to Henry and Catherine, but all died in infancy. This seemed to the devout Catholics a divine condemnation of the marriage—although the Pope had issued a dispensation for the wedding. Nevertheless, the superstitious fears of many, and the very grave apprehensions of those who saw the prospect of another War of the Roses looming through the absence of an heir, led to Henry's divorcing Catherine—or, rather, of declaring that the marriage had been void ab initio—and marrying Anne Boleyn, a maid of honor.

By Catherine, Henry had a daughter, Mary. By Anne Boleyn, he had another daughter, Elizabeth. By Jane Seymour, his third wife, he had a son, Edward. None of his other wives, Anne of Cleves, Catherine Howard, or Catherine Parr, yielded a male heir; and their execution at the hands of the savage old monarch is directly traceable to his desire for a family of sons to succeed him. Perhaps he thought it was cheaper to kill a few wives than to plunge all England into Civil War again for lack of an undisputed succession.*

EXPROPRIATION OF THE POOR.

But as a result of the spoliation of the Church, the nobles had developed a hunger for land. Whetted by the gift of the abbey lands, they next began the seizure of the common-lands of the villages, on which for many generations the common folk had pastured their cows and sheep and geese. Still further the spoliation went, until whole villages were destroyed, their houses torn down, their people driven away, in order that the nobles might occupy the land thus vacated as sheep-ranches, to raise wool for the Flemish woolen mills.

Sir Thomas More, in his "Utopia" says "In England your shepe, that were wont to be so meke and mylde and smal eaters, now, I heare saye, be become so great devourers and so wylde that they swallow down the very men themselfs." Not only "very men" but whole towns, whole countrysides, were destroyed by the "shepe".

The people, robbed of their farms, of their flocks and herds, were made vagabonds on the face of the earth. Savage laws were enacted to repress this "vagabondage"; men were whipped, branded, mutilated, and killed for being without work, although their work had been taken from them by law. The vagrant laws of Henry VIII., of Elizabeth, of Edward VI., are almost unbelievable

*After Edward's death, Mary and Elizabeth were confirmed in the succession, in order to avoid a war.
in their ferocity, until one reads the statutes on vagrancy in effect in this country at the present time, which are unchanged in spirit and almost in form from those barbarian laws of the expropriators of the poor in England. Men are deprived of work by capitalist development, by panics, by new inventions, by child labor, woman labor, and prison labor, by importation of aliens; and then they are penalized, imprisoned, and in times of great crises are killed, for being without jobs.

Frederic C. Howe, in his book “Why War?” describes the effect of this seizure of lands on the history of England. At the outbreak of the Great War, the land of England was almost completely in the hands of a few wealthy families. “In no country in Europe”, says Howe, “is the land so completely feudalized. Out of 77,000,000 acres, more than 52,000,000 acres is in the hands of large landholders, owning one thousand acres or more. Out of a total population of 48,000,000, less than a quarter million of the English people own their own homes. Practically all the people are tenants, subject to competitive rents. The great landlords own the lands under great cities; they own mines; they own docks and ports.”

Their wealth is incalculable; undreamed of. And it all dates back to the destruction of the villages and the spoliation of the Church in the middle of the sixteenth century.

Karl Marx, in his book Das Kapital, in the chapter on “Expropriation of the Poor” gives a clear description of this process of converting England from a country of homesteads and villages to a country of slums and millionaire princes. Charles Kingsley also describes it vividly, and Mark Twain, in “Prince and Pauper”, does likewise. Oliver Goldsmith, in his “Deserted Village” tells how even in his days the land hunger of the nobility was not sated, and destruction of the homes of the poor was still going on.

The poor of England were thus left without resources or means of earning a living. Any work at all, any chance at gaining food and shelter, found an army of cheap starving labor eager to grasp at it. Crowded into the towns, huddled in filthy disease-breeding tenements, the poor were ready to be converted into mill-workers. And in every city of England great factories arose, manned by pauper labor, by child labor, by woman labor. The children of the poor, for whom their parents were utterly unable to provide, were taken from their families by the parish, chained in great gangs of two or three hundred, and driven through the lanes and byways of England to be sold to the highest bidder for work in the mills. They died at the cotton looms like flies; laboring ten, twelve, sixteen hours a day, children of from six years old and upward were burned alive in the mills of Mammon, as a sacrifice to the brazen God of Capitalist England, even as the Phenicians of old had burned their children alive to the brazen image of Moloch, their King.

While the dispossessed poor of England thus created a vast supply of cheap pauper labor, the sons of the rich were exiled abroad. By the law of entail, only the eldest son of each family
could inherit. He received all of his father’s property, without division. Thus a vast army of younger sons was created, whose only chance of survival was to go abroad as adventurers, or else entering the Church, the Law, or the Army or Navy at home, to serve their family by keeping the poor contented and submissive to their lot. The disinherited sons of the rich who went abroad built up the foreign markets in which was sold the products of the labor of the disinherited sons of the poor at home.

England’s great commercial empire was thus in the first place based on pauperization of the poor at home. The second great cornerstone in its edifice is found in the pirates of the Spanish main. These were shielded by England, ennobled and given a share in her government, for their notable services in supplying her capitalist classes with the ready cash, which the new fabric of world capitalism required.

Columbus, while seeking for a European monarch to back him in his plans for discovering a sea route to India, came to the court of Henry VII. of England. That frugal monarch refused to risk anything on so wild a scheme. But when Columbus had proved that there is a land beyond the western seas, Henry VII. allowed John and Sebastian Cabot to discover Newfoundland for England; and when they laid the sovereignty of the continent of North America at his feet, he graciously rewarded them with a present of $50 in cash.

Columbus found that the islands of the New World contained gold and silver mines of inexhaustible wealth. Cortez and Pizzarro discovered that Mexico and Peru were empires of undreamed-of riches. One single galleon-load of gold dispatched by Bovadilla, successor of Columbus as Viceroy of the Indies, more than repaid Spain for the whole expense of the Discovery. Pope Alexander VI. had divided the New World between Spain and Portugal, leaving England out. It is more than possible that the news of the immense wealth of the New World, coupled with the knowledge that the Pope had given most of it to Spain, lent enthusiasm to the cause of the English Reformation, which gave Henry and Elizabeth a chance to glorify the exploits of their privateers as crusades against the iniquitous papal tyranny, as well as highly profitable ventures for the speculators who invested in shares in private stock.

At any rate, the “gentlemen-adventurers”, Francis Drake, John Hawkins, Henry Morgan, and a whole vast fleet of privateers, set out from English shores to plunder the galleons of Spain. Spanish speculators tortured and killed the natives to compel them to yield up their gold; English speculators tortured and killed the Spaniards to take away from them the gold they had taken away from the Indians. A successful pirate was decorated with a title and an office. Henry Morgan, who sacked and burnt Panama, destroyed convents and churches, ravished nuns and scuttled ships, came back to England with shiploads of gold, was made a knight, and dispatched as vice-governor to Jamaica.
Francis Drake likewise, as bloodthirsty a pirate as ever sailed the seas, was made a knight, and is hailed as one of the founders of the British navy even today.

Sir John Hawkins founded the African slave trade. Spain had killed off the Indian natives. The Englishman kidnapped whole tribes of African negroes and sold them to the Spanish mine owners to take the place of the Indians. By the treaty of Asiento, in 1713, Great Britain secured the exclusive monopoly of the slave trade for the Spanish colonies. Forty-seven years later she sold this monopoly back to Spain for $500,000—a fortune which would be equivalent to several billion dollars at the present time—and from that date set herself to the laudable task of abolishing the slave trade.

In 1655 Admiral Blake was sent by Cromwell to attack and conquer a footing in the Spanish West Indies, in which the pirates might find shelter. By an alliance with the buccaneers they succeeded in taking possession of the island of Jamaica. England thereupon made the island a haven for all the "gentlemen-adventurers", who from that vantage point proceeded to harass the commerce and navy of Spain to such a degree that in 1670 Spain was glad to sign a document called the "Treaty of America", by which the government of England was allowed to have and to hold all the lands on the American continent of which it was at that time in possession. By this treaty the donation of Pope Alexander VI. was annulled, and England's claim to most of the mainland of North America acceded to by Spain.


"The buccaneers were regarded as valuable to the Colonies because of the prizes they brought in; and even vanity had a share in their being countenanced. The French writers call them "nos braves" and the English boast of their "unparalleled exploits." The governments connived at the actions of these adventurers, which could always be disavowed, and whose successes might be serviceable. This was esteemed a maxim of sound state policy.... It was a powerful consideration of the French and English governments to have always at their occasional disposal, without trouble or expense, a well-trained military force, always at hand, and willing to be employed at emergency; who required no pay or other recompense for their services and constant readiness, than their share of the plunder, and that their piracies upon the Spaniards should pass unnoticed." It is interesting to note the condemnation of the U-boats as "pirates" by English writers who glorify Drake and Hawkins, who were also pirates.

Meanwhile English colonies had been planted all along the shores of the North American mainland. How was it that the English succeeded in maintaining their colonies, in spreading their language and institutions all the way across the great continent, in amalgamating the vast confusion of languages and kindreds and tongues upon this continent into a composition that calls itself, in
defiance of all the facts, “Anglo Saxon”? The answer does not lie in the superior genius of the English-speaking folk; nor in their heaven-sent mission. It lies in the fact that England, alone of all the nations of the world, had so brutalized, impoverished and pauperized her own sturdy peasantry that they formed an inexhaustible reservoir out of which colonies could be formed.

SPECULATING IN COLONIES.

For the English colonies were speculations. Grants of land were made by successive kings to their favorites all along the coastline. Their favorites formed stock companies, largely financed from gold taken from the Spaniards and from the profits of the manufacturing industries manned out of the paupers. Seeing that the pauper class was so profitable at home, these benevolently-minded Lords Proprietors saw no reason why they should not be exploited abroad. Men, women, children, were kidnapped, indentured, and sold to the merchant colonists as slaves. Many hundreds of thousands of English poor sold themselves to ship-captains for their passage over, to be sold by the captains at the docks in America to the highest bidder. Many thousands of them died of starvation on the way over.

The colonies would have failed had it not been for the discovery of tobacco, upon which the wealth of Virginia and the Carolinas was built. On smoke and on tea the speculators of the British Isles made their fortunes. We shall see later how the empire in India, built largely on the trade in tea and spices, had much to do with the American revolution. So let us pass now to India.

FOUNDATION OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANY.

Sebastian Cabot, who discovered North America for $50, also landed on the shores of India, which at that time was claimed by Portugal. France also put in a claim later on, but England succeeded in driving out both rival claimants. And the method is extremely interesting. Europe’s appetite for Eastern spices had been cultivated by the Crusades. But it was immensely stimulated when the way to India by sea had been discovered. Companies were formed in England to charter ships to voyage to India and bring back its spices and silks. At first the charters were for single ships to make single voyages. On such single voyages, the speculators frequently recovered as much as 100% dividends.

On December 31, 1600, the British East India Company was chartered, with powers to do anything that seemed to them to be good in order to swell the profits of the shareholders. Rivalry between the British East India Company and the Dutch East India Company was keen from the start, and the “heroic Dutch wars” of 1652 and 1653 were based upon the sordid commercial motive of keeping the Dutch speculators out of the rich field of Indian trade.
King Charles II. married a Portuguese princess, who gave him the port of Bombay for a wedding present. From that center the British influence spread. In 1789 the British East India Company issued a statement to its officials, saying:

"The increase of our revenue is the subject of our care, as much as our trade. It is that which must make us a nation in India."

British domination of the trade of India was established by Lord Clive in 1787, at the battle of Plassey, when the French were finally defeated. This left the mastery in the hands of the Company. Clive, according to his biographers, left behind him "nothing but the tradition that any amount of money might be squeezed out of the natives by the mere terror of the British name."

What barbarities, what unspeakable cruelties, lay behind that Terror, is fairly recounted in the trial of Warren Hastings by the matchless eloquence of Edmund Burke. For seven years the trial dragged along, revealing to the British nation the desolation, the horror, the destruction of whole tribes and nationalities, which Warren Hastings had brought upon India in order to implant in the breasts of the Indian natives the "terror of the British name", by means of which unlimited money might be squeezed to fill the pockets of the British speculators.

The enormous quantities of money wrung out of India by the British speculators at the present time is estimated by H. N. Brailsford at two billion dollars a year, clear profit.

On March 15, 1917, the British Council in India decided to make Great Britain a present from the natives of India of $500,000,000, as a "free gift from India to England." There is no difference, moral or otherwise, between this "free gift" and the "free gifts" made by the cities of Belgium to Germany under the pressure of military occupation. As an "act of justice" the Council at the same time raised the import duty on cotton goods from England 4% ad valorem. But, according to Lajpat Rai, this would only produce a maximum of five to six million dollars. The remainder of the loan had to be wrung in taxation out of the Indian laborer, whose average income is $10 a year, and out of which he already pays $1.75 in taxation. It is true that, from the point of figures, the Indian worker is the most lightly taxed of imperial subjects. But it is also true that he is even more lightly paid than he is taxed.

India sends England food and necessities at the lowest prices; England sends India luxuries of flimsy value, at enormous prices. Even in famine years, when her people are dying by the million for lack of food to keep their bodies and souls together, India sends to England millions of tons of foodstuffs, starving herself to keep England supplied with the food which English land-hogs prevent her people from raising for themselves.

Lajpat Rai says that "of the people of India, more than 100 million are insufficiently fed at all times; and 60,000,000 do not get as much as two meals a day." Yet India produces immensely; why cannot she feed herself? The answer is clear; she must
first support England’s younger sons before she can support herself.

It is upon this third cornerstone of famine in India that the weight of the British empire rests. In order to control the sea routes to India, England has been forced to control all the land adjacent to or commanding those sea routes. The seizure of the Suez Canal; the rape of Persia; the acquisition of Gibraltar and of the islands in the East End of the Mediterranean, thus making that sea a British lake; all of these have been dictated by the imperative necessity of protecting the highway to India. And, significantly enough, H. G. Wells, in his absurd book “The Soul of a Bishop” refers to the collapse at Gallipoli Peninsula as “the grave of British Imperialism.”

SEIZING THE CANAL.

In the middle of the last century, a Frenchman, De Lesseps, conceived the idea of building a great ship-canal across the Isthmus of Suez, so that ships could sail out of the Mediterranean Sea into the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean and so through to India. Back of this project lay the ambition of France to reconquer for herself that empire of trade which she had lost to Clive at Plassey. England was quick to see the menace, and plotted to wrest the canal away. The story of how it was taken involves the story of one of history’s greatest gamblers since Caesar,—Benjamin Disraeli.

THE BLUFF THAT WON.

Disraeli was born of a Jewish family, but baptized into the Church of England at the age of 13. He was dismissed from school for his independence of ideas and insubordination of temperament. At the age of 22 he wrote “Vivian Grey”, a successful novel, and immediately leaped into fame, and debt.

Disraeli’s great passion was for clothes, and clothes of the oddest sort imaginable. Lytton thus records his impressions at the first meeting with Disraeli: “He wore green velvet trousers, canary colored waistcoat, low shoes, silver buckles, lace at wrist, his hair was in ringlets, and heavily oiled and pomaded.” He specialized in jewelled satin shirt fronts, in rare laces, essences, and perfumes, in wearing gold and jewelled rings over his gloves, and in all manner of highly expensive personal equipment, the like of which staid England had seldom seen. In a letter from Gibraltar he writes of his two walking canes, one for morning and one for evening, “changed as the gun fires.” He writes enthusiastically of a “very successful handkerchief” brought him from Paris at considerable expense.

With all of these fancies to keep up, Disraeli ran heavily into debt. In order to pay his debts he ran continually for Parliament, although at that time no one got a salary for going to Parliament. He was defeated five times in succession. Meanwhile he challenged to a duel Daniel O’Connell, the “liberator”, because Disraeli said
that the famous Irishman was descended from the Impenitent Thief. Morgan O'Connell took up the challenge; and the matter having become reported around, the police dragged Disraeli from his bed early one morning and haled him into a police court, where he admitted that his honor had been satisfied.

Froude says that Disraeli was at length elected to Parliament in 1837 just in time to escape financial ruin, and, perhaps, imprisonment for debt. The expenses of electioneering, the backing of friends' notes, and his own heavy clothes bills, drove him to borrow from all the moneylenders in London, with whom he had a personal or a family acquaintance, at ruinous rates of interest. He frankly told them that he had no chance of repaying the loans unless he was elected. Consequently the interest they charged him was huge enough to cover the risk.

Disraeli's first speech in the House of Commons was greeted with roars of laughter. The absurd figure he cut, with his extraordinary dress, affected manner of speech and the fantastic phrases he chose to employ, and the extravagant way in which his hair and goatee were trimmed, made him a figure of ridicule. He paused in his speech, and cried to the House "Gentlemen, the day will come when you will hear me!"

In 1841 he was elected member for Shrewsbury. Seven years later his father died and left him all his money, with which Benjamin paid most of his debts. In 1851 he married a Mrs. Brydges Williams, a wealthy Spanish Jewess, who brought him enough money to live on in comfort. Thus at last the imminent shadow of debt was removed.

In 1868 he became Premier through the defeat of Gladstone, but held office for only one year. He was defeated on the question of the disestablishment of the Irish Church.

In the year 1874 the question of ritualism in the Church of England became uppermost. Disraeli threw himself into the controversy with great energy, making vigorous speeches on behalf of the suppression of the High Church element. This roused a very vigorous antagonism. Disraeli, in spite of his membership in the church, was very evidently a Jew still; and the staid conservatives of the Church said "Why is this Jew telling us how to run the Church of England?" The indignation raised by this issue was so intense that Disraeli was in grave danger of overthrow; and in order to distract the popular attention he planned the seizure of the Suez Canal.

De Lesseps had obtained the consent of Egypt for the building of the Canal by giving to the Khedive fifty-one per cent of the canal stock, France holding the remainder. This gave the Khedive actual control of the management of the waterway.

The Khedive Ismail, a young Oriental despot, came for the first time into contact with Western civilization when he ascended the throne of Egypt, and went crazy with the charm of it. He purchased locomotives by the dozen, grand pianos and sewing machines a hundred at a time; tossed gold and silver away to the crowded streets of Paris; and wasted money in a hundred ways
on public enterprises and private follies. European contractors overcharged him from 80 to 400 per cent on construction works, and his creditors sometimes got as much as 25 per cent interest on their loans to him. Of a loan of $160,000,000 which he raised in 1873, only $100,000,000 ever reached the treasury, the rest melting away in commissions to bankers.

Egypt thus came under the control of British and French bankers. The Egyptians were taxed to the limit of their capacity to pay, but Ismail could not guarantee payment of the interest. Disraeli secretly offered to pay all of Ismail’s debts, on condition that the shares of the Canal were made over to the British government. In order to secure the money, Disraeli perpetrated one of the most stupendous gambles in history; he bluffed the Bank of England.

Louis N. Parker’s play, “Disraeli”, hinges upon this scene. Disraeli, in a private conference with the Governor of the Bank of England, demands from him the loan of the cash. He refuses. Disraeli thereupon threatens to revoke the charter of the Bank of England, by virtue of his power as premier, unless the money is forthcoming. The indignant Governor yields, exclaiming “It is a monstrous outrage that one man should have such power!” As Disraeli fingers the check, his niece, who has witnessed the interview, exclaims “Uncle, I did not know you had such power!” Disraeli replies, smilingly “I haven’t, my child, but—he doesn’t know that!”

But England’s loan must be secured, and in 1877 occurred the bombardment of Alexandria,—an international outrage, entirely without justification, except that England desired an excuse to obtain control of Egypt.

Having secured the Canal, Disraeli opened the Parliament which had threatened to unseat him with a bill to confer upon the Queen of England the title of Empress of India; which so tickled the vanity of Queen Victoria that she refused to hear of any plan to shake his power.

In 1878—as another instance of the way in which this necessity for control of the Road to India dictates England’s policies—Russia and Turkey had signed a treaty at San Stefano which provided for practically all that England is asking for in the Balkans as a result of the present war. It protected the small Balkan nationalities, and practically expelled Turkey from Europe. Russia had decisively beaten Turkey in the war, and claimed control of the Dardanelles as the fruits of her victory. But when the news of the agreement reached London, Disraeli tore up the Treaty of San Stefano, and demanded another which should protect England’s interests by giving Turkey control of the Straits. And all the Armenian massacres from that time on were perpetrated under the patronage of the Empress of India.

Again; the partition of Persia between Russia and England raised a very great outcry in this country when Morgan Shuster, the American financier who had been employed to straighten out the finances of Persia was dismissed by these powers on the plea
that he was making Persia independent. This partition was dictated by England’s need of keeping Russia away from the shores of the Persian Gulf, and of preventing any possibility of any other power touching on the shores of that sea. South Africa was acquired in order to control the Cape of Good Hope, an important station on the road to India. Australia and New Zealand were settled with the convicted labor leaders, who strove to organize the plundered and betrayed working men of England for better wages and better hours, and thus threatened the very corner stone of the Imperial fabric—British cheap labor.

In Donald Hankey’s book “A Student in Arms”, he quotes one of the wounded soldiers in a London Hospital—indignant because of the treatment he receives—as saying “You’ll see; it’ll be the same as it was after the South African War, when we shed our blooming blood to take the Transvaal for England. As soon as the fighting was over, we working men were so much dirt.”

These things were all done in response to the driving pressure of British invested capital; that capital accumulated out of the spoliation of the poor at home, and the piracies of the Spanish Main abroad. Cruelties were perpetrated, not because the perpetrators were English, but because they were capitalists.

**THE CASE OF IRELAND.**

And now we come to the most tragic page in the history of this Great British Empire, whose cornerstones are pauperism at home and piracy abroad, and which is cemented with the blood of subject nationalities and held together by the bonds of speculative greed. This page of history is that which deals with the case of Ireland.

Lying on the extreme edge of the Continental Shelf, Ireland is bathed in the tropic waters of the Gulf Stream. Its climate is balmy and delightful, its fertility enormous. It never was a part of the Roman Empire; Roman historians, however, describe its fertility and beauty as the blessed Isle of Ierne. But it is England’s nearest neighbor, and was the first to feel the weight of her ambitions.

Early in the twelfth century, Dermuid McDonough, king of Leinster, ran off with the wife of O'Rourke, one of his chieftains. O'Rourke raised an army of his fellow chiefs and chased McDonough out of the country. Wherupon King McDonough and Mrs. O'Rourke went to King Henry II. of England and asked him to replace them on the throne of Leinster. Henry II. put the problem up to the Pope, who at that time happened to be Adrian IV., the only Englishman who ever sat upon the Papal throne. Adrian was a queer character, and many curious stories are told of him. It was he whom Arnold of Brescia, the great Republican monk, chased out of Rome for his extravagances and follies; and he whom Frederick the Redbeard, Emperor, threw off his mule when the Pope insisted on the Emperor’s holding his stirrup.
Adrian gave permission to Henry to conquer Ireland if he could, and keep it if he was able, on condition that he would restore to the Papal obedience the Church of Ireland, which had not been a member of the Imperial Church since the days of Patrick. Armed with this proposition Henry began the conquest in the year 1171. But for five hundred years English rule in Ireland was confined to what was known as the English Pale, a small territory surrounding the city of Dublin.

But in the days that followed the Reformation, the land hunger which had despoiled England spared not Ireland. An ally was called in to aid the English armies—the grim ally of Famine. Soldiers were moved, not against the Irish bands of warriors, but against their crops. All houses and corn were burnt. "The soldiers," says the gentle Edmund Spenser, author of "The Faerie Queene", "harassed the country, taking great prizes, and killing all mankind that were found therein. By this means", he says, "the people will soon be compelled to devour each other." And they were. The records of those days tell how the corpses of those who died from hunger were devoured, often by their own relatives. In Munster, in six months, over 30,000 people starved to death. Lecky says "No spectacle was more frequent than to see multitudes of the poor people dead, with their mouths all colored green with eating nettles, docks and all things they could find above ground."

From the reign of Mary until the days of William III., extermination continued. During Cromwell's 11 years, 616,000 out of a total population of 1,466,000 were killed, besides many that starved unaccounted for in the bogs and forests. To this day "The Curse of Cromwell on you" is the bitterest imprecation an Irishman can swear.

Until the year 1800, Ireland had a Parliament, although only Englishmen could hold office and only Protestants could vote. But from 1782 to 1800, the Irish themselves elected their Parliament. For in 1782, while the American colonies were in revolt and great affairs on the Continent distracted the attention of England, Grattan raised an army of volunteers and demanded Irish independence. During the eighteen years which followed, Ireland enjoyed greater prosperity than ever before or since.

But in 1800, by barefaced and outrageous bribery, the Dublin Parliament voted to transfer its sittings to London, and the Act of Union was passed. Seumas McManus in the Irish World for Nov. 17, 1917, gives the following figures: "In 1795, when England was beginning the work of stealing Ireland's Parliament, the Irish National Debt amounted to $15,000,000. In 1801, Ireland was charged with all the expense necessary to bribe its Parliament, and her National Debt amounted to $140,000,000—a nine hundred per cent increase. In 1817, when the Irish National Debt was merged with the British National Debt, it had increased to $560,000,000—having multiplied by four in those sixteen years. Meanwhile, England's debt had increased but 75 per cent.
"At the present day, Ireland is privileged to share on equal terms the Imperial National Debt,—incurred for carrying on England's wars of aggression, expansion, oppression and general greed, in every quarter of the globe; wars for the enriching of England at the expense of the weak in all corners of the world—an Imperial Debt of more billions than would buy Ireland twenty times over, at market prices.

"In 1795, Ireland was taxed 9½ shillings per head. In 1801, this had increased to 14 shillings. In 1914, taxes were more than 52 shillings per head. In 1917-1918, they are more than three times what they were, three years ago.

"In complete tax revenue", says McManus, "Ireland is paying sixteen shillings out of every pound. England, possessed of an enormous taxable surplus, is paying less than three shillings in every pound.

"Since the Union, England's taxation per head has decreased considerably. Ireland's taxation has increased four hundred per cent.

"The Financial Relations Commission of 1896 recommended that England should pay back to Ireland $11,000,000 a year by way of compensation for the robbery of past years. "Repayment be blowed" said John Bull. "Let's forgive and forget."

How did Ireland respond to this treatment? The story is told in the fact that in one hundred years no less than eighty-seven coercion acts were passed by England upon Ireland; one nearly every year, in order to club Ireland into gratitude for the benefits conferred upon her by England's culture.

But the story is not told until the Famines are recounted. Persistently, recurrently, the most fertile land of Europe is cursed with wholesale starvation. In the famine of 1847-48, more than one million persons died of starvation. Of those who sought to escape by emigration, more than half died on the way and while landing. The banks of the St. Lawrence are dotted with graves of twenty thousand Irish emigrants who sought to find food in the new country. One quarter of all who shipped died on the way over. The Sultan of Turkey, moved with compassion, sent shiploads of provisions to starving Ireland, which cast anchor in her ample harbors alongside English ships loaded with food from Irish farms, bound for England to be sold there to pay the rent.

With these things in mind, it can easily be understood that in the American Revolution half of the Continental army was composed of Irishmen—and that these were the soldiers on whom Washington and his generals relied. There is a letter to General Washington from General Montgomery, dated Oct. 15, 1775, in the Manuscript department of the New York Public Library, saying "The New England soldiers are the worst stuff imaginable for soldiers. They are homesick. Their regiments are melting away." But Joseph Galloway, speaker of the Pennsylvania Assembly prior to the Revolution, and a member of the Continental Congress, testified that the Irish formed the backbone of the armies. Being
a Tory, Galloway had departed for England when the Revolution began. A Joint Committee of the Lords and Commons was appointed to make inquiry into the conduct of the Revolutionary War. In the Royal Gazette of Oct. 27, 1779, Galloway’s testimony is given to the effect that of the rebel armies “scarcely one-fourth were natives of America; one-half were Irish, the other fourth were English and Scotch.” General Charles Lee also testified that about one-half were Irish. These facts are given in a lecture by Hon. Michael J. O’Brien, delivered at the LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, on April 28, 1917, which may be obtained in pamphlet form from the Irish Fellowship Club of Chicago. It also contains a letter from Benjamin Franklin, written while ambassador at Versailles, to the “Good People of Ireland’, whom he urges to rise in revolt.

Considering these things, why have Irish soldiers been so predominant in England’s armies? The answer is simple; they were starved into the army. The system of enrollment employed is this: the recruiting sergeant goes into the public-houses and saloons and offers to treat. When the prospective recruit is well drunken, he is offered a “Queen’s shilling,” whose acceptance constitutes the act of enlistment. Through starvation and drink the Irish have been dragged into the army that subjugates the Empire.

Seen then in its perspective, the bitter opposition of the Irish nation to conscription by England becomes intelligible. When the Easter Rebellion of 1916 was extinguished in the blood of Ireland’s bravest and best, and Padraic Pearse, James Connelly, and Sheehy Skeffington were shot in Dublin Castle, then the fourth cornerstone of England’s greatness, the subjugated Irish race, began to rive asunder from the building. Ireland began to quiver and throb anew with a fierce current of revived nationality. As a result of this high feeling, Lloyd George promised an Irish National Convention to determine the status of the island; but he carefully handpicked the members of the Convention, taking them mainly from the British officeholders, allowing only a negligible representation to Irish Labor and but two members to the party of Sinn Fein, which stands for the Irish Republic. After deliberating for two years, this Convention, while not able to agree—it had been carefully selected so that it could not possibly agree—brought in a report, endorsed by an overwhelming majority, demanding for Ireland complete self-government of the kind enjoyed by Canada. But Lloyd George, announcing that because the Convention lacked complete unanimity, its report could not be accepted, demanded that Conscription be forced upon Ireland before Home Rule was granted it.

Confronted by this proposal, Ireland caught fire; and at this moment the House of Bishops have cast in their lot with the Sinn Feiners, and the Lord Mayor of Dublin is appealing to the President of the United States to enforce upon England that clause of the Allied War Aims which insists that the “freedom and self-determination of small nationalities” is one of their principal desires; for Ireland, surely one of the most self-conscious of all
small nationalities, now demands the immediate establishment of
the free and independent Republic of Ireland!

During the years from 1870 to 1900, England's empire has
added to its possessions the huge total of four million, seven hun-
dred and fifty thousand square miles of additional territory, with
an estimated population of eighty-eight million persons. The clue
to much of this lies in Cecil Rhodes, a gambler in diamonds, and in
Benjamin Disraeli, a gambler in canals. But the steady impulse
to acquisition in the case of the British Empire is the same as it
was in the case of the Roman Empire; namely the greed of specul-
ators and investors for large returns on their investments and
their wagers. For this is always the heart of empire.

Since the War began Great Britain has added to her possessi-
on all of Germany's colonies in Africa and in the South Seas. And
yet Lloyd George, in a speech in London, cried out of the German
ambitions for extension "We are being strangled!"

When the war began, American commerce suffered equally
from both sides. On July 30, 1916, the United States government
transmitted a note to the British government in regard to the
blockade instituted by England, and the blacklist ordered against
all American firms who were doing business with any foe. In it
this government said:

"It is manifestly out of the question that the Government of
the United States should acquiesce in such methods.... The order
was received with painful surprise.... It embodies a policy of
arbitrary interference with neutral trade, against which it is our
duty to protest in the most decided terms.... British ships will
not accept goods from proscribed firms.... neutral ships who do
so are refused coal and may be put on the blacklist.... neutral
bankers refuse loans.... These things are inevitably and essential-
ly inconsistent with the rights of the citizens of all the nations
not involved in the war."

Yet in spite of vigorous protests, this country did assent to
all the restrictions laid against us by the British orders in Council.
Not only that, but as soon as we entered the war we instituted a
policy against neutrals as vigorous and, the neutrals say, as
vicious, as that which on Germany's part drove us into the war.

Such then is the history of the foundation of the British Em-
pire. But an even greater chapter is now being written. For the
chief cornerstone of that imperialism—cheap labor at home—is
being undermined. British Labor has during the war become the
dominant factor in the Empire; and the pauperization of the home
land has been brought to an end.

THE RISE OF BRITISH LABOR.

England is the "classic land of capitalism" because there
Capitalism had its first and completest fruit. And now it appears
that capitalism has given way to the rising power of the new
order, there first of the European lands. For in the first week of
January, 1918, the British Labor Party, comprising the whole Trade Union Congress, all of the Cooperative Societies and all of the old Socialist and labor political organizations, was formed, and announced that, having a majority of the votes in England, it would determine the destinies of the empire.

Lloyd George was summoned to appear before this gathering; and to him British Labor issued its orders. "We intend", said they, "to grant self-government to India and to Africa!" With India self-governed, the third cornerstone of the Empire will have been removed; and Imperialism will be no more, but in its stead a federation of free nations, held together not by the golden bond of speculation that is based on starvation and famine, but by the creative fellowship of the men who toil.

Let us in summing up contrast here two or three opinions in regard to the destiny of England; first that of H. G. Wells, who takes the view of Prof. Cramb that God's name is really England, and who insists that no one who does not entertain these views is entitled to hold office.

"It is scarcely less necessary for a believing man with administrative gifts that he should be in the public administration, than that he should breathe and eat", says Wells, in "God the Invisible King." "Whatever oath or the like to usurper church or usurper king has been set up to bar the way to service, is an oath imposed under duress. If it cannot be avoided it must be taken, rather than that a man should become unserviceable." In order to supply the places for job-holders under this high calling, England must be in the position of control of all the administrative offices to be filled. Curious,—how like this is to Treitschke!

Contrast with this the view of Henry Noel Brailsford:

"If we are to continue in the twentieth century to inflate our patriotic rhetoric with sounding phrases about the balance of power, let us at least be clear about its modern meaning. Shall the Germans be allowed to dig for iron ore on the slopes of the Atlas range, or to carry it in the shape of steel rails to Bagdad? That is the typical question of modern diplomacy. To settle this and similar questions, the young men of Europe are drilled, the battleships are built and the taxes are squandered."

Frederick C. Howe, in his book "Why War?" says:

"In Great Britain, as in Prussia, the people do not really rule. Rule is still in the hands of the old feudal nobility, whose political and economic privileges remain only less sacred than in earlier days. Power is conferred by tradition, by custom, and in final analysis by ownership of the land by the ruling class."

Concerning Cecil Rhodes, the Empire-Gambler of South Africa, William T. Stead, greatest of British journalists, said thus in the Review of Reviews for March, 1896, just after the Jameson raid:

"Cecil Rhodes's objective is the extension throughout the world of the great principles of peace, justice and liberty, of which
the English race may be regarded as in a special sense the standard bearers of the Almighty..... In the old Roman sense of the term, Mr. Rhodes is supremely religious. Patriotism is to him a religion. His Israel is the English-speaking folk, wherever they are found on land or sea, and in them he sees the Providential race, the called of God, the predestined rulers of the world. He accepts the law of the survival of the fittest. He starts from that as the most authentic revelation of the will of the Great Invisible. It colors all his thinking; it dominates all his policies. If it be the will of God that the fittest should survive, then surely it is the first duty of man to help in securing the survival of the fittest, the elimination of the unfit.

"But who are the fittest to survive? The answer is written in capitals all over the open page of the planet. The fittest, as proved by the scientific test of survival, are the English-speaking folk.....

"It is the old Hebrew idea. Mr. Rhodes has no more doubt of the divine mission of the English folk than had Joshua of the divine call of ancient Israel. Hence, looking around him with comprehensive gaze, Mr. Rhodes has arrived at the conclusion that if there be a God who ruleth over the nations of men and concerns himself in the destinies of mortals, then it is impossible to serve him better than by painting as much of the map a British red as possible, and in assisting so far as may be possible in facilitating the survival of those whom Milton called "God's Englishmen" and the elimination of the unfit in the shape of the savages and other residual refuse of the human race.....

'He has a supreme indifference to the means so long as he can obtain his ends.'

How like this is to Bernhardi!

But back of all these tremendous declarations, lies the sharp, prolonged and ceaseless pressure of the British investors for large returns upon their speculative capital, which requires domination of the world in order to safeguard their interests. Surely the native English workingmen have never felt the full beauty of those divine principles of liberty and justice which it is the special mission of England to introduce in other countries. And now British Labor, whose impoverishment and pauperization was the keynote to the Empire, has spoken and decreed the abolition of that on which the Empire was built.

"You have taught us", said British Labor to British Capital, "the meaning of the word "conscription"; and it will go hard with us, but we will better our instruction. If life can be conscripted for the trenches, then wealth can be conscripted to pay the cost of the war;—and that is what shall be done. All railroads, mines, and nationally necessary industries shall belong to the workers of England, when the war is over. There shall be no more war profits!" says British Labor.
And with those words British Labor sets its feet on the new
pathway—the pathway of peace for the nations. For with the
guiding motive of imperialism stricken away; with the deadly tap-
root grubbed up and burned, that evil tree which overshadows the
world and forces the nations to eat of the bitter fruit of Militar-
ism will wither and die.

British Labor has led the way to the true Internationalism
that shall replace the old bloody Imperialism; let all the workers
of all the other nations follow where they have led!
Lecture III.
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THE AMERICAN IDEA

Phrases vs. Facts.

An extraordinary book has just been published, amid high encomiums from the press, entitled “America among the Nations”, by Prof. H. H. Powers, Pres. of the University Bureau of Travel. Prof. Powers is author of “The Things Men Fight For”; and he has been a member of the faculties of the University of Wisconsin, the University of Oberlin, Cornell University, and Leland Stanford University. This book is frankly imperialistic. Yet its opinions largely agree, at least in its statements of fact, with those of an ardent Internationalist, even tho we differ widely on conclusions.

In his Introduction to this book, Prof. Powers says:

“Nations reveal their character by what they do, rather than by what they say. Every nation has certain political principles which it reiterates until they become shibboleths. It has an astonishing power to take these shibboleths seriously, as reflecting its real convictions and character. “Equality before the law”—“consent of the governed”—“non-intervention in the affairs of other nations”—the Monroe Doctrine—we can point proudly to the unvarying profession of these principles thruout our history. The writer would rather, if possible, forget these time-honored formulas and arrive at an independent estimate of our national character from the homely facts of our national history.”

This, in beginning. The formulas which he quotes are set over in contradiction against the facts which he recites. Prof. Powers’ idea is that we should abandon the formulas. My own idea is that we should alter the facts; and inasmuch as we cannot change the facts of the past, that we should so revolutionize the facts of the present as to make the facts of the future harmonize with the phrases which have embodied the ideals of the American hope since the day of the birth of our nation.

“Nations,” says Prof. Powers, “act from self-interest. This is a basic principle. It is a popular fallacy that friction between nations is due to wounded or injured sensibilities; and the frequent allusions to that vague entity known as “national honor” lends color to this belief. The writer has repeatedly been asked, on returning from his visits to Japan, “How do the Japanese feel toward Americans?” Were it possible to answer this question, it would hardly be worth while to do so. If there is ever trouble between America and Japan, it will not be because Japan’s feelings have been hurt, but because her interests are endangered.”
And it is upon this understanding that he dissects our national history, and strives to show that beneath the persistent iteration of high-sounding phrases the smooth current of Fact has flowed strongly on, undeterred and undisturbed by the foam of formulas cast up upon its surface.

In the Metropolitan Magazine for March, 1918, there was an article by William Hard which contrasted the phrases uttered by President Wilson in his speeches on the subject of national policy, with the hard facts which have occurred during his term of office. The facts in Mexico, in Panama, in Haiti and Santo Domingo, in Greece, have been set against the phrases employed by the President. Mr. Hard's article caused the issuance of an order for the suppression of the magazine by the Postoffice Department. This magazine is largely controlled by Theodore Roosevelt, who has the backing of many powerful interests; and hardly had the Postoffice issued the order barring this magazine than it was induced to withdraw it. But many Socialist and Labor papers have been completely suppressed for less cause than was offered by the Metropolitan Magazine.

An even more extraordinary instance is the fate of the People's Council, which was organized in response to the splendid phrases contained in the President's messages to Congress regarding the "right of the people to demand—and insist on—full information at all times in regard to all the nations' affairs." Its main purpose was to back up the cry of Free Russia for support in all other lands—again in response to the Presidential praise bestowed on Russia as a "fit partner in a league of honor," At its Constituent Assembly, the Council adopted a resolution commending the President's phrases concerning the rights of a free people to its freedom, and asking him to secure the correspondence of the facts in the case to the phrases in his speech; but the Council was suppressed at the point of the bayonet, and its leaders have been indicted, — for taking these phrases seriously and trying to bring the Facts into harmony with them. The reason for this conflict between the phrases of the President and the conduct of his administration may be that his words are his own, while the acts of his cabinet are the deeds of others.

But, however, such phenomena are by no means new in American history. Our Declaration of Independence was written under the influence of the Age of Phraseology inaugurated by the philosophers who preceded the outbreak of the French Revolution. Our Constitution, says the President in his "New Freedom", was "written under the influence of the Newtonian theory of checks and balances." And the story of the bitter conflict between the forces which produced the Declaration and the forces which framed the Constitution is the story of the wide variance between Phrases and Facts which has been one of the most remarkable phenomena of American national life.

COLUMBUS.

For example: we were most of us bred up under the impression that Columbus discovered America in order to provide
a home for political liberty. As a matter of fact, of course, America was discovered as a commercial speculation. Mohammed had organized the wild roving tribes of the Arabian desert into an empire which barred the Trade with India from the Mediterranean city-states. Columbus persuaded the Queen of Spain to pawn her jewels on the desperate gamble that he could find a new way to India by sailing to the West. He was actuated by the motive of high profits to be secured by trading in the silks and spices of Japan. When he found that the American natives had no silk nor spices, but were the ignorant possessors of gold and silver mines of great wealth, he tortured them and massacred them to get their gold. So extreme were his cruelties that the same Queen Isabella who commissioned Torquemada, the Grand Inquisitor, to employ all the tortures that fiendish ingenuity could invent in order to convert heretics to the true faith, was horrified by the cruelties practised by Columbus upon the helpless natives, and recalled him in chains to Spain. Perhaps it is not so lamentable an historical accident, after all, that the Western Continent is called after Americus Vespucci, the scientist, rather than after Christopher Columbus, the Discoverer—and Torturer!

Another interesting theory is that our land was settled by the Puritans, in order to establish religious freedom here. But unfortunately the records in the case show that there were no bitterer persecutors of religious heretics than these same Puritans, who burned Quakers and witches and who exiled Congregationalists and Baptists, with the same ferocity exhibited by the Church of England and the Church of Rome. Religious liberty was first proclaimed in this country by the Roman Catholic colony of Maryland; and this was done in order that the Roman Catholics might secure the benefits of that religious liberty which they had, perforce, to extend to all others if they claimed it for themselves.

And still another historical romance is destroyed when we discover that the Thirteen Colonies were settled by wretched white slaves; by kidnapped and indentured paupers; by convicts, and by all the human misery that could be swept together out of the slums of England and dumped on these shores—as a speculation by the Lords Proprietors to whom the colonies were granted. America was discovered as a business proposition; and it was settled as a business proposition by joint-stock or by proprietorial corporations, who sought to make all the profit possible out of the poor of England—those poor who, having been deprived of their own villages and farms thru the Acts of Expropriation, sold themselves into actual slavery to obtain the chance at farms of their own in this country.

Henry Pratt Fairchild's book on "Immigration" gives a picture of two centuries of horror, in the cruelties practised upon the hapless and despairing ones of Europe who sought this country as a haven of liberty, by the ship companies which brought them here. "In 1731" he says" such a scarcity of food was provided for the passengers among some of the ships that
they were compelled to live on the rats and mice which abounded in the hold. These were considered dainties. The Captain believed that the passengers had considerable money aboard, and he starved them to get the money out of them. He succeeded only too well, for out of 156 passengers, only 48 reached America. The rest were buried at sea."

**ORIGIN OF HYPHENISM.**

Prior to the Great War the carrying of immigrants to America was a vast and lucrative business. The customary price for a steerage passage was $30; and since many ships carried two thousand or more such passengers, it was easily possible to make $60,000 on a single voyage—the expenses of which were already more than covered by the freight. In order therefore to stimulate this business, agents were scattered abroad in all the countries of Europe to swell the tide of immigration. Great industrial corporations helped the business along by employing only newly arrived immigrants. As these became familiar with the language and customs of America—and, more important still, with the possibilities of unionism—still lower and lower levels of national life were tapped by the immigration companies, in order to underbid and drive out of the industry those older immigrants who had become “contaminated” with Americanism, so far as to insist upon American standards of living. The great industrial corporations—steel mills, textile mills, copper mines—thus debased the national stock, of set purpose to destroy Americanism during all the years prior to the Great War. Then when the tide of immigration was shut off, it was these same great industrial corporations which had scoured the world to find races of human beings low enough in the scale of living to endure the utterly un-American and almost inhuman conditions of life forced upon their employees—it was these same Industrial corporations which now raised the cry of “Americanize the foreigner!” They did it for the same reason; to prevent unionization, the raising of the scale of pay and raising of conditions of life and labor to the American standard—by branding this as “un-American”.

No better instance of the conflict between Phrases and Facts could be found than the loud cry for “Americanization of the foreigner” and “abolish the hyphen” by those very forces which have striven with every weapon, even to machine-gun and sabre, to prevent the Americanization of standards of life and labor.

**CONDITIONS IN THE COLONIES.**

In Europe, at the time of the settlement of the Colonies, the laws were barbarously savage. Men—and women—were hanged for stealing a sheep or a loaf of bread or a joint of meat worth over a shilling. Savage laws such as these were needed to repress the hunger of the poor deprived of every means of earning an honest living. And it was out of the depths of their misery
that they were brought to America—only to find here a repetition of the debtors' prisons and the slave laws which had made their life a curse at home.

James O'Neal, in his "Workers in American History" quotes extensively from the records of that time in picturing the horrible condition of the poor debtor in the Colonies, and of the enslaved white workers brought over as immigrants. Having read these, small wonder remains that the poor "white trash" escaped from their masters whenever they could, to brave the horrors of savage warfare in the wilderness, with the torture which was the sure consequence of capture by the Indians, rather than serve their liberty-loving masters of the colonies.

From THE WORKERS IN AMERICAN HISTORY, by James O'Neal (Pages 46-48.)

"One step above these slaves were the convict bond-servants, or men and women in a state of temporary involuntary servitude. These people were either political offenders or felon convicts. Those guilty of political offenses, as the Scots taken in battle of 1650, the prisoners captured at the battle of Worcester in 1651, Monmouth's men, 1685, the Scots concerned in the uprising of 1678, the Jacobins of 1716, the Scots who went out in 1745, were, of course, of this class of offenders.

"The felons formed the great source of supply. One historian of Maryland declares that up to the Revolution twenty thousand came to that colony, and half of them after 1750. Another authority... asserts that between 1715 and 1775, ten thousand felons were exported from the Old Bailey Prison in London..."

"But the indentured servant and redemptioner did not cease to come when the colonies became the United States. Speaking generally, the indentured servants were men, women and even children, who, unable to pay their passage, signed a contract called an indenture before leaving the Old World. This indenture bound the owner or master of the ship to transport them to America, and bound the emigrant after arrival in America to serve the owner, or their assigns, for a certain number of years. On reaching port the owner or master, whose servants they then became, sold them for their passage to the highest bidder, or for what he could get.

"The redemptioner, on the other hand, was an immigrant who signed no indenture before embarking, but agreed with the shipping merchant that after reaching America he should be given a certain time (generally a month) in which to find a redeemer. If he failed to find a purchaser within a specified time, the ship captain was at liberty to sell him to the highest bidder...

"When a ship laden with one to three hundred such persons arrived, we will say at Philadelphia, the immigrants, arranged in a long line, were marched at once to a magistrate and forced to take an oath to the United States, and then marched back to the ship to be sold. If a purchaser was not forthcoming... they were frequently sold to speculators who drove them, chained together, thru the country, from farm to farm, in search of a purchaser.

"The contract signed, the newcomer became in the eyes of the law a slave, and in both the civil and criminal code was classed with negro slaves and Indians. None could marry without consent of the master or mistress, under penalty of an addition of one year's service to the time set forth in the indenture. They were worked hard, were dressed in cast-off clothes of their owners, and might be flogged as often as the owners thought necessary. Father, mother and children could be sold to different buyers."

These were all white persons; and such conditions prevailed up to and even after the formation of the American Republic.

O'Neal continues: (pp. 49-50)

"It also became the fashion to place paupers up at public auction in Boston and other New England towns and sell them to the lowest bidder for
their support. New Jersey followed this simple Puritan plan, as did New York, where their children also were sold as apprentices. New England "democracy" found its way over into Pennsylvania and blessed the workers there with its presence. We are informed that in this colony "The class of indentured servants was not recruited from immigrants alone. The courts of this period (1684) and for many years after, frequently sentenced free-men to be sold into servitude for a period of years in order to liquidate fines or other debts...; orphan children were brought to the court to be "abjudged", there being on one occasion, in the Chester county court, in 1697, thirty-three whose terms of service were fixed by the court." It was New England "democracy" that also set the fashion in punishing offenders with whipping, branding, cropping, mutilation, the pillory and the stocks."

These quotations are taken by O'Neal from Prof. McMaster's "History of the People of the United States."

O'Neal goes on on Page 55, quoting from "Documentary History of the United States:

"Fugitive slave laws as applied to these slaves were a part of the legislation in all colonies. The laws generally provided penalties for both fugitives and those who gave them shelter or aided them in any way to escape. The penalty for fugitives generally included an addition to their terms of servitude, which varied in each colony. Advertisements appeared in all colonial newspapers. The following, from the Virginia Gazette (Williamsburg), July 14, 1737, may be cited as an example of hundreds:

"Ran away some time in June last from William Pierce of Nansemond county, near Mr. Theophilus Pugh's, merchant; a convict servant woman, named Winifred Thomas. She is a Welsh woman, short, black haired and young; marked on the side of her right arm with gunpowder W. T. and the date of the year underneath. She knits and spins, and is supposed to be gone by the way of Cureatuck and Roanoke inlet. Whoever brings her to her master shall be paid a pistole besides what the law allows, paid by William Pierce."

It will be noted that this white woman serf had her initials and the date when she was purchased branded on her right arm."

Rebellions of the white slaves and of the debtors, who were treated with horrible cruelty, were frequent. All historians who deal with the American Colonies tell of them. Mary Johnston's novels "Prisoners of Hope" and "Audrey" are faithful pictures of those times. King Charles II. of England said of Governor Berkeley of Virginia, who suppressed Bacon's rebellion with great severity, "The old fool has put to death more people in that naked country than I did here for the murder of my father."

Such conditions as these were the normal portion of the poor and the working class in every country in Europe at that time. So when the French philosophers of the Rights of Man began to propound their theory of the Social Contract, their theories found a strong, instantaneous response in this country. Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry and the young intellectuals of that day read with avidity their writings and enthusiastically adopted their theories. It was under the strong impulse of this movement that the Declaration of Independence was written by Thomas Jefferson.*

*William Elroy Curtis, in his entertaining book "The True Thomas Jefferson", tells concerning the Continental Congress which adopted the Declaration a story that passes unnoticed in most of our histories. The Convention met in a hall adjoining a livery-stable, and the day was hot.
Upon such a background as this the tremendous opening phrases of the Declaration of Independence smote and echoed like a clap of thunder. "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created free and equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

This—to the tortured debtors; this, to the cruelly oppressed white slaves, and tenants, and working-men; this, to the paupers and the prisoners, sounded like a blast from the trumpet of God calling for judgment. The whole wretched structure which was built upon their misery seemed to be tottering to its fall, when such words as these could be written into the forefront of an army going to battle. No wonder that the wealthy and influential classes, alarmed by such rash statements, turned Tory in such large measure and fled to Great Britain.

For eight long years the Army of the Revolution, composed one-half of Irish who had fled from landlordism in Ireland, and of Scotch and American poor who trusted in the promises of the Declaration, fought in snow and ice and misery to make good the Phrases which opened the Declaration of Independence.

When the treaty of peace was signed, there were thirteen small nations strung along the Atlantic coast line, from New Hampshire to Georgia. During the period between Independence and Federation, the governments of these thirteen little countries grew more and more democratic with rapid strides, under the impulse of the great hope of Liberty. Prof. J. Allen Smith, in his book "The Spirit of American Government", outlines the steps by which the rights of workers and tenant farmers were increasingly safeguarded; how the government was more and more passing into the hands of the plain people; and how this alarmed the substantial property-holders. Laws favorable to the workers and the debtors were passed in state after state. Rebellions broke out, such as that one known as "Shays Rebellion" in Massachusetts, which gathered the tenant farmers and poorer classes into mobs which prevented the courts from framing indictments for debts, and from ejecting tenant farmers from their lands at the will of the landlord.

General Knox wrote to Washington in 1786: "The people who are insurgents" (The Shaysites) "have never paid any, or very little taxes. But they see the weakness of government. They feel at once their poverty, compared with the opulent, and their own force, and they are determined to make use of the latter, to remedy the former. Their creed is: 'That the property of the United States has been protected from the confiscation of Britain by the joint exertions of all, and therefore ought to

Jefferson's production met with sharp criticism—at first. A phrase here and there was pulled out, a word changed, and the punctuation altered. But in the heat of the day a swarm of green livery-stable flies entered the window, and began to bite the silk-stockinged legs of the delegates until the blood came. Under these conditions debate became impossible; and the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration as it stood, and sped from the hall to rout the British—having been defeated by the green-backed flies.
be the common property of all. And he that attempts opposition to this creed is an enemy to equity and justice, and ought to be swept off the face of the earth.'"

FRAMING OF THE CONSTITUTION.

There is abundant testimony to the fear in the wealthier classes of this uncalled-for literalness of the working classes, in taking at their face value the phrases of the Declaration of Independence under which the Revolution had been fought and won. The most eloquent of this testimony is that contained in the journal of the convention which framed the Constitution, as reported by James Madison, its secretary, later President of the United States. And this is the story:

In 1786 the legislature of Virginia invited all the colonies to send delegates to a convention at Annapolis to discuss the trade and commercial system of the colonies. The attendance was slim, but this attendance issued invitations to another convention in Philadelphia in 1787, to propose amendments to the Articles of Confederation, and safeguard trade. Delegates to this commercial conference were chosen on a property basis. Indeed, almost all elections were on a property basis. In New York, for example, in 1790, out of a population of 30,000, there were only 1209 who possessed sufficient property to be voters.

There were four classes of non-voters in the Colonies: slaves, indentured servants, non-propertied classes, and women. Those who held real property were divided into the squatter and tenant class on the one hand, in opposition to the large landholders of the coast on the other. The squatters and tenants were a large debtor class; the princes of the Colonies were the patroons of the Hudson Valley and the slave-holders of the South.

Prof. Charles A. Beard of Columbia University, in his book "Economic Interpretation of the United States Constitution", has made a careful analysis of the tax reports and Treasury documents of these early times, on the strength of which he makes the statement that "The overwhelming majority of the members of the Constitutional Convention, at least five-sixths, were directly, immediately and personally interested in the outcome of their labors at Philadelphia, and were even to a greater or less degree economic beneficiaries from the adoption of the Constitution.

"A majority of the members were lawyers by profession. Most of the members came from towns on or near the coast: that is, in the regions where personalty was most largely represented. Not one member represented in his immediate personal economic interest the small farming or mechanic classes."

That interests that were represented he shows, by governmental records, to be divided as follows:

- "Public security holders, 40 out of the 55.
- Purchasers of speculative lands, 14 members.
- Money-lenders, 24 members."
Mercantile, manufacturing, and shipping lines, 11 members. Slave-holders, 15 members.”

The “public securities” referred to as comprising nearly four-fifths of the convention were those who had bought up Continental Congress scrip at extremely low rates from the impoverished soldiers who had fought thru the eight years of war, receiving wounds and enduring starvation in order to make the principles of the Declaration of Independence come true. This Continental currency sank so low that Washington, who was in a position to command the most advantageous rates, was compelled to sell at the rate of twenty for one the certificates which the Continental Congress had sent him in payment for the arrears of his salary as Commander-in-Chief of the Army. Twenty for one—five cents on the dollar! This was the value of the pay given to the soldiers of Valley Forge and of Yorktown!

Shrewd speculators had bought up all this currency at the lowest possible rates. If a strong central government were formed, which would redeem these certificates at one hundred cents on the dollar, profits of nineteen hundred per cent would be realized. Likewise, debts contracted in the cheap currency would be collected at the high figure; that is, a nickel’s worth of debt would suddenly become magnified into a dollar’s worth.

Some of the soldiers of the Revolution had taken their payment in land warrants, giving them title to the Western lands beyond the Alleghenies. But these also were purchased at a very low valuation by land speculators; and if a strong central government could be formed to protect these lands and encourage their settlement, these speculators also would realize handsomely on the investment. Slaves escaping from one colony into another—white slaves as well as black—could be seized and brought back to their owners by a strong central government; and here came in the interest of the slave-owners. The mercantile and manufacturing interests were chiefly interested in the levying of a high tariff; as is shown by the long petitions sent to the First Congress by the mercantile societies of Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia and New York, giving long lists of products on which protection was desired. The difficulty of tariffs under State government was, of course, that if one state levied a high tariff and another state a low one, the manufacturers of the unprotected state would be at a disadvantage.

CHOOSING A CAPITAL.

A quarrel arose between the Northern and the Southern colonies over the assumption by the National government of the state debts. Most of the fighting had been done in the North, and consequently most of the debts had been incurred by the Northern colonies. The Southern states objected to sharing equally in that burden. But there was also a quarrel as to the location of the new National Capital. Boston, Philadelphia and New York claimed it on the ground of prior rights. But the Southern dele-
gates made a trade. "Give us the Capital," they said, "and we will assume your debts." The trade was made; and Washington was located in a district ceded by Maryland and Virginia, on the beautiful Potomac, near the home of George Washington, President of the Convention and later President of the Union.

The total amount of the national debt, after the state debts were funded, is given by Hamilton as $76,096,468.67. Large sums were won on the New York Stock Exchange thru the manipulation of these securities after its foundation in 1792. Callender, a bitter opponent of Hamilton, claims that a national debt of practically $80,000,000 had been created, of which only $30,000,000 was necessary. Gallatin later held that the unnecessary debt—or graft, to use a shorter word—was only about $11,000,000. Beard, after careful analysis, places it at $40,000,000, which was mainly gained by the holders of securities of the Continental Congress, thru the adoption of the Constitution.

Now to some persons it will seem sacrilegious to look behind the curtains which reverence has thrown around the Constitutional Convention. But after all, says Beard "as practical men they were able to build the new government upon the only foundations which could be stable: the foundations of fundamental economic interest." After the Revolution of 1848, the doctrinaires of Europe gathered in convention at Frankfort and tried to build a government out of aspirations and ideals. After wrangling for more than a year, they were dispersed by the police under the anti-noise ordinance.

The moneyed classes were the only group in the colonies who were nationally self-conscious at that time. Eventually the working classes would have achieved a national unity and established a Republic based upon the Rights of Man instead of the Rights of Property. And it was to prevent that event, clearly foreseen by the Fathers of the Republic in the disturbances of the continual rebellions, that our Constitution was framed. This is no idle guess. James Madison, the "Father of the Constitution", states so plainly.

"The supreme danger will arise", says Madison, as quoted by Beard, "from the fusion of certain interests into an overbearing majority—the landless proletariat—which would make its rights paramount and sacrifice the rights of the minority. To secure public good and private rights against the danger of such a faction, and at the same time preserve the spirit and the form of popular government, is then the great object to which our inquiries are directed."

In accordance with this desire, the Constitution was so framed as to make it impossible for the majority of the people to obtain, on any one issue, control of their governmental machinery. The electoral body was broken up into many different classes, and the officials are elected for different times and by different groups.

For example: the House of Representatives is elected for two years, the President for four years, the Senators for six years and the judges are appointed for life. The Senate is a con-
tinuous body, only one-third of its members being elected every two years. Each of these branches of Government is elected by a different body. The President and Vice-President are chosen by the College of Electors. The Senators were to be chosen by the State Legislatures; the Representatives are elected by the people direct, and the Judges are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Thus the Senate, a continuous body, was to be the balance-wheel of the governmental machinery, and was relied upon to protect the interests of property—which it has done with great faithfulness. Alexander Hamilton was a great admirer of the House of Lords in the British Parliament, and strove to model the Senate on that model. "The House of Lords," said he, "is a noble institution!" Concerning the judiciary, he said: "In a monarchy, judicial control is an excellent barrier to the despotism of the prince; in a republic it is no less an excellent barrier to the encroachments and oppressions of the representative body."

Property qualification for the new government was strongly urged, and seems to have been unanimously favored. But a snag was struck; representatives of landed interests and representatives of moneyed interests could not agree as to whether the qualification should be possession of land or possession of money; and rather than yield to the other side, each faction incurred the risk of the "landless proletariat".

As first drawn up then, the Constitution entirely omitted any provision corresponding with the phrases of the Declaration of Independence—as can easily be seen by examining its present form. Hardly had the proposed Constitution been made known when a violent storm of protest arose against it, because of this omission.

OPPOSITION TO THE CONSTITUTION.

Chief justice John Marshall, in his "Life of Washington", says:

"So balanced were the parties in some of the states that even after the subject had been discussed for a considerable time, the fate of the Constitution could scarcely be conjectured; and so small in many instances was the majority in its favor as to afford strong ground for the opinion that, had the influence of character been removed, the intrinsic merits of the instrument would not have secured its adoption.

"Indeed, it is scarcely to be doubted that in some of the adopting states a MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE WERE IN OPPOSITION. In all of them, the numerous amendments which were proposed demonstrate the reluctance with which the new government was accepted; and that the dread of dismemberment, not an approbation of the particular system, had induced an acquiescence in it. North Carolina and Rhode Island did not at first accept the Constitution, and New York was apparently dragged into it by a repugnance at being excluded from the Confederacy."
The objections were not capacious, but based on the fact that the original draft of the new Constitution entirely omitted any reference to the human rights enumerated by the Declaration. Careful analysis of the facts of the situation as recorded in Treasury reports and state documents, made by Prof. Charles A. Beard, demonstrates that in fact the Constitution could not have been adopted at all, and the Federal Government could not have come into power, had not the provision for human liberty specified in the Declaration of Independence, which gave this nation its birth, been later forced into the proposed Constitution.

Thomas Jefferson, the writer of the Declaration of Independence, and founder of the Democratic Party, was greatly disgusted by the proposed Constitution in its original form, and bitterly opposed its enactment until amendments could be secured; the first amendment specified by him as vitally necessary to the preservation of the Union being that for the safeguarding of religion, speech, press, assembly and petition. Prof. C. A. Beard, in "Evolution of the American Government," page 63, says:

"During the struggle which occurred in many states over the acceptance of the new plan of government, it was manifest that a great deal of the opposition to it was based on the absence of any provisions expressly safeguarding individual rights against the action of the Federal Government.

Jefferson, who was in Paris at the time the convention finished its work, wrote to a friend in Virginia that he wished four states would withhold ratification until a declaration of rights could be annexed, stipulating "freedom of religion, freedom of press, freedom of commerce against monopolies, trial by jury in all cases, no suspensions of habeas corpus, no standing armies."

"Most of the state constitutions had provided such limitations on their governments, and there was evidently a desire on the part of many who otherwise approved the Constitution, to see the ancient doctrine of private rights embodied in it. Seven (7 of nine) of the ratifying state conventions even put their wishes in the concrete form of a total of one hundred and twenty-four articles of amendment to be added to the Constitution.

"After a delay of two months, the House passed seventeen amendments, which were reduced to twelve in the Senate, slightly modified at a joint conference committee, and submitted to the States by a two-thirds vote on September 25, 1789, with an accompanying resolution to the effect that this had been done to "extend the ground of public confidence in the government, and best ensure the beneficent ends of its institution."

"Two of the amendments dealing with the apportionment and payment of members of Congress failed to receive the approval of the requisite number of states, but the other ten were ratified by eleven commonwealths, Virginia being the last to add her sanction, Dec. 15, 1791."

It thus appears that had the first ten amendments, and especially the first of those ten, not been forced into our Consti-
tution, it could not possibly have been adopted, and our United States of America could not have come into existence.

The price of our national life is therefore, in a peculiar, special and vitally emphatic sense, the first Amendment of the Federal Constitution, which provides:

"CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW RESPECTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION, OR ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH, OR OF THE PRESS, OR OF THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE PEACEABLY TO ASSEMBLE AND PETITION FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES."

To strike at this amendment, therefore, is to destroy the keystone of the arch of the Union. It is to destroy that which gave America its birth; to pull out the cornerstone on which, in sober historic fact, our national structure is erected.

The question must arise, why was this matter of human rights, so prominent in the Declaration of Independence, omitted from the first draft of the Constitution?

The answer to this question must be looked for in the composition of the body which drew up the Constitution. According to the record of the Constitutional Convention preserved for us by James Madison, secretary of the Convention and later President of the United States, the members of the Constitutional Convention were openly and avowedly interested in maintaining the supremacy of property rights over personal rights. This was proclaimed by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and many others.

Hamilton said: (Quoted in Beard, Ec. Interp. P. 199.)

"All communities divide themselves into the few and many. The first are the rich and well born, and the other the mass of the people...... The people are turbulent and changing; they seldom judge or determine right. Give, therefore, to the first class a distinct, permanent share in the government. They will check the unsteadiness of the second, and as they cannot receive any advantage by a change, they will, therefore, ever maintain a good government. Can a democratic assembly who annually revolve in the mass of the people be supposed steadily to pursue the public good? Nothing but a permanent body can ever check the imprudence of democracy. It is admitted that you cannot have a good executive upon a democratic plan......

"The House of Lords is a noble institution. Having nothing to hope for by a change and sufficient interest, they form a permanent barrier against every pernicious innovation, whether attempted on the part of the Crown or of the Commons."

MADISON ON THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

James Madison, Secretary of the Convention and later President, wrote in the Federalist, (Number 10) as follows:

"The diversity in the faculties of men, from which the rights of property originate, is not less an insuperable obstacle to a uniformity of interests. The protection of these faculties is the
first object of government. From the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degrees and kinds of property immediately results; and from the influence of these on the sentiments and views of the respective proprietors, ensues a division of society into different interests and parties.

"The most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society. Those who are creditors, and those who are debtors, fall under a like discrimination. A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations and divide them into different classes actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation, and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of the government."

This is as clear a statement of the Socialist doctrine of the class struggle as has ever been written, on American soil at least.

It was the protection of the rights of property, and in particular the rights of property in speculative values that chiefly interested the framers of the Constitution. It was for this reason that they omitted any reference to the rights of humanity as differing from the rights of property. Popular indignation at this omission forced the inclusion of these amendments as the price of national union.

ALIEN AND SEDITION LAWS.

It was not long before the security of these amendments was tested. President Adams, still a representative of the propertied interests, secured the passage of a series of laws known as the Alien and Sedition Law, bridging, among other things, the rights of free speech, free press, and free assembly. Knowledge of the effect and fate of these laws is of supreme importance at the present time.

It was the Federalist Party which had formed the union. It was they who were supreme in all branches of the government. But when these laws were passed by the Federalist Congress, and signed by the Federalist President, that party ceased to exist. The Government and Administration which dared, even under extreme duress and pressure of circumstances, to strike at the right of Free Speech, Free Press, and Free Assembly, was almost instantly wiped out of being by the American people. Yet the need seemed to Adams acute.

In the spring of 1798 the new French Republic was feverishly preparing to meet the second coalition England was forming, with Austria, Russia, Turkey, Naples, and Portugal, to crush out democracy and establish the divine right of autocracy. The French Ambassador had been sent home by President Washington for
insolence. French vessels had fired upon and depredated American commerce. The British Navy was then, as it has been since, searching all American vessels before allowing them to sail the seas. The alleged presence of French spies and agitators in the United States caused the Attorney-General to ask for the passage of the Alien and Sedition Laws. Congress yielded.

The Sedition law was used for purposes of political oppression then, as it is now. Critics of the administration were accused of favoring the enemies of the Republic, and thrown into prison. Fine and imprisonment were given for criticizing officeholders.

The result was the destruction—extermination—of the Federalist party.

Concerning this the following is stated by Prof. Frederic Jackson Turner, M. A. LL. D., Litt. D. Prof. of History, Harvard, formerly at University of Wisconsin, in the Encyclopaedia Britannica.

"The reaction in Great Britain against the indefinite "rights of man" had led the parliament to pass an alien law, a sedition law suspending the writ of habeas corpus, and an act giving wide and loosely defined powers to magistrates for the dispersion of meetings to petition for a redress of grievances.

"The Federalists.... were strongly tempted by sympathies and antipathies of every sort to form their program on the model furnished from England. They.... tended to force the Constitution into an anti-democratic direction.

"Three alien laws were passed in June and July, 1798. The first, repealed in April, 1802, raised the number of years necessary for naturalization from five to fourteen. The third, still substantially in force, permitted the arrest and removal of subjects of any foreign power with which the United States should be at war. The second, which is usually known as the Alien Law, was limited to a term of two years; it permitted the President to arrest or order out of the country any alien whom he should consider dangerous to the country. As many of the Republican editors and local leaders were aliens, (Irish and French) this really put a large part of the Republican organization in the power of a President elected by their opponents.

"The Sedition Law, (to be in force until March 1801 and not renewed) made it a crime, punishable by fine and imprisonment, to publish or print "any false, scandalous or malicious writings against the government of the United States, either House of Congress or the President, or to stir up sedition or opposition to any lawful act of Congress, or of the President, or to aid the designs of any foreign power against the United States."

Out of Congress the execution of the objectionable laws took the shape of political persecution. Men were arrested, tried and punished for writings which the people had been accustomed to consider within legitimate political methods. The Democratic-Republican leaders made every trial as public as possible, and so gained votes constantly so that the Federalists began to be shy of the very powers which they had created. Every new elec-
tion was a storm signal for the Federalist Party and the danger was increased by schism in their own ranks.

Prof. Charles A. Beard, in "American Government and Politics" (P. 106) says:

"Thus a long chain of circumstances led to the formation of two parties: the Federalists, and the opposition known in the beginning as the Anti-Federalists, but later as the Republicans or Democrats, the terms being used synonymously, and sometimes joined together. The Federalists were deeply angered by this antagonism to what they regarded as their patriotic efforts on behalf of the nation. Chief Justice Ellsworth in a charge to a grand jury in Massachusetts, denounced the "French system mongers from the quintumvirate in Paris to the Vice-President (Jefferson) and the minority in Congress, as the apostles of atheism, anarchy, bloodshed and plunder."

The Encyclopaedia Brittanica says: "Jefferson, leader of the Anti-Federalists, was roundly denounced as an atheist and "leveler", while Adams, the Federal candidate was characterized by his opponents as "the monarchist." So sharply drawn was the contest that Adams was chosen by the narrow plurality of only three electoral votes.

"During Adams' administration a series of events thoroughly discredited the Federalist Party. Adams was for a time popular, principally on account of his early attitude toward France for the mistreatment of our representatives but that popularity was short-lived. The Republican newspapers heaped the most indiscriminate abuse upon the head of the President and the Federalists generally, and as a result Congress pushed through the Alien and Sedition Acts . . .

"Under the Sedition Act many of the Anti-Federalists were sharply punished for what would seem to us trivial criticisms of the administration. For example, Callender, a friend of Jefferson, was convicted for saying among other things, "Mr. Adams has only completed the scene of ignominy which Mr. Washington began."

"The Sedition Act, especially, seemed to be in flat contradiction to those amendments to the Federal Constitution securing freedom of press and speech against Federal interference, and undoubtedly it was unconstitutional . . . These laws marked the death knell of the Federalist party."

The Party of Thomas Jefferson, first called Democratic-Republican, and then Democratic, came into being to uphold the First Amendment to the Constitution.

LINCOLN UPHOLDS FREEDOM.

From that time until the days of Lincoln, the First Amendment to the Constitution was not seriously challenged. In Lincoln's day the agitation for the suppression of this right in wartime arose again, but was sternly refused by Lincoln.
On the night of his renomination, Lincoln said: "I do not pretend that those who thought that the best interests of the nation were to be subserved by the support of our administration embraced all the patriotism and loyalty in the country. . . . I do not impugn the motives of any one opposed to me. . . . It is no pleasure to me to triumph over an enemy."

Invited to a Union mass meeting in Buffalo during the Presidential campaign of 1864, Lincoln refused even to write them a letter in his own behalf, lest he should be thought to be using his Presidential powers to influence public opinion for himself personally. Nicolay and Hay state: "During the campaign of 1864, Mr. Lincoln was frequently called upon to assist his friends, to oppose his enemies, and to exercise his powerful influence in appeasing discord in different states and districts. He interfered as little as possible. . . . He took no account of the personal attitude of candidates toward himself. He compelled office holders to allow their subordinates to vote as they pleased."

At the time when the Union was rent asunder, and in far greater peril than at any time before or since, the Democratic party met in convention and adopted a platform calling for the immediate cessation of the war and the acceptance of any terms obtainable from the Confederate States. So far from interfering with this Convention, or with the campaign which followed, Lincoln said that the test of a Democracy was that it could maintain itself in despite of division of opinion; that to suppress discussion was to confess that the Government was afraid. As was stated by the Industrial Relations Commission in its report of 1915. "It is axiomatic that a government which can only be maintained through the suppression of criticism ought not to be maintained."

Thus the Democratic Party, founded in order to protect the right of free speech, press, assembly and petition, which insisted on the extreme exercise of those rights during the great national crisis, came to the Administration of Woodrow Wilson with an unbroken record behind it of staunch championship of the principles of democracy in times of war and national crisis as in times of peace, as the very essence of democracy itself. It was reserved for an Administration which embarked upon a crusade for making the whole world safe for democracy to suppress the fundamental principle and essence of democracy at home; to declare that the Keystone of the arch of the Federal Republic is no longer in its place. When Republicans were in power, Democrats might criticise. But when Democrats are at last in power, to criticise is "treason!"

OTHER PHRASES AND FACTS.

One of the most persistently misrepresented facts with regard to our national history is the War of 1812. How many American children are taught, for example, that the war of 1812 was a side issue of the Napoleonic wars; that England had overwhelmingly beaten us, landed a force at Washington and captured
our national capital, burned the Capitol and the White House, and chased the President out into the woods, where he slept for three nights? The country was saved at the battle of New Orleans, and the heaviest brunt of the attack was borne by Jean Lafitte and his pirates—an outlaw band from Barataria Bay, where a colony of smugglers had taken refuge from the federal revenue officers. Had it not been for those brave pirates, the mouth of the Mississippi might have been captured by England, and this country held in a circling vise from Canada to the Gulf which would have permanently crippled its growth.

Heroic France came to our aid in the war of the Revolution with armies composed largely of Irish; and France's aims were far from unselfish. Only a short time previous, France had lost to England the whole vast Empire of Canada, and Louisiana was in jeopardy. By her aid to the American Colonies, France sought to regain her lost empire. It is a curious by-play of history that at the treaty of peace which ended the Revolution, France sought to have us accept our freedom as a gift from France, and even to have us acknowledge ourselves a colony of France. (See "America Among the Nations"; by H. H. Powers.)

And again; the only time in all our history when we expanded into a territory which wanted us was in the case of Texas; and Texas knocked at the gate of the Union for ten long years before we would let it in. In all other cases of territorial expansion we entered regions which were either indifferent or hostile.

The Gadsden Purchase, by which we settled with Mexico for the extreme southwestern boundary, is narrated by Prof. H. H. Powers as a sample of the extreme idiocy which can at times afflict a growing nation. In order to evade the payment of a few damage claims and get a route for the Southern Pacific Railroad, the Senate concluded this purchase without acquiring the head of the Gulf of California which was allowed to remain in the hands of Mexico; and thus the Southwestern region was deprived of a natural outlet to the sea, with infinite resulting complications.

**CAUSES OF THE CIVIL WAR.**

Prof. H. H. Powers account of the process of our national growth is interesting as laying bare many an unknown chapter of our history. But perhaps the most persistently misrepresented chapter of our whole national history is that which deals with the Civil War. We are accustomed to think of that great conflict as having been fought for the freedom of the slaves. But Abraham Lincoln himself so late as August 22, 1862, wrote to Horace Greeley, editor of the New York Tribune:

"As to the policy I seem to be pursuing, as you say, I had not meant to leave anyone in doubt. I would save the union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it. If I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do that, and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would do that."
A perusal of the letters and documents of Lincoln as preserved in Nicolay and Hay's Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln leave us in no doubt on this score. And they leave us in no doubt on another point; that Abraham Lincoln's sorest efforts to preserve the Union would have been of no avail, if England had carried out her threat of breaking the Southern blockade in order to get cotton for her mills. Had that been done, and had the English fleets bombarded the northern ports and paid the South for all her cotton, with money and munitions, the cause of the North would have been hopeless. The English Government was on the verge of doing this very thing. What prevented it? The answer is startling; the Workingmen of England, led by Karl Marx, raised so tremendous a protest against this proposal that the British Government was compelled to abandon its plan.

Had it not been for this cooperation of the workingmen of England with Abraham Lincoln, there is no reasonable doubt that the Union would have been destroyed. The men who founded the International Workingmen's Association, that "Red Spectre" which for fourteen years terrified the chancelleries of Europe, were in correspondence with Lincoln all during the time of its formation. The letters he sent them and which they sent him, as well as the writings of both, demonstrate that they shared in common the ideas which led to the great Socialist movement in America; that in fact, these two movements were expressions of the same mighty ferment of ideas which led to the Revolution of 1848 in Europe, the anti-slavery movement in America, and the formation of the International the world over.

LINCOLN THE INTERNATIONALIST.

No life of Lincoln has ever been written, so far as I know, which deals with this aspect of the great President as an Internationalist. And yet no life of Lincoln is complete or deals with him in his true significance to the world which does not show him as, in very fact, one of the Founders of International Socialism. For the ideas which Marx later expressed in concise and scientific form in the pages of Das Kapital ring thru and thru the writings of Lincoln. It is true that he never formulated his convictions into a program similar to that of Marx. But Marx was a constant reader of Lincoln's writings, as indeed, he was the whole course of American public opinion. And their correspondence shows how closely akin were their methods of thought, and how they played into one another's hands.

Lincoln's interest in the law began when he was quite a youth. The story goes that a traveller offered him a quarter to row him across the Sangamon river, in the absence of the ferry. But the ferryman had been granted a charter for a ferry across the river at that point, and he sued Lincoln for an infringement of his charter. The court granted the plea, and ordered Lincoln to pay a fine.
This struck him as an outrage, but he was compelled to obey the law. Thereupon he made up his mind to become master of the law, which could make it an offense to oblige a traveller in distress, by establishing corporate rights against human rights. This was the impulse to that career in the law which determined him never to use the law to overthrow what common humanity taught was justice.

So early as 1846, when he was first elected to Congress, Lincoln outlined the theory of the rights of labor as against capital, of the just reward of labor, of the class struggle, and of the need of abolition of parasitism, which form the substance of the Socialist theory. He outlined the economic basis of morals in a masterly fashion in discussion the question, why is it that slavery seems to a slave-holder to be right? and, most startling of all, he laid the outbreak of the Secession and the attempt to disrupt the Union to the attempt of the Southern Confederacy to place capital upon an equality with labor—or even on a superior plane to that of labor—in the national structure.

These facts are so utterly unknown, so completely misrepresented, by American historians, as to produce the impression, when they are quoted, that one is lying. And yet any reference to Lincoln's complete works will prove the accuracy of these quotations. The paragraphs given below may be verified by reference to Nicolay and Hay's Complete Works of Lincoln, at any public library. Nicolay and Hay were both of them private secretaries to Abraham Lincoln, and in the best possible position to compile his writings accurately.

LABOR THEORY OF VALUE.

Concerning the perfect reward of labor, Lincoln early advanced the theory later elaborated by Marx, in the formula of the "Full social value of the product of one's toil". This was written by Lincoln in the period between his election to Congress in 1846 and taking his seat in 1847. Under a just system of exchange, he says, "Each receives the whole of that which the other parts with, and the reward of labor is perfect; each receiving the product of just so much labor as he has himself bestowed on what he parts with for it."... This, Socialism claims, is the only just reward of labor.

THE THEORY OF REAL WAGES.

"Suppose a man works all the year around at $10 per month, which amounts in the year to $120. A change in affairs enables him to buy supplies at one half the former price, and to get $50 per month for his labor, but at the same time deprives him of employment during all months of the year but one. In this case, the goods have fallen one half and labor risen five to one, it is still plain that at the end of the year the laborer is $20 poorer that under the old state of things." (p. 92, Nicolay and Hay.)
LABOR SOURCE OF ALL WEALTH.

"In the early days of our race, the Almighty said to the first of our race "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." And since then if we except the light and the air of heaven, no good thing has been or can be enjoyed by us without having first cost labor. And inasmuch as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things of right belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened in all ages of the world, that some have labored, and others have without labor enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong, and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any good government."

ABOLITION OF PARASITES.

"The habits of our whole species fall into three great classes—useful labor, useless labor, and idleness. Of these, the first only is meritorious, and to it all the products of labor rightfully belong. But the two latter, while they exist, are heavy pensioners upon the first, robbing it of a large portion of its just rights. The only remedy for this is to so far as possible, drive useless labor and idleness out of existence!"

This is the whole purpose of the Social Revolution, and of the Socialist movement which seeks to accomplish that revolution peacefully. (See p. 95, Nicolay & Hay.)

"If at any time," Lincoln goes on, "all labor should cease, and all existing provisions be equally divided among the people, at the end of a single year there could scarcely be one human being left alive. All would have perished for want of subsistence. So again, if upon such division all that sort of labor which produces provisions should cease and each individual should take up as much of his share as he could, and carry it continually around his habitation, altho the amount of labor going on might be as great as ever, as long as it could last, at the end of the year the result would be precisely the same—none would be left living. The first of these propositions show that universal idleness would speedily result in universal ruin; and useless labor is in this respect the same as idleness."

These observations were written by Lincoln in preparation for his Congressional career. But the ideas which they express were continued and elaborated by him, and form the substance of his most important state papers. They will be found on Page 90 and following of Volume I of Nicolay and Hay's "Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln."

On page 179 of volume I, Lincoln says:

"As labor is the common burden of our race, so the effort of some to shift their share of the burden on to the shoulders of others is the great durable curse of the race."
On pages 573—574, in the course of a speech at Cincinnati, Ohio, delivered on Sept. 17, 1859, he further advances the fundamental philosophy of his life. He says:

"Labor is the great source from which nearly all, if not all, human comforts and necessities are drawn. There is a difference in opinion about the element of labor in society. Some men assume that there is a necessary connection between capital and labor, and that connection draws within it the whole labor of a community.

"They begin next to consider what is the best way. They say there are but two ways—one is to hire men and allure them to labor by their consent; the other is to buy the men, and drive them to it—and that is slavery. Having assumed that, they proceed to discuss the question of whether the laborers themselves are better off in the condition of slaves or of laborers, and they usually decide that they are better off in the condition of slaves."

"In the first place," says Lincoln, "I say that this whole thing is a mistake. That there is a certain relation between laborer and capital I admit; that it does exist, and rightfully exists, I think is true."

In a speech delivered in Milwaukee within the same year (given on page 581 of Vol. I) Lincoln repeats the argument given above, and proceeds to complete it as follows:

"Another class of reasoners believe that Labor is prior to and independent of Capital; that in fact, Capital is the fruit of Labor, and could never have existed if Labor had not first existed; that Labor can exist without Capital, but Capital cannot exist without Labor. Hence, Labor is the superior—greatly the superior—of capital."

In this speech Lincoln does not declare which of these "classes of reasoners" he ranks himself with; but later utterances, couched in almost the same words, do so, and show that he was working out the fundamental philosophy of his life in these paragraphs.

In this same speech at Milwaukee (on September 30, 1859), Lincoln says:

"By the "mudsill" theory it is assumed that Labor and Education are incompatible, and any practical combination of them impossible. According to this theory, the education of Labor is not only useless, but pernicious and dangerous. In fact it is, in some sort, deemed a misfortune that laborers should have heads at all. These same heads are regarded as explosive materials, only to be safely kept in damp places, as far as possible from that peculiar sort of fire which ignites them. A Yankee who could invent a strong handed man without a head would receive the everlasting gratitude of the "mud-sill" advocates.

"But free Labor says "No." Free Labor argues that as the Author of man makes every individual with one head and a pair of hands, it was probably intended that heads and hands should cooperate as friends, and that that particular head should direct
and control that pair of hands. As each man has one mouth to be fed, and one pair of hands to furnish food, it was probably intended that that particular pair of hands should feed that particular mouth, and that each head is the natural guardian, director and controller of the hands and the mouth inseparably connected with it; and that being so, every head should be cultivated and improved by whatever will add to its capacity for performing its charge. In one word, free Labor insists on universal education.” This will be found on page 582 of Volume I.

On page 624, in the course of a speech delivered March 6, 1860, at New Haven, Conn., Lincoln said:

“We know we hold to no doctrines and make no declarations which were not held to and made by our fathers who framed the government under which we live, and we cannot see how declarations that were patriotic when they made them are villainous when we make them.” These words are of comfort now to radicals of every description.

In the course of the same speech he said:

“I am glad that a system of labor prevails in New England under which laborers can strike when they want to, where they are not obliged to work under all circumstances, and are not tied down and obliged to labor whether you pay them or not. I like the system which lets a man quit when he wants to, and wish it might prevail everywhere.”

**ECONOMIC BASIS OF MORAL IDEAS.**

On page 618, in the midst of a discussion of the views of slave-owners as to the morality of slavery, he introduces the following illustration of how property influences ideas of right and wrong. It is as clear a case of the economic basis of moral ideas as has been laid down by the most severe of scientific economists:

“One sixth of our population, in round numbers, are slaves. The owners of these slaves consider them property. The effect upon the mind of the owners is that of property, and nothing else....and is to persuade them that there is nothing wrong in it.

“The property in slaves influences the slave-owners minds. You remember the case of the Dissenting minister who argued some point of theology with a minister of the established church, and was always met by the reply “I cannot see it so.” The Dissenter opened the Bible and pointed him to a passage, but the orthodox minister replied “I cannot see it so.” Then he showed him a single word. “Can you see that?” “Yes, I see that” he replied. The Dissenter laid a guinea over the word. “Can you see it now?”

“So here. Whether the owners of that species of property do really see it as it is, it is not for me to say; but if they do, they see it as it is thru two billions of dollars, and that is a pretty thick coating. Certain it is that they do not see it as we see it. Certain it is that those two thousand millions of dollars
of investment in that species of property is all so concentrated that the mind can grasp it at once. That immense pecuniary interest has that influence upon their minds."

THE CLASS CONFLICT.

And again, further on, Lincoln says:

"We think that slavery is an injury to free white men. Those two ideas—the property idea that slavery is right, and the idea that it is wrong—come into collision, and the actually produce that "irrepressible conflict" which Mr. Seward has been so roundly abused for mentioning. The two ideas conflict, and must forever conflict..... Whenever this question shall be settled, it must be settled on some philosophical basis. No policy that does not rest upon philosophical public opinion can be permanently maintained."

Here, clearly stated, is the doctrine of the class struggle between the property idea of right and wrong and the free human idea of right and wrong. This idea is given its most impressive, startling and epochmaking utterance in Lincoln's first regular message to congress.

CAPITAL CAUSE OF CIVIL WAR.

Lincoln took office on March 4, 1861. He found the Southern States under arms. The Senate was in session to confirm his appointees. On July 4 he called the House also to meet in a special session of Congress to devise war measures. The first regular session of Congress convened on December 3, 1861. In his message to this body, Lincoln set forth the views on capital and labor developed above thru many conflicts and debates, embodied in official form; and he traced the outbreak of the Civil War to that attempt to make Capital the equal of Labor, which has been the settled policy of both Republican and Democratic administrations ever since. This fact is one of the most startling in American history—and also one of the least known. Lincoln traced the attempt to disrupt the Union not to the iniquity of the Southerners as slave owners, but to the Southerners as capitalists.

These are his words, taken from his first message to a regular session of Congress. In them are set forth the fundamental principles of International Socialism. (Page 104, vol 2, Nicolay & Hay.)

"It continues to develop”, says President Lincoln, “that the insurrection is largely, if not exclusively, a war upon the first principle of popular government—the rights of the people. Conclusive evidence of this is found in the most grave and maturely considered public documents, as well as in the general tone of the insurgents. In those documents we find the abridgment of the existing rights of suffrage and the denial to the people of all right of participating in the selection of public officers, except the legislative, boldly advocated, with labored arguments to prove that large control of the people in their government is the source of all poli-
tical evil. Monarchy itself is sometimes hinted at, as a possible refuge from the power of the people.

"In my present position I could scarcely be justified were I to omit raising a warning voice against this approach of returning despotism.

"It is not needed or fitting here that a general argument should be made in favor of popular institutions; but there is one point, with its connections, not so hackneyed as most others, to which I ask brief attention.

"It is the effort to place capital on an equal footing with if not above labor in the structure of government. It is assumed that Labor is available only in connection with Capital; that nobody labors unless somebody else, owning capital, somehow by the use of it induces him to labor. This assumed, it is next considered whether it is best that capital shall hire laborers, and thus induce them to work by their own consent, or buy them and drive them to it without their consent. Having proceeded thus far, it is naturally concluded that all laborers are either hired laborers or what we call slaves. And further it is assumed that whoever is once a hired laborer is fixed in that relation for life.

"Now there is no such relation between Capital and Labor as assumed. Nor is there any such thing as a free man being fixed for life in the condition of hired labor. Both these assumptions are false, and all inferences from them are groundless.

"Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration.

SAFEGUARD POLITICAL POWER.

"A few men own capital, and those few avoid labor themselves and with their capital hire or buy another few to labor for them. Again, as has been said, there is not of necessity any such thing as free hired laborers being fixed to that condition for life. A large majority belong to neither class—neither work for others nor have others working for them......

"Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which if surrendered will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and to fix disabilities and burdens upon them, till all of liberty shall be lost."

Prophetic Warning!

This extract is repeated, word for word, in his reply to the Workingmen's Committee of New York City on March 21, 1864. In this letter he adds:

"The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations and tongues and kindreds."

This is the very message of the Communist Manifesto.
Lincoln's utterances on Labor and Capital were closely followed by the Labor and revolutionary forces in Europe. They were quite as closely followed by the forces of wealth and greed abroad. The open sympathy of the "classic land of Capitalism—" England—with the South, is well known.

It was not all the demand for cotton and the fear of financial loss which impelled England to sympathize with the aristocracy of capital in the South. It was a very profound fear lest the victory of the North might lead to revolution everywhere.

How alive Lincoln was to this danger, and how clearly he understood the part played by the Workingmen in preventing the destruction of the Republic, is shown in the letters republished herewith. Beneath the diplomatic wording there appears clearly evident the terrible peril which he had seen. His dispatch of Henry Ward Beecher to England to appeal to the people, over the Heads of their government, shows how desperate was the necessity which he confronted.

I have not been able to get hold of a copy of the New Years Resolutions which the following letters allude; but their substance is evident in the document which follows.

On January 19, 1863, Lincoln replied to the letter of the Workingmen of Manchester, whose New Year's Address had been forwarded to him. On February 2 he replied to a similar address sent him by the Workingmen of London, in a similar strain. The letter to the Manchester group is as follows:

TO THE WORKINGMEN OF MANCHESTER.

"I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the letter and resolutions which you sent me on the eve of the New Year.

"When I came on the 4th of March, 1861, thru a free and constitutional election, to preside in the Government of the United States, the country was found on the verge of civil war. Whatever might have been the cause, or whosoever the fault, one duty paramount to all others was before me namely to maintain and preserve at once the constitution and the integrity of the Federal Republic. A conscientious purpose to perform this duty is the key to all the measures of the administration which have been and to all which will hereafter be pursued. Under our frame of government, and my official oath, I could not depart from this purpose if I would. It is not always within the power of governments to enlarge or restrict the scope of the moral results which follow the course that they may deem it necessary, for the public safety, from time to time to adopt.

"I have understood well that the duty of self-preservation rests solely with the American people; I have at the same time been aware that the favor or disfavor of foreign nations might have a material influence in enlarging or prolonging the struggle with disloyal men in which this country is engaged. A fair examination of history has served to authorize a belief that the past actions and influence of the United States were generally regarded as having been beneficial toward mankind. I have therefore reckoned upon the forbearance of nations. Circumstances—to some of which you kindly allude—induced me especially to expect that if justice and good faith should be practised by the United States, they would encounter no hostile influence on the part of Great Britain. It is now my pleasant duty to acknowledge the demonstration you have given of your desire that a spirit of amity and peace toward this country may prevail in the councils of your Queen, who is respected and esteemed in your own country only more that she is by the kindred nation which has its home on this side of the Atlantic.
"I know and deeply deplore the sufferings which the workingmen of Manchester and of all Europe are called to endure, in this crisis. It has been often and studiously represented that the attempt to overthrow this government, which was built upon the foundation of human rights, and to substitute for it one which should rest exclusively on the basis of human slavery, was likely to obtain the favor of Europe. Thru the action of our disloyal citizens, the workingmen of Europe have been subjected to severe trials, for the purpose of forcing their sanction to that attempt.

"Under these circumstances I cannot but regard your decisive utterances upon this question as an instance of sublime Christian heroism, which has not been surpassed in any age or in any country. It is indeed an energetic and reinspiring assurance of the inherent power of truth and of the ultimate and universal triumph of justice, humanity, and freedom.

"I do not doubt that the sentiments you have expressed will be sustained by your great nation; on the other hand I have no hesitation in assuring YOU that they will excite admiration, esteem and the most reciprocal feeling of friendship among the American people. I hail this interchange of sentiment, therefore, as an augury that whatever else may happen, whatever misfortunes may befall your country or my own, the peace and friendship which now prevail between the two nations will be, as it shall be my desire to make them, perpetual.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

To the Workingmen of London on February 2, 1863, Lincoln wrote:

"I have received the New Years Address which you have sent me with a sincere appreciation of the exalted and humane sentiments by which it was inspired.

"As these sentiments are manifestly the enduring support of the free institutions of England, so I am sure also that they constitute the only reliable basis for free institutions throughout the world. The resources, advantages and powers of the American people are very great, and they have consequently succeeded to equally great responsibilities. It seems to have devolved upon them to test whether a government established on the principles of human freedom can be maintained against an effort to build one upon the exclusive foundation of human bondage. They will rejoice with me in the new evidences which your proceedings furnish that the magnanimity they are exhibiting is justly estimated by the true friends of freedom and humanity in foreign countries.

"Accept my best wishes for your individual welfare, and for the welfare and happiness of the whole British people."

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

The sufferings to which Lincoln alludes in this letter were indeed extreme. The workingmen of all England depended in very large measure upon imported materials from this country. Most particularly, the cotton and textile industries were prostrated by the lack of cotton. It was the need of England for cotton that encouraged the South in its resistance. "Cotton is King," cried Yancey, and the other fire-eaters. "Europe must have our cotton, and will force open any blockade to get it." England indeed had determined to force the blockade to obtain the cotton, to relieve the distress of her workingmen and capitalists alike. But out of the midst of their sufferings, even of their starvation, the workingmen of London and Manchester, under the leadership and guidance of Karl Marx, raised such a threat that the Government hastily recalled its decision; and the North was victorious, and the Union was preserved.
Lincoln's reelection in November, 1864, occurred only two months after the formation of the International Working-men's Association in St. Martin's Hall, London, in September, 1864. Karl Marx presided at this gathering. One of the first acts of the International was to transmit a greeting to Lincoln on his reelection as a signal victory for the International. This letter is couched in a phraseology which makes it evident that it was first written in a foreign language and roughly translated into English. It bears strongly the marks of the composition of this same Karl Marx. This letter was read in the Congressional Record of February 12, 1918, by Congressman Meyer London. Karl Marx signed it as corresponding secretary for Germany. There is little doubt that he was its author. It is as follows:

MESSAGE OF MARX TO LINCOLN.

To Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America.

Sir:—We congratulate the American people upon your reelection by a large majority. If resistance to the slave power was the watchword of your first election, the triumphal war cry of your reelection is death to slavery.

From the commencement of the titanic American strife the working-men of Europe instinctively felt that the Star Spangled Banner carried the destiny of their class. The contest for the Territories which opened the dire epopee was it not to decide whether the virgin soil of immense tracts should be wedded to the labor of the immigrant, or be prostituted by the tramp of the slave-driver.

When an oligarchy of 300,000 slaveholders dared to inscribe for the first time in the annals of the world "Slavery" on the banner of armed revolt, when on the very spots where hardly a century ago the idea of one great democratic Republic had first sprung up, whence the first declaration of the rights of man was issued and the first impulse given to the European revolution of the eighteenth century; when on those very spots counter-revolution with systematic thoroughness, gloried in rescinding the "ideas entertained at the time of the formation of the old Constitution", and maintained slavery to be a "beneficial institution" indeed, the only solution of the great problem of the relation of capital to labor, and cynically proclaimed property in man the "cornerstone of the new edifice", then the working class of Europe understood at once, even before the fanatic partisanship of the upper classes for the Confederate gentry had given its dismal warning that the slaveholders' rebellion was to sound the tocsin for a general holy war of property against labor, and that for the men of labor, with their hopes for the future, even their past conquests were at stake in that tremendous conflict on the other side of the Atlantic. Everywhere they bore therefore patiently the hardships imposed upon them by the cotton crisis, opposed enthusiastically the pro-slavery intervention-importunities of their betters—and from most parts of Europe contributed their quota of blood to the good of the cause.

While the workingmen, the true political power of the north, allowed slavery to defile their own Republic, while before the negro, mastered and sold without his concurrence, they boasted it the highest prerogative of the white-skinned laborer to sell himself and choose his own master, they were unable to attain the true freedom of labor or to support their European brethren in their struggle for emancipation; but this barrier to progress has been swept off by the red sea of the civil war.

The workingmen of Europe felt sure that, as the American war for independence initiated a new era of ascendency for the middle class, so the American anti-slavery war will do for the working classes. They consider it an earnest sign of the epoch to come that it fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln, the single-minded son of the working class, to lead his
country thru the matchless struggle for the rescue of the enchained race and the reconstruction of a social world.

Signed on behalf of the International Workingmen's Association, the Central Council:

George Odgers, president of the council.
P. V. Lubez, corresponding Secretary for France.
Karl Marx, corresponding Secretary for Germany.
C. P. Fontana, corresponding Secretary for Italy.
J. E. Holtrop, corresponding Secretary for Poland.
H. F. Jung, corresponding Secretary for Switzerland.
William Cremer, Hon. General Secretary, 18 Creek St. Soho, London W.

ENTHRONEMENT OF CAPITAL.

But while Lincoln, with the aid of Marx, was striving for the overthrow of the attempt to place Capital on a footing superior to that of Labor, other forces were working to accomplish that great change which Lincoln foresaw would destroy the foundation of liberty.

Every incident of the national strife was seized by swiftly-forming corporations to extort from the harassed government some advantage whereby they could enthrone themselves in power.

The North was desperately in need of money. To obtain this, bonds were issued. While the soldiers were paid in greenbacks, the bonds had to be paid in gold. While soldiers' pay was 43 cents a day in currency, which sank as low as 80 to 40 per cent of its par value, the financiers who loaned their money to the government must receive their return in gold. A dollar in gold was worth $2.85 in greenback currency. And United States bonds were forced down so low as to be bought at 67 cents on the dollar.

The story of how the gold market was cornered when President Grant was secluded in an out of the way town and the wires cut; of how a raid on the treasury was engineered by the noble financiers who were helping the nation by loaning it their money, is told by Henry C. Clews in his book "Fifty Years of Wall Street."

Here is one instance of this enthronement of corporations:

At the time of the Seven Days Battle, when the whole North was frightened and horrified by the news of the great slaughter going on on the battlefield; when President Lincoln, his heart bleeding and alarmed for the future of the country, sent out a hurried call for 300,000 more volunteers—at that moment the financial ring which infested the capital forced on him the Union Pacific Bill, which raided the treasury and despoiled the natural domain of the country to an incalculable extent. The chief elements in his bill were these:
The government advanced $66,000,000, secured by interest-bearing bonds, based on the estimate of $16,000 per mile to the Rockies from the Missouri River; $48,000 per mile thru the mountains, and $32,000 to the Coast. Collis P. Huntington later testified that the actual average cost was less than $10,000 per mile. Of this money the Union Pacific actually expended in construction work $9,746,683.

The company was also authorized to make a private cash loan of $60,000,000. A first mortgage secured the private loan; the Government loan was secured by a second mortgage. No interest was to be paid on the Government loan for 35 years; interest on the private loan was to start immediately. The railroad actually sold $100,000,000 worth of stock.

The total construction profits were $43,925,328 above all expenses. When the Government used the road, one half of the costs were paid, the other half applied as a credit on the loan. Also, the railroad was given free one half of all the land within 20 miles of the right of way, all the timber and coal within 6 miles of it; this including 25,000,000 acres of land free, with invaluable mineral and timber rights. At the extremely low price of $2.50 an acre, the land more than paid for the total cost of building the road.

Prof. Parsons sums up the transaction thus; the promoters got from Congress more than the cost of the road; they bonded it again to private investors for all that it was worth; issued stock again beyond the cost of construction; sold and gave away a good deal of it—and still had the road and the control of its earnings left for themselves. This was the bill pressed on the agonized mind of Lincoln at the moment when the whole destinies of the Union seemed to be shattered by the slaughter of the Seven Days Battle. This was but one sample of that corporation greed which undid the lifework of Lincoln, by enthroning capital above labor in the councils of the government.

WILSON AS WITNESS.

How completely the corporation control which began in the civil war gained possession of the country's government has been told, better than by any other living man, by Woodrow Wilson in his book "The New Freedom." set of conditions which enables a small number of men who control the government to get favors from the government; by those favors to exclude their fellows from equal business opportunity; by those favors to extend a network of control that will "he laws of this country," says Wilson on page 15 of that book, "do not prevent the strong from crushing the weak. Because the strong have crushed the weak, the strong dominate the industry and the economic life of the country." (Page 15.)

On page 19: "There has come over the land that un-American presently dominate every industry in the country."
Page 19. "One of the most significant signs of the new era is the degree to which government has become associated with business. I speak of the control of government by big business. Our government has been for the past few years under the control of heads of great allied corporations with special interests. It has not controlled those interests and assigned them to a proper place in the whole system of business; it has submitted itself to their control. In the train of this capture follow the troops of scandals, wrongs, indecencies, with which our politics swarm.

"It is amazing how quickly the political party which had Lincoln for its first leader forgot the precepts of Lincoln and fell under the delusion that the masses needed the guardianship of "men of affairs.".....The gentlemen whose ideas have been sought (by the government) lately are the big manufacturers, the bankers, and the heads of the great rail road corporations. The masters of the government of the United States are the combined capitalists and manufacturers of the United States. The suggestions of economic policy in this country have come from one source, not from many sources.....the benevolent guardians, the kind hearted trustees who have taken the troubles of government off our hands, have become so conspicuous that almost anybody can write off a list of them......

"Suppose you go to Washington and try to get at the government. You will always find that while you are politely listened to, the men really consulted are the men who have the biggest stake—the big bankers, the big manufacturers, the big masters of commerce, the heads of railroad corporations and of steamship corporations.....I do not object to these gentlemen being consulted, but I do object to their being exclusively consulted.

"The Government of the United States is at the present a foster-child of the special interests. It is not allowed to have a will of its own."

It is true that under William Howard Taft the Government of the United States reached perhaps its lowest pitch. That a President could sign his name to a statement which he knew to be false—as in the case of the Wickersham-Ballinger-Pinchot affair; that he could insist on including in a tariff bill a schedule which he publicly admitted was "indefensible:" that he could, in his campaign for renomination, rush madly about the country proclaiming "Even a rat in a corner will fight"—these things are recollected by Americans with severe pain. And that Woodrow Wilson when his term began, made valiant onslaughts on this corrupt control of governmental affairs in the name of the high idealism with which his speeches and utterances rang, is a thing still fresh and fragrant in our memories.

Had it not been for Wilson's personal backing, Frank P. Walsh could never have gone thru the two years of investigation of American Labor conditions which resulted in that epoch-making Industrial Relations Report. The federal reserve bank act, the federal farm loan act, the parcels post act, and the courageous attitude of the Department of Labor, all followed the general line of Wilson's policy. That so many of these bills had
the effect opposite to that intended can be attributed to the necessities of experimentation.

But the power of great corporations so admirably sketched by Wilson is not broken so easily by the few phrases of a single idealist. They do not give in so quickly. The great combinations of money were waiting for their chance. And then came the world war. This was their opportunity, as the Civil War had been their opportunity.

During the months after the outbreak of the Great War, the American International Corporation was organized, with the avowed intention of securing for American capital control of the foreign trade of the world. While Germany and England were fighting for the supremacy in world commerce, American finance was to reach out and take it away from them both. This corporation was composed of multi-millionaires, and was financed at $500,000,000. It announced its intention of carrying American capital to foreign fields, and to open the markets of the world to American mining and electrical machinery, harvesters, clothing and foodstuffs.

"Success will depend," says the corporation's circular, "entirely on the education of American investors to take foreign securities. The field for development is almost unlimited, and it is believed that there is an abundance of investment money in this country now to absorb many foreign issues.

"It is proposed to sell securities of foreign countries and municipalities and governments direct to investors... and when this is done the American International Corporation will assume no further risks, leaving its capital free as soon as the securities are sold.

"It is believed by some of the promoters that a start will be made in South America, where the war has greatly embarrassed many projects which had counted on European capital. Securities of some of these companies may be acquired from the present holders, and brought here from Paris and London.

"Wealth is accumulating here so rapidly that a portion of it can be spared for investment abroad."

Thus the plan of this organization is to follow the same line that made Rome and England imperialistic—to invest the "surplus wealth" of the country in foreign lands. The inevitable result will be that, with our money invested in other countries, we will seek to control those other countries so as to promote returns on that investment. This would mean world-empire; and our feet would be set upon the same highway as that down which went the feet of Babylon and Rome. Surplus wealth lured England into Egypt, France into Morocco, and Germany toward Bagdad. All the powers of this tremendous concentration of wealth were directed against the phrases which were made so current by the Wilson platform and writings. The storms that were raised over the Mexican situation, when every investor in the country was yelling hoarsely for Mexican blood and the "protection of our interests", and when Wilson stood staunchly
against that cry, showed International finance with what it had to deal. And plans were laid accordingly.

On September 29, 1915, J. P. Morgan took charge of the bond issue for the Allies in this country. They asked for a billion dollars; they could but get half a billion. Morgan took $20,000,000 for his profit in handling that deal. In the New York and Washington and Chicago papers of that date is a great deal of comment and question, summarized in this query: "If the Allies lose the war, how can they be made to pay?" The Washington Post of June 4, 1916, said, "If defeated, the Allies may not pay;" and comments on the uncertainty of war loans. The Hibernian Bank of Chicago refused to loan any money, on the ground that repudiation was inevitable if the Allies lost the war, or if it were long continued. In December, 1915, Great Britain gathered up four billion dollars worth of American securities held by her subjects, to pay for war loans. But more money was needed.

President Van Hise, of the University of Wisconsin, said in a speech in Chicago on January 21, 1916, "Strip war of all its glitter, and talk of its price—the result will be that the rich are made richer and the poor poorer. The only escape from disaster is repudiation." (See Chicago Tribune, January 22, 1916.)

As far back as September 1915, the Annalist, the great financial authority, had discussed "Repudiation of War Debts" as not only possible, but quite possible. On April 21, 1916, the Chicago Daily News reported that France had refused to add anything to its bare credit, to give any added security for her loans except her word, on the ground that it was beneath the dignity of France to offer anything except her bare word.

These warning signals culminated when on Thursday, November 27, 1916, the Advisory Council of the Federal Reserve Board issued a warning to all American bankers, and incidentally to all investors, suggesting to them not to tie up their funds in the new foreign loans in the shape of foreign treasury notes, unsecured. "These loans may be short in form," said the Board, "but naturally the borrower must attempt to renew them collectively." James B. Forgan of the First National Bank of Chicago according to the Chicago Tribune of Friday, November 29, gave to this order his unqualified endorsement.

On December 2, 1916, J. P. Morgan withdrew the offer of a new loan. Sir Edward Holden, treasurer of the Bank of England, in a speech in London on Jan. 27, 1917, bitterly criticized this policy of the United States. Explanations were issued by the Advisory Board of the Federal Reserve Bank. But still the loan was "unpopular."

On February 18, 1917, the Comptroller of the Currency, John Skelton Williams, said "The whole world is now in debt to the United States." In the last week of February, 1917, the United Press carried cables from the capitals of England and France, in which high officials of those governments were quoted as saying "If we repudiate our debts, it will not be because of dishonor, but because we are unable to pay."
Now if the whole world is in debt to one country, and those debts are repudiated, what happens to that country?

This being so,—repudiation of war debts being openly discussed, being acknowledged as inevitable in case of a long-continued war—and the United States being heavily involved, not only in the shape of loans but of contracts for war materials; and the collapse of Roumania having made it evident to all that the Allies were not winning—what should America do? Should it let them collapse—and with them, its whole financial structure?

Whether or not the Germans invaded America, whether or not they ever intended to land an army on our shores or in South America,—it is absolutely certain that defeat of the Allies would have meant financial catastrophe in this country; the collapse of the entire commercial structure of the world, which then hinged on our credit; disaster and ruin, everywhere that industry is based on the capitalist system.

What was the President to do?

His high phrases about neutrality of spirit, of peace without victory, of America as the steadying balance wheel, were up sharply against the unquestionable fact that defeat for the Allies meant not only a sentimental hurt to the United States, but actual disaster. The forces of world-capitalism were too strong for any phrases; and we were swept into the whirlpool.

And at that moment the forces of Greed sprang to their opportunity. They saw millions undreamed of to be gained out of war, and losses unheard if we continued in peace; and we had gone to war.

A tornado of terrorism was let loose upon the land. Every radical paper, every honest statesman who demanded that the graft be kept out of war, was branded and pilloried and all but burned at the stake. After four years of idealism, those powers of corruption which no man saw more clearly than Wilson wanted their revenge; and they got it.

Wilson still rode above the storm, uttering phrases of matchless beauty; but the government of the country was largely in the hands of Burleson and Gregory. The profits were staggering which the great corporations coined out of the agony and weltering blood and hideous sorrow of the world; but any one who dared raise a voice against these profits was howled down as a pro-German, because he was "distracting our attention from winning the war."

With our entry into the war, then, came the climax of the long struggle between Phrases and Facts which has marked the course of our history. Jefferson wrote phrases; Hamilton championed Facts.

Lincoln championed the cause of free white labor as against Capital, as part of the great international upheaval which was shaking the nations between 1848 and 1865. But even while he did so, the forces which he fought undermined his work, and now the Republican Party is the principal foe of those ideals which Lincoln held, even while it mouths Lincoln's phrases as its own.
We have come now to the supreme struggle; to the world-wide challenge of those phrases which Woodrow Wilson has now made common coin current in the mouths of all the world. Shall these high phrases be made into new facts? Or shall they shatter and shipwreck upon the harsh rugged rocks of world-greed, as idealism has done hitherto since the world was young?

For even while he utters them, those forces gathered around him seek to destroy their meaning. Shall they succeed?

For fifty years Socialists have been proclaiming that the war was going to occur, as the natural result of the capitalist system of strife for foreign markets. Then when it came, America as one of the capitalist nations, had the choice of either totally abandoning its fellow-nations to their fate, suffering the loss of tremendous loans and re-making its whole system of production on a non-profit basis—in short, of thoroly Socializing its industry so as to become entirely self-sufficient—or else of joining in the conflict. I could not and cannot see how we could have stayed out; but being in, the function of Socialists is clear. They should fight by every means in their power for the abolition of any sort of private ownership of public necessities, with the great leverage given them by the vast demonstration of the utter collapse of private industry in the crisis. They must cut at the root from which Imperialism and Militarism and War spring,—private profit at public expense—to put an end forever to War.

**RECONSTRUCTION.**

On March 20th President Wilson wrote a letter to a conference of New Jersey Democrats, which met at Newark. In this he said:

"Every sign of these terrible days of war and revolutionary change, when economic and social forces are being released upon the world whose effect no political seer dare venture to conjecture, bids us search our hearts thru and thru and make them ready for the birth of a new day—a day, we hope and believe, of greater opportunity and greater prosperity for the average mass of struggling men and women, and of greater safety and opportunity for children."

"The men in the trenches who have been freed from the economic serfdom to which some of them had been accustomed, will, it is likely, return to their homes with a new view and a new impatience of all mere political phrases, and will demand real thinking and sincere action."

"Economic serfdom!" "They who had been accustomed to economic serfdom will be content with it no longer!" "They will demand REAL THINKING and SINCERE ACTION!" Of this there is no doubt.

"Impatience of all mere political phrases!" But since when have our old parties used anything else? What was the Democratic platform of 1912, with its pledge of a Panama Canal free to American coastwise traffic, in order that the railroads might be
curbed; and of a one-term Presidential candidate? What was the Democratic platform of 1916?

On December 7, 1915, Woodrow Wilson addressed both houses of Congress. In the course of his speech he said, "I for one do not doubt the patriotic devotion either of our young men, or of those who give them employment—those for whose benefit and protection they would in fact enlist."

Will the young men who have enlisted and been drafted in this war be content with the knowledge that they have fought for the benefit of their employers?

Unless we begin preparing now for a reconstruction of the World Order, so that the transition can be made orderly and in accordance with a plan carefully thought out, the conflict which will follow the war may be worse than the war itself.

Already the elements of the new structure exist within our national life. They need but to be recognized and united.

It is idle for Americans to adopt the resolutions of British Labor or of the Russian Revolution, for the reason that we are in America and not in Britain or in Russia. Our Industrial Revolution must be planned in accordance with American customs and preached in the language of American ideals. Our challenge must be made to the Facts, that they shall correspond to the Phrases; not, as many imperialists are proclaiming, to the abandonment of the Phrases that the ugly Facts may be unopposed.

We must write a new Constitution, since the Democratic Administration has abandoned the old one. As the first was written by the capitalist class of the colonies to safeguard their property, so must the New Constitution be written by the working class of the Republic to safeguard their humanity. As the first was planned to establish the form of a political democracy, so must the second be planned to establish the fact of an Industrial Democracy.

Already the forces which will shape this new Industrial Democracy are active in our midst; are growing in strength and self-consciousness with every change in the situation. Shall we not now begin the great work which will overthrow the evil endeavors, now desperately being made, to take away from those who are actually fighting in the Great War the Substance of that for which they are told they fight?
Lecture IV.

The Russian Idea: The Proletarian Revolt.

Rurik the Rodsman;—Invasion of the Tartars;—The Holy War;—Fall of Constantinople and Assumption of the Crown of the Caesars by the Grand Prince of Moscow;—How the Eastern Church became enslaved;—St. John Chrysostom; Peter the Great and the Building of Petrograd;—The Autocratic Theory;—Development of Capitalism.

Forces making for the Revolution;—Capitalists, Laborers, Peasants, Intellectuals, Zemstvos;—the Beginning of Revolt;—The Revolution of 1905;—Black Sunday;—Summoning the Duma;—First, Second and Third Duma;—Outbreak of the Great War;—Overthrow of the Czar;—Milyukoff;—Kerensky;—Lenine and Trotzky;—the Soviet in Power;—The German Invasion;—the Appeal to the World.
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THE RUSSIAN IDEA

The Proletarian Revolt.

Understanding Russia is, at this crisis in history, the most vital necessity in the world. And yet, analyzing the situation in Russia seems to many people very much like the ancient problem of shaving a jack-rabbit; it can be done, if he will only stay still. Woodrow Wilson, in his book "The New Freedom", his campaign-book in his first Presidential contest, said that the industrial and political situation of these days was like that described in "Through the Looking-Glass" when Alice and the Red Queen, after dashing over hill and down dale at a very terrific speed until Alice was completely exhausted with the effort, found that they were in the very place from which they had started. Alice exclaimed at this. "Why yes," said the Red Queen, "you have to go twice as fast as that if you want to get anywhere." So, said Wilson, it is in these days; and a hundred-fold so it seems now with Russia. For Russia has been lagging behind the rest of us for many generations; and in order to catch up with us she was compelled to run at so terrific a speed that she has far outstripped us; and we will have to travel very fast, now, to catch up with Russia.

And yet the Russian revolution has its roots far back in the vague and splendid past. The shadow of Caesar hung over the palace of the Czar. There was so vast an accretion of medieval and pre-medieval rubbish to be cleared away, when the nation took its bound forward into the present day, that the scene is naturally untidy. And this untidiness has disgusted many observers, like certain American parlor revolutionists, who have got into the habit of wanting all their revolutions done in the parlor. But it is a historic fact that revolutions always start in the kitchen; or rather in the pantry, when that has been swept bare and there is no more food in sight. The Russians wanted Land, Peace and Bread. The Czar would not give it to them, Lvoff and Milyoukoff did not give it to them, and poor, heroic, despairing Kerensky could not give it to them. So they put in Lenine and Trotzky, who at least tried to give them all three.

In what I shall say on this subject, I shall make large quotations from a wonderful book "The Soul of the Russian Revolution" by Moissaye J. Olgin, and from other sources as well. There
is always in mind a passage of Mark Twain's concerning the French revolution in his "Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court". We speak often, he reminds us, of the Reign of Terror which lasted a few months and in which the nobles were guillotined, but we do not so often think of the reign of terror which had lasted three hundred years, and in which the people were starved and sacrificed in foolish wars to glut the pride of kings.

RURIK THE RODSMAN.

Russian history begins far back in the middle of the ninth century, when the savage and pagan tribes inhabiting the interior of that vast northland invited Rurik the Rodsman, a Scandinavian sea-king, to come with his kinsmen and establish order among their warring groups. Rurik and his kinsmen came in galleys driven by oars—"rods"—and hence the name of Rodsman, from which Rossiya, "Russia" is derived.

Rurik and his fellow-vikings established a number of independent dukedoms and principalities, with Teutonic dynasties at the head of each of them. For four centuries their history is little but a tangled network of wars and raids; and then in 1238 came the scourge of the East, the Tartar hordes, who swept across Russia into central Europe carrying fire and sword thru the heart of the nations.

For more than two hundred years the Grand Khan of Tartary ruled Russia from his splendid tent, set up somewhere on the Siberian plains or else at Sarai, on the lower Volga, where were the headquarters of his far-famed Golden Horde. Dukes and princes of the haughty Rurik's strain, when accused of disloyalty to their sovereign Khan, were compelled to travel the weary miles over snow and wilderness to where the Khan held his court of barbaric splendor, wherever that might be.

In 1380, shortly after the Black Death had swept over all the world and killed one out of three of all the human race, Dmitri Donskoi, prince of Moscow, formed a confederation of the princes of Russia to drive out the Tartars. It was a Holy War, a Crusade, Christian Russian against pagan or Mohammedan Tartar. The orthodox faith became the badge of the revolution; and hence the soil of Russia became holy land. The term and the idea of "Holy Russia" originated in the long century of conflict between 1380 and 1462 while the hosts of Russia were driving the hordes of Tartary back into their wilderness again. Moscow, as head of the Confederation, assumed for her ruler the title of Grand Prince, and all of Russia was for long known as Muscovy, from its capital.

THE DIADEM OF CAESAR.

Even while the last blows were being struck that rid Russia of the Tartar, the Mohammedan armies which for eight hundred years had been hammering at the gates of Constantinople swept across the Bosphorus and took the capital of the Eastern
Caesars. Constantine XI., last of the house of the stout Emperor Palaeologus, fell defending his crown in the streets of his capital.

And while the world rang with the story of the downfall of the greatest stronghold in the world, the Grand Prince of Moscow set the diadem of Caesar on his head and assumed the title of the long line of emperors that began with Augustus. Modified by the strong emphasis natural to a Russian palate, the title Czar held by Nicholas II. was the same in origin and in meaning as that held by the Caesars of Rome and the Kaisers of Germany.

Up to that time the Grand Prince of Moscow had been but one among many rulers in Russia, the "primus inter pares"—first among equals. But with the assumption of the imperial crown his state changed to imperial pretensions; and, as his critics murmured, he "assumed the splendors of a Byzantine potentate together with the absolutism of a Grand Khan of Tartary."

In the year 1613 Michael Romanoff came to the throne as Czar, his title being derived thru his father, Philaret, patriarch of Moscow, who had married a Princess of the reigning house. Philaret helped young Michael with the heavy cares of government. He was, in fact, the power in Russia. Nothing was valid without his signature, and the patriarch presided in councils of state.

But when Peter the Great became Czar, the patriarch of Moscow of his own day tried to assume similar powers to those of Philaret; and Peter said him nay. Because the patriarch asserted his claims as head of the church, seeking to assume in the Eastern Church the position of the Pope of Rome in the West, Peter exiled the head of the church to an imperial prison, and established, in place of the patriarchate, a Holy Synod of three laymen, appointed by himself; and thus was written the last chapter in the long story of the subjugation of the Orthodox Church to the throne of the Caesars, a story which begins with the Ecumenical Councils of the Church and reaches its climax in the gaunt figure of John of the Golden-Mouth, Patriarch of Constantinople in the days of the Emperor Arcadius; a rugged saint better known to us under his Greek title of Chrysostom.

JOHN OF THE GOLDEN MOUTH.

It is impossible to understand Russia without remembering Chrysostom. At the great entrance to every Iconostasis in the orthodox Greek church today, there stands a vivid icon, or highly colored figure in low relief, of John Chrysostom in his patriarchal robes. And this is the story:

In the thirty years since Constantine made Christianity fashionable, wealth and luxury had become the portion of the leaders of the church, when in the year 347 John of the Golden Mouth was born at Antioch. His father, Secundus, was one of the eight generals who commanded the army of the Roman Empire. Young John studied law, and became in a very few years
of practise so famed a pleader that the law-courts were thronged when it was known that he was to appear. At that time the profession of the law was the road to wealth. For the jurisprudence of the Roman Empire was in intolerable confusion. There were more than 2,000 bulky works on law containing the precedents and decisions, which numbered more than three million, mainly uncoded. For a skilful and ingenious man, the possibilities of the legal profession were all but limitless. In defense of crime and in instruction of the wealthy how to avoid the penalties of the law, the opportunities open before such a lawyer were but little short of such opportunities of today.

But John had hardly entered upon his twenties when he withdrew in disgust from the profession which, as he said, involved moral prostitution. "To take a fee for making the worse appear the better" he said "seemed to be bribed to a lie; to take Satan's wages; to sin against one's own soul." And he left the pursuit of the law, joined the Christian Church, took refuge from the corruption of the world in a cave on the summit of the desolate mountain range four miles south of Antioch, and there for six years he lived on roots and water, first in a Christian community, and later for two years by himself. "It was," he said later, "the life of the angels."

Then his superiors in the Church summoned him to return, since his life was risked by these austerities; and the bishop of Antioch made him preacher at the Cathedral in Antioch—an unusual honor, for John was only a deacon. Only after five years was he made a priest; and in those days only the bishop was supposed to preach, after the custom of the apostles. In Antioch Cathedral whenever John was to preach, the throngs packed the building so closely that, as he tells in one of his sermons, "the pickpockets had a rich harvest." The congregations testified to their approval with loud applause and cheering; which also he disliked, because, he said, they were "treating him as they treated a favorite jockey at the games."

The substance of his sermons was a bitter denunciation of the avarice of the rich. A strange, a startling sensation comes over one who reads his sermons out of some dust-covered volume in some theological library; for he describes corners on grain, tricks of dishonest investors, manipulation of the food supply by speculators—in the very words and terms which we use today of the food speculators who increase famine that they may coin public hunger into private profits.

DENOUNCING A FOOD CORNER.

It is worth while to quote one of these sermons; for the substance of the preaching of John of the Golden Mouth has an intimate bearing on the events of the Russian revolution as they are enacted day by day.

"A draught once overtook our city," he says in his sermon on the text 1 Corinthians, 15; 27; "and all were trembling for the last of evils—(famine). But afterwards, beyond expectation
there was wafted down from heaven a great and plentiful rain, and thenceforth all were in holiday and feasting. But in the midst of so many and great blessings one of those exceedingly wealthy people, with a gloomy and downcast countenance, went about quite dead with sorrow. And when many inquired the reason, he declared, 'Why, having in my possession ten thousand measures of wheat, I have no means of disposing of them left.'

"Hast thou not heard what Solomon saith "He that withholdeth corn, the people shall curse him?" Doth not that tongue deserve to be cut out and the heart to be quenched, that brought forth these words? Seest thou not how gold doth not suffer men to be men, but wild beasts and fiends? For what can be more pitiful than this rich man, whose daily prayer is that there may be more famine, in order that he may have a little gold?

"But I say these things not only to this man, but to each one of them who are so diseased; those I say, who raise the price of their wares, and make a traffic of the poverty of their neighbors. For of humanity none anywhere makes any account; but everywhere the covetous desire brings out many at the time of sale. And oil and wine is sold by one quicker, by another more slowly, but neither out of regard for others; rather the one seeks gain, the other to avoid loss, by the spilling of his produce. Many for example, have gone so far as to empty whole casks, not giving a cupful to the poor or a piece of silver's worth to the needy; but after it hath become vinegar they dash it all upon the ground, and destroy besides their casks. Others who would not give a part of a single cake to the hungry, have thrown whole granaries into some river; and because they listen not to God, who bade them give to the needy, they exhausted all they had in their houses to most utter destruction and waste; drawing down upon their own heads together with their loss, much scorn and many a curse."

Such sermons as this pleased the vast multitudes of the Eastern empire, the poor, the wage workers, the toilers, exploited and robbed not only thru the taxes levied by the government, but thru the exorbitant profits levied by the speculators. But they were intensely displeasing to the speculators.

Patriarchate of Constantinople.

In the year 397 the Patriarch of Constantinople died; and there was a scramble for his place. For Constantinople was the richest city of the world, and the seat of the Eastern Empire; and the Patriarch was the recipient of many honors and much luxury. Eutropius, chancellor of the Emperor Arcadius, grew disgusted with the hungry throng of ecclesiastical sycophants who pulled every wire to secure the nomination. Passing thru Antioch he heard of John's eloquence and his rugged disdain of all power. Perhaps the wily chancellor thought he would give the cultured capital a shock. At any event he offered the miter of Constantinople to John, who promptly rejected it. But Eutropius was not so easily to be put off; summoning John to a house on the
outskirts of the town under pretense of visiting a sufferer, he
kidnapped him, placed him in a closed chariot, and drove him thus
a prisoner the six hundred miles between Antioch and Constan-
tinople; there informing him that he was to be made ruler of the
Church of the East.

Far otherwise than the soft and complaisant prelates who
had filled the pulpit of Sancta Sophia, the Church of the Divine
Wisdom, was John the hermit of Antioch. His first act was to
sell all the gold and silver plate, the rich furniture, and every-
thing of wealth belonging to the patriarchal palace, and invest
the proceeds in hospitals, in asylums, and in homes for the poor.
He spent his time among the hovels of the laborers; and his
sermons rang with the same fierce indignation against the money
lenders and the speculators of Constantinople as against the
grain cornerers of Antioch.

Constantinople at that time was a city of gamblers. Situated
on the narrow strait between the Mediterranean and the great
grain-growing provinces that bordered the Euxine Sea, it was the
natural center of the grain trade. Because it was the capital of
the Empire, the wealth of the world poured in tribute to its
wharves. And around the emperor had grown up a crowd of blood-
sucking vampires, tax farmers, speculators in lands and grain and
necessities of life and above all in money.

All of these corrupt gambling rings John assailed with the
terrific fervor of his eloquence. For a while he was a sensation
and a not unpleasing situation. But his eloquence was more than
the vaporing of a popular evangelist. He meant what he said. The
speculator rings grew first indignant, then furious, then revenge-
ful. Finally John was banished. But the popular upheaval which
resulted threatened to result in a revolution, and the weak
Arcadius was compelled to summon John back.

But he had learnt nothing, and kept on preaching the same
fiery denunciations of the gamblers in life and death which had
wrought his first exile. And in due time the power of the specula-
tive capitalist ring forced his downfall. Soldiers burst into the
Cathedral, on Easter Eve, when three thousand catechumens were
waiting to be baptized; and mingled the blood of the candidates
with the waters of their baptism. John was sent into exile under
guard of a company of soldiers, and his jailers were promised a
bribe if he died on the way. So he died on the way.

Shortly after his death, his body was brought back in pomp
and rejoicing, and interred in a sumptuous mausoleum. For he
was safely dead; and it is a favorite process of capitalist specula-
tors to worship after death the hero-prophet whom they have
hounded into the tomb.

SHACKLING THE CHURCH.

But the lesson had been learned. Never again must a radical
be allowed to hold office within the Eastern Church. Never again
must priest or bishop who took the Gospel literally be allowed to
occupy a post whence he might inflame the minds of the poor with the absurd idea that the Gospel of Jesus and the religion of the Prophets were intended to be believed, because they meant what they said. And from the day of the death of John of the Golden Mouth on until the fall of the city of Constantine, the Orthodox Eastern Church was kept muzzled and bound by chains both of iron and gold to the throne of the Eastern Caesar.

And hence when the Russian grand prince of Moscow took over the crown and claim of the Caesars he took over the headship of the Eastern Holy Orthodox Church; and when a board of laymen was appointed to rule in place of the Patriarch, they assumed all the powers which the Byzantine Caesars had held over the Church of the East. Pobiedonostseff, Procurator of the Holy Synod when Nicholas II. fell, was the product of many centuries of slow evolution; but the course of the evolution which produced him, and all the evils which he symbolised and comprehended within himself, was shaped on the day when John of the Golden Mouth saw the blood of his converts staining the crystal waters of the baptismal pool beneath the golden dome of Sancta Sophia.

Concerning this power of the Czar, Katkov, one of the staunchest defenders of the autocratic theory, writes:

"All power has its derivation from God. The Russian Czar, however, was granted a special significance, distinguishing him from the rest of the world's rulers. He is not only the Czar of his land and leader of his people; he is also designated by God to be the guardian and custodian of the Orthodox Church. The Russian Czar is more than an heir to his ancestors; he is a successor to the Caesar of the Eastern empire, the builders of the Church and its conclaves, the founders of the very Creed of the Faith of Christ. With the fall of Byzantium Moscow arose, and the grandeur of Russia began. Herein lies the mystery of the deep distinction between Russia and all the nations of the world."

THE AUTOCRATIC THEORY.

In theory the autocratic government lived out this ideal. All power resided in God in heaven and in the Czar on earth. From his pure unchecked and unhampered will the whole process of government flowed. It was the Russians who advanced and practised that theory which found an echo in Prussia, that the only freedom a loyal Russian could ask was permission to obey absolutely the will of the Government; a theory which finds strong supporters among some American office-holders and notably some American newspapers at the present time.

But in practise, the Czar could not attend to all the details of his imperial administration. That was left to the tchinovniks, the politicians, the bureaucrats; whose prevailing mode of thought was that it did not really matter what one did, or whether one did anything, just so he did it by the proper and prescribed formula. Always the peasants were taught—and believed, until January,
1905,—that the Czar was the Little Father of his people, and that if they could only get at him thru the pestilent crowd of tchinovniks who surrounded and obscured him, then all their troubles would vanish and Russia would have peace and plenty.

THE PECULIARITY OF PETROGRAD.

It was Peter the Great who abolished the patriachate and placed the church under control of a committee of laymen. It was Peter the Great who strove mightily,—and to a extent successfully—to bring Russia out of its long night of backwardness into the light of modern times. But in Moscow he was gravely hampered by the precedents and customs of his ancestors. A Russian Czar was supposed to be clad in flowing robes, to move only in accordance with the proprieties of antique times, and to wear a full beard. Peter desired to wear trousers and a mustache, and to move about freely as the whim took him. In order to overcome the scruples of his fellow-townsmen at Moscow he built Petrograd in the marshes by the Neva, so that he could wear trousers and shave off his beard without shocking all the old fogies. Petrograd was an imperial city, created for the purpose, like Washington. All the imperial government was centered there; and when the Revolution captured Petrograd, it captured all of Russia. But it is not so with the government of the Soviets; for the Soviet at Moscow is but the chief of three thousand local soviets scattered throughout the vast territory of the empire; and until they are all slain, the Soviet government will live on.

But the impulse launched by Peter the Great brought up against one tremendous obstacle; Russia had no port. From Moscow the empire moved westward to the shores of the Baltic, conquering the land of Lithuanians, Letts, Finns, and all the Baltic tribes—only to find that the Scandinavian kingdoms, Germany and England barred her free access to the commerce of the world, for they blockaded the mouth of the Baltic. Her White Sea ports can only be used a few months of the year, and the difficulty of getting at them is tremendous. Southward Turkey blocked the way. In 1878 Russia defeated Turkey overwhelmingly, and through the Treaty of San Stefano had gained almost all that she desired in the way of access to the Mediterranean through the Dardanelles; but England stepped in, took Turkey under her own protection, and barred the great white giant from "England's Lake." Eastward Russia stretched her blind and giant arms across the vast wastes of Siberia to the Sea of Japan; Vladivostok and Port Arthur were to be her outlet; but the empire of the Mikado flung itself upon her and blocked her way there. Southeastward toward the Persian Gulf she felt her way; and there again England, by her buffer states of Afghanistan and Beluchistan, and through the partition of Persia—(in which England took the southern half to block Russia's access to the warm waters around India)—prevented her attainment of her dream.
Without free access to water-borne traffic, modern commercial development is almost impossible. It was in the ceaseless reach after an ice-free port by Russia, and the ceaseless vigilance of England to prevent this, that the whole story of the Balkan and Turkish troubles is written, until Germany, through Austria, became involved and intensified the strife.

DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM.

Yet within the last thirty years of the last century, Capitalism invaded Russia with giant strides. Vast natural resources were discovered to lie within her borders. Production of iron and steel doubled and quadrupled. From 1887 to 1898, this industry increased by four hundred per cent. In 1892 Russia built every year but 453 versts of new railroads. In 1901 this had increased to 3,338 versts. Between 1890 and 1897 the mileage had doubled.

Stock companies increased from 55 new companies a year in 1893 to 305 new companies a year in 1899, and their capital stock increased proportionately. In the metal industry, profits of 100% a year were not unusual. Quarterly dividends frequently reached 20 per cent.

Prior to this time the landed proprietors had been the lords of Russia. But the new nobility of capitalism began to feel itself worthy of quite as much respect as the old grand dukes, counts and princes whose titles to public deference rested upon an inheritance of a few ragged tracts of land. Bankers, investors, promoters, railroad magnates, engineers, mechanics, managers, began to rub elbows with the old lords of the land. By the nature of the case a landed proprietor is only interested in his land. His concern ends with the boundaries of his estate. But a banker, capitalist, or manufacturer is keenly interested in the affairs of all the money markets of the world. What goes on at Vienna, Paris, London, Berlin and New York exchanges, affects his business from hour to hour. But the landed proprietor controlled the government, and there was no provision for protecting the interests of the capitalist class. Hence these were the first group to chafe against the restrictions of the old autocratic government. The Russian revolution, appropriately enough, first passed under the control of the Capitalists.

UNREST OF LABOR.

But capitalist progress meant the accumulation of labor in great numbers. Workers flocked into the towns to operate the machinery of the factories and mills. Monster plants with ten thousand workmen were not uncommon in small towns which had been but sleepy villages for many generations. In this great human contact the laborers naturally began to develop a hunger for self-improvement. Their self-respect demanded better conditions on which to feed its growing strength. But this was in
sharp contrast to the actual conditions of their life and work. The very aristocracy of labor, the metal workers and mechanics, received but the equivalent of $3.30 a week, while at the bottom of the scale we find 600,000 textile workers receiving $1.35 to $1.73 a week. Cigarette makers never received more than $1.10 a week.

Collective bargaining was forbidden by law. Strikes were criminal acts. Participation in a strike was punishable by two to four months imprisonment, but agitation in favor of a strike received a double term. A workman who broke the individual contract with his employer was sent to jail. An employer, however, who broke the contract with his workmen was given a slight fine, or was reprimanded. The Law of June 2, 1897, limited the workday for male adults to 11 1/2 hours; but the actual workday was never less than 12 hours. To complain of a breach of the law meant to lose one's job. Conditions were no better than they were in Colorado in 1914, where the militia were called out to repress miners who struck to enforce a state law, or in Alabama in 1908, where because the miners demanded the abolition of the secret fine, the right of check-weighmen and the abolition of the blacklist, they were first driven at the point of the bayonet out of their miserable shacks into the woods, and then at the point of the bayonet driven out of the woods back into their miserable shacks again, with all their rights still denied. And one of those bayonets, I blush to say, was mine.

Sanitary and medical conditions in the Russian factories were appalling. Out of 19,292 factories inspected in 1892, 15,804 had no arrangements for medical aid whatever. Dormitories for resident workmen were frightful; no ventilation, unclean lavatories, dirty floors, filthy pillows on benches, everything crawling with vermin. The workmen who lived in barracks or in the workshops—often the only places they had to live, for the small towns were overcrowded by the sudden inflow of labor—were absolutely dependent on their masters, and lived in conditions of actual slavery. Those who lived outside the factory gates were far below the minimum of comfort. Out of 15,922 flats in the industrial quarter of Moscow, the average population was 11 per flat, while 12,650 flats consisted of ONE ROOM PER FLAT!

I remember standing in Tompkins Square, New York, and saying to a park guardian: "The people seem pretty numerous around here."

"Yes," said he, "they live pretty thick."

"How many would on an average live in a house like that?"
I said, pointing to a four-story structure on a side street.

"Oh, about twenty to a room," he said. This was in New York City, in 1912. Most of the people who lived on the square had emigrated from Russia—to escape tenement slavery.

In the year 1896 a great wave of strikes swept Petrograd. The strikes were all lost, but the workmen gained something infinitely greater than higher wages or shorter hours; they gained class-consciousness. The strike began in a mere blind rage, a protest against conditions which had simply become unbearable.
In the strike agitation they found that all their fellow workers were thinking the same thoughts, hoping the same hopes, and were driven by the same despairs. The Russian Social Democratic Labor Party was formed as a result of this agitation, in 1897.

In that same year, 1897, Sergius, the chief of the Moscow Secret Police, organized the Council of Workers, to offset the propaganda of the Social Democratic Labor Party. The idea was much the same as that which lay behind the organization by Samuel Gompers of the Labor and Democracy Alliance, to combat the lightning-like spread of the People's Council in 1917. The idea of Sergius was to provide a "loyal" labor union into which he could gather the workmen under his wing.

The results were surprising. The workmen, who had been almost untouched by the Socialist group, flocked into the Council of Workers by the thousand. They did not know it was supposed to be loyal; the secret police could not of course come out in the open and show themselves as the founders of it, and in their happy ignorance the workers took it for the real revolutionary article. As a result a series of strikes sprang from it, far greater in number and in violence than anything ever experienced before.

Labor in Russia had absolutely nothing to lose. It possessed no offices, no treasuries, no elaborate organizations, no newspapers—no stake in the government like those which drew all the life out of the German Socialists and prevented their opposition to the war policies of the government. They had nothing to lose but their chains; the Marxian formula, which most Socialists chant as a pious aspiration or a poetic hyperbole, was to them absolutely real.

In 1899 and 1900 came a crisis of strikes. A hurricane of labor unrest swept over Russia. They were not begun as political strikes; the workmen simply decided in most cases that they might as well starve idle as starve working, and so quit work. But every strike was forbidden by law, and consequently every strike became a political rebellion. Thus labor, which originally had no idea of a political revolution, was driven by the ruling class into converting its blind economic protest into a well-organized and thoroughly revolutionary political upheaval. The same course of events seems to be coming here; where the master-class, enthroned in the Senate and controlling the House of Representatives, strives to make an act of treason every act of the workers to better their conditions or to secure some share of the enormous war-profits made by the employers; when the very attempt to induce others to join a union is made a criminal act, and picketing, whether peaceful or otherwise, is declared illegal. In Russia, the chain of events was inevitable; the development of labor's self-consciousness within the crust of the old autocracy united with the class-consciousness of capitalism to burst the old shell; and then when the two groups fought for the mastery, labor, better organized, and self-conscious, prevailed.
THIRD GROUP; THE PEASANTS.

Along with the unrest of capital and labor went the growing misery of the peasants. As far back as the year 1606, a law had been passed under Boris Godunov which chained the farm laborers to the soil. The peasants were part of the live-stock of the farm, and could not leave their village nor change owners, nor refuse to obey the orders of the landlord. But the landlord was also bound to care for his peasants.

Each estate was divided into two unequal parts, the one belonging to the landlord, the other to all of the peasants. Labor on the landlord’s land was the price paid by the peasant for permission to toil on his own. Three days a week he worked on the landlord’s crop, and three days a week on his own. Sometimes the proportion was four days on the landlord’s and two days on his own.

Numerous revolts of the peasants, resulting in burning and wreckage of a hated landlord’s property, resulted in the demand “Let us free them from above, or they will free themselves from below.”

On February 19, of 1861, the famous “Emancipation of the Serfs” was decreed by Czar Alexander II. It is a classic example of the value of an emancipation that comes from above. In return for the freedom so graciously decreed, the peasants found that a large part of the land formerly considered theirs was awarded to the landlord; and for the fraction they were allowed to retain, an outrageously high redemption payment was demanded.

Where, for example, in the days of serfdom a peasant had regarded ten acres as his own, to be paid for with three days of labor on the landlord’s estate, he was awarded six acres instead of ten and was charged with a heavy money rent. The average proportion of peasants’ land given to the landlord as a payment for their freedom was, in 21 out of 36 provinces, 26 per cent. In the provinces of Poltava and Yekaterinoslav it was 40 per cent, in Saratov 41 per cent, and in Samar 44 per cent—practically half their land taken as the price of their “emancipation!”

The redemption payments assessed upon the land far exceeded its value. The total redemption sum, to be paid in 49 yearly installments, was one and one-half billion rubles. At the utmost valuation this land was worth 700,000,000 rubles, and at the fair average it was worth half a billion rubles. So that the landlords who comprised the Russian nobility, taking advantage of the necessity, turned the emancipation of the serfs to their own profit and to the impoverishment of the peasantry of all Russia.

But the peasants did not receive the land awarded them as individuals, but in communities. Every ten or fifteen years the land was to be redistributed by the village communities among their members, in accordance with the working strength. A family containing several sturdy workers would be given a large-sized slice of the communal land; and a family in which all the sturdy
workers were dead or had moved away, received next to nothing. There was no appeal from the decision of the village community; the peasant family must accept the ruling of that tribunal. Furthermore, the peculiar sense of justice of the Russian peasantry made them reason thus: "In our village district we have some good land, some medium land and some poor land. Each family must take its share of all these sorts." Instead of giving, for example, more acreage of poor land than of good land, they awarded to each family a strip of good land, a strip of medium land and a strip of poor land; perhaps miles apart, and each strip perhaps being only a few yards wide. The extreme difficulty of taking care of land cut up in such extraordinary fashion was augmented by the fact that every few years it was all divided out afresh, and whatever improvements a peasant might have put upon his portion were inherited by the next peasant to draw that lot.

In addition to these difficulties, there was a heavy land tax, a heavy poll tax, and many other taxes; there were the redemption payments; there was a total lack of schooling, and a complete absence of any knowledge of scientific agriculture. There was a lack of laws protecting the poor peasants against exploitation by the rich.

Between the years 1870 and 1900 the peasant population increased 56.9 per cent; the total area of land in possession of the peasants increased only twenty and one-half per cent. In twenty-seven provinces of Russia the total rent payments amounted to eighty-one per cent of the net receipts from the farm!

Yet the peasant had no right to sell his farm. He had only a right to rent it to his more fortunate neighbor, and become a hired laborer in the household of his neighbor, but on his own land. Thus what rights existed were gradually passing from the weak into the hands of the strong. Under such conditions as these, starvation spread its hand over fertile Russia. In 1891 occurred the first great famine in Eastern Russia. Only seven years later the second occurred, and it lasted two years. In three provinces only, more than one hundred thousand persons died of scurvy.

Facing conditions such as these, the revolts of the peasantry increased in number and violence. They were unpremeditated and unplanned. A rumor would spread among the farmer folk that on such a date they would sack the estate of their landlord; and they did so, with violence and burnings, only to be met with the rifle and knout of the Cossacks and of the regular army.

Thus the peasantry were the third element of discontent; the deepest and most radical of all these elements which united in the final great upheaval.

THE INTELLECTUALS.

And now comes the most wonderful story in the world; the story of the Russian Intellectuals, who stand out like pillars of fire amid the horror of great darkness in which Russia was im-
mersed. Their eyes saw the dawn when dark reigned all around. Their bodies were immured in the backward and torpid East; their minds ran and leaped in the progressive West.

When compulsory public education had become one of the foundations of all modern constitutional countries, the great bulk of the Russian people could neither read nor write. The younger sons of the nobility and of the intellectual classes travelled in Germany, in France, in England; they drank of the keen wine of the great ferment of all the other lands in Europe; and they hurled their splendid young bodies against the seemingly impenetrable brick wall of the Russian autocracy in a sacrificial fervor the like of which has not been since the days of the Christian catacombs.

They labored under this great disadvantage; that there was no organized labor movement with which they might mingle to learn the principles of organized movements. They were all primarily book men. It seemed of the most tremendous consequence to have a program perfect to the last comma and semi-colon carefully written out, to have the dogma and the creed correct in the last metaphysical analysis. If facts did not fit in with their theories, they ignored the facts. They substituted discussion for action. They were eager for the latest theories, the newest ideas; and could not trust themselves to make the slightest move without having it all planned out beforehand. Of course, great movements do not occur in that way. Perhaps this intense devotion to a theoretical correctness was an inheritance from the great Councils of the Undivided Church, which all Orthodox Russians are so carefully trained to revere; but under the conditions they confronted, it was inevitable.

And with this, the Intellectuals had a profound, almost a pathetic reverence for the common people. Knowing that they were powerless without the adherence of the mass of the people, they looked for the coming of the Great Day of the awakening of the people as early Christians looked for the second Coming of Christ; and they looked for it almost in the same terms. It was the intellectuals who started classes and clubs in every city for the discussion of social problems; it was they who scattered far and wide the seeds of new ideas; even as Rousseau and Voltaire and the Encyclopaedists with their new theories of the social contract laid the foundations of the French Revolution. It was they who went to Siberia, to prison and to the knout cheerfully, even exultantly, hoping that their bodies were as the seed which must die that the grain may grow, and the harvest come to its fruition.

THE ZEMSTVOS.

And last came the organization which was the mainstay of the revolution when it did occur—the Zemstvos. Originally these were created by the central government in order to provide for the economic and cultural needs of the population. They conducted model farms, supplied instructors in agriculture, owned farm newspapers and magazines, and maintained hospitals and physi-
cians. They were forbidden any political function, and they were not allowed to criticize the laws. Yet they were the only legal opposition in Russia. They maintained a vast army of what would correspond to the American class of city settlement workers; intellectual and educated men and women who mingled with those sunk in conditions of deepest misery, and who brought to bear upon such situations scientific skill and trained agencies of betterment.

After the war of 1878, when, as one of the fruits of the victory of Russia over Turkey the Czar granted independence and political rights to Bulgaria, the Zemstvo of Tver addressed a communication to him which reads curiously like similar documents emanating from various organizations of American radicals. This Manifesto of Tver runs as follows:

"His majesty the Emperor, in his careful attention to the welfare of the Bulgarian people liberated from the Turkish yoke, recognized the necessity of granting to those people true self-government, inviolability of personal rights, independent courts, and freedom of the press. The Zemstvo of the Province of Tver dares to hope that the Russian people, who bore all the hardships of the Russo-Turkish war, with so much courage, with such deep affection for their Czar, the Liberator, will be allowed to enjoy equal privileges, which alone will make it possible for our people to enter the path of gradual, peaceful, and lawful development."

There was, of course, no result from this appeal except a reprimand. When Nicholas II. mounted the throne, a delegation from the Zemstvos asked him for constitutional rights, and received a reply telling them to "give up absurd illusions." They were instructed to confine themselves to agricultural education and to hospital work, and to keep their hands off the whole structure of political administration, since that must remain the inviolate personal concern of the God-appointed Czar.

THE UNIVERSITIES.

During the years 1901 to 1905, Russia was on fire with strikes; they rolled from end to end of its vast territory in an unceasing agitation. In 1903 a wave of political strikes, called to support demands for political rights, swept over southwestern Russia. The Universities were the center of the revolutionary propaganda. Few things are more remarkable than the extreme contrast between the Universities of Russia, wherein the young men and young women who gathered therein for an education, devoted themselves wholeheartedly to stimulating and spreading the cause of the Revolution—and the Universities of these United States, whose students seem chiefly concerned in athletics and avoidance of intellectual toil. It is true that the supreme crisis of the war has struck sparks here and there. But in this country the Universities are more the centers of reaction than of revolution. And the cause of it is simple; the boards of trustees are in most cases dominated by representatives of commercialism, who
sternly censor faculty and students alike to repress any glimmering sparks and sprouting radicalism. But in Russia, the students bared their breasts to Cossack sabers with joy.

In order to distract attention from the revolution, the Government resorted to pogroms, or carefully prearranged massacres of the Jews. The great slaughter in Kishineff was such a governmental diversion, and was followed in ever-quickening succession by a series of such gladiatorial massacres.

THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR.

In 1904 Japan, having first assaulted Russia, declared a state of war; and the Colossus of Empires revealed its interior rottenness. The Army and the Navy were corrupted with graft and incompetence. The official class, cruel to their own people, were helpless when confronted with the highly organized and supremely efficient devotion of the Japs. Russia at first was torpid; the people were little interested in the war, which seemed to them but a far-off quarrel over timber-lands along the Yalu. But defeat after defeat, disaster after disaster, forced upon the minds of the whole nation a spirit of unrest, of questioning, of amazed astonishment at finding that this supposedly invincible Government was really a poor, weak thing, unable either to conduct an aggressive war or to make an advantageous peace. Von Plehve, the dictator, attempted to stifle all discussion of the shortcomings of the administration. The result was that Sazonov, the student revolutionist, threw a bomb under Von Plehve's carriage; and the dictator was dead.

Realizing, apparently, that in the face of such a poor figure as Russia had made before the world in the war some yielding must be shown, the Czar appointed a liberal, Prince Sviatopolk-Mirski, who sought by ingenious palliatives to allay popular discontent. A National Convention of Zemstvos was summoned for November 6, 1904, and an organization effected which laid a deep foundation for the united effort of the intelligent reformers.

BLACK SUNDAY.

Meanwhile, in order to combat the discontent of Labor, Zubatov, the chief of police of Petrograd, had conceived the idea of organizing a Gathering of Industrial Workingmen, after the fashion of Sergius' organization in Moscow. George Gapon, a priest, was the founder and administrator of this great Settlement. He seems to have had no political ideas; his aim was at first to gather the workingmen into a sort of a debating society, where they might work off their growing unrest. In March of 1904 it was opened; and by December it had 11 branches in all parts of Petrograd, with more than eight thousand members. The rooms of the Gathering seethed with excitement and interest all day and all night. Discussions, study classes, debates, lectures, were endless. Workingmen thronged into them. As had been the case at
Moscow, the workingmen were far more eager than suited the plans of the secret police. What had been begun as a side-track movement for the Revolution, became the main channel through which it was precipitated.

On January 3, 1905, a great strike began at the Putilov iron works in Petrograd. It spread all over the city. Within three days 140,000 workmen were out in sympathy. All Petrograd stood still and wondered what was to happen. In the boiling excitement at the Gathering headquarters, the idea was born of going direct to the Czar, the Little White Father, and of presenting to him direct the grievances of the workmen. Until that time the idea had persisted, deep down in the consciousness of the Russian workingman, that the Czar was all-wise, all-good, all-loving, and that only the wicked Tchinovniks blocked his good-will from remedying the evils under which they labored.

THE "BILL OF RIGHTS."

Father Gapon—or Pope Gapon! to give him his Russian title—drew up a petition in which the grievances and also the desires of the striking workmen were carefully and clearly stated. It must be admitted that they formed a formidable list. This is what they asked from the Czar:

Freedom of speech, of press, of assemblage; compulsory public education; responsibility of ministers; equality before the law; abolition of indirect taxes, and direct graduated income taxes; transferring of the land to the people; abolition of the redemption payments; protection of labor by legislation; the universal eight-hour workday, and freedom of labor to strike!

This program far outstrips what labor has gained even in the progressive and enlightened United States of America. But at least, a careful perusal of it will dispel the notion that the Russian revolutionists are blind, ignorant muzhiks who do not know what they want.

Gapon warned his people, as the week went on, that they might not be received with open arms by the Little Father. But they were resolute. "We might as well be killed as live on under such conditions as these," they cried, with one voice. On the day before January 9th they sent word to the Czar that they were going to march in procession to the square before the Winter Palace, and asked him to be there to receive them. There was no reply; but all during the night detachments of soldiers were marching to the neighborhood of the Winter Palace, and guns were posted to command the square.

On Sunday—Black Sunday, January 9—a vast crowd marched in procession, singing and carrying banners, to the Square before the Winter Palace, to meet their Little Father and lay before him their grievances and demands. Suddenly, and without warning, the soldiers opened fire upon the mob. Volley after volley was fired into the mass of men, women and children. Five hundred were
killed. Three thousand were wounded. The white snow covering the Square turned red.

Russia instantly sprang into flame. Intellectuals and labor leaders met together. The situation became so menacing that the Czar appointed an Industrial Relations Commission to investigate the causes of Industrial Unrest. General strikes of entire cities encircled Russia as with a belt of flame.

And in the midst of the excitement, the Holy Synod issued a proclamation containing the intelligence that the labor movement in Russia was supported by Japanese money! How familiar that sounds! Surely, with the Russian Revolution, the Holy Synod, Pobiedonostseff and the rest of them, fled to America and obtained high positions on editorial staffs of the American press!

Within a month, the situation grew so sinister and menacing that on February 18, 1905, the Czar announced that he had decided to summon a Duma of the Empire, with the right to discuss bills, but not to vote on them. No time was announced for its convening. Still the agitation went on. In October, 1905, a general strike paralyzed all the railroads. Startled by this, the Czar issued a new rescript, admitting every one to vote for the Duma, stating the time of its convening, and announcing that no law could become binding henceforward, without the consent of the Duma.

THE BLACK HUNDREDS.

This meant the end of the old autocracy. On that day—October 17, 1905—Russia, after so many centuries, became a Constitutional, Parliamentary government. It is true that the autocracy retained its old ways. But all that it did thereafter, as an irresponsible autocracy, was done illegally; whereas before, all had been perfectly legal that the autocrat willed.

But on the very day that this great concession, fulfilling the hopes and dreams of centuries, was announced—in many cities even while the imperial rescript was being read—the pogroms began. Russia, gathered in its millions to hear the announcement of the new day, heard the wails of the slaughtered Jews mingling with the words whereby the autocracy promised a democratic future for the empire. Throughout Russia the Black Hundreds were organized, to terrorize, and torture, and kill. The Reign of Terror that succeeded the granting of the Constitution casts a black shadow of horror across the pages even of the history of horror-stained Russia.

Meanwhile, at the center of things in Petrograd, the workers were pushing home their advantage. On Nov. 3, the land redemption payments were abolished. About the same time the Council of Workmen's Deputies was organized in Petrograd, and speedily became the leading body of all Russian labor. But they outwore their welcome. A succession of general strikes was called in rapid succession. As fast as one "general strike" succeeded, or failed, or fizzled, another was announced. The workers could not live without working; and the strike calls began to be ignored.
The period of repression called forth machine guns in the streets of Moscow and Petrograd. All over Russia punitive expeditions were sent forth to murder and rape with a free hand. Black Hundreds everywhere perpetrated unmentionable and indescribable outrages—all in the name of patriotism and "loyalty to the administration." They had various names, like our own "Next of Kin" and "Khaki Klad Klans" and "Loyal Legions" of today. And their conduct was much the same, veiling under the same pretext of loyalty to the administration the same purpose of crushing out the strength of the economic revolution.

CONVENING OF THE FIRST DUMA.

It was in the midst of the full tide of the horrors of this period that the First Duma met, on April 27th, 1906. It was with hearts big with the importance of the hour, and full of high hopes for the future of their nation, that the members of the Duma met, and after electing Mouromtseff as President of the Duma, voiced a demand for amnesty for political prisoners as the first expression of the articulate will of the Russian people.

In high hope and eagerness they awaited evidence of the disposition of the Government toward the Duma, as would be given in the first bill presented by the Council of the Empire and the Cabinet for their consideration. Amid a solemn silence this bill was presented and read; it was an appropriation for building a laundry in the hothouse of the imperial university at Dorpat!

And that was what the Czar thought of his Duma!

Great precautions had been taken to insure the election of a Duma which would be strictly obedient to the wishes of the autocracy. In each province the population was grouped into electoral classes, consisting of the nobility, the peasants, the wealthy inhabitants of cities, the poor inhabitants of cities, and the factory workingmen. Each group chose its provincial electors, and these meeting together elected the Duma representatives. By this means it was hoped that all radicals would be hopelessly outnumbered. But the Government's expectations were disappointed. In the First Duma, the proportion was: 178 Constitutional Democrats, 116 Labor members, 63 Liberals, 20 Socialists, and but 28 supporters of the administration.

Only a short time elapsed before this Duma was dissolved, and a new election called for, under more stringent regulations. Stolypin was then prime minister, and he issued the famous edict "National expediency is above the law"—a favorite aphorism of autocrats, whether Russian, German, British or—of other lands. Under Rule 87 of the new Constitution, the communal land holdings were abolished on November 6, 1906. This famous rule 87 was of great value to the autocracy. It was a sort of a "recess appointment" provision, by which the Cabinet could pass any law "of immediate necessity" during the recess of the Duma, and submit it for their approval when the session began again. Of course, if a law had been passed, and organization of the country
had proceeded in accordance with it, it was a practical impossibility for the Duma to withhold consent and unravel all that had been done under it. So that Rule 87 was the "string to the package." A recess could always be made to order.

Even the "constructive recess," that favorite device of Theodore Roosevelt, which construed the imperceptible interval between the simultaneous dissolution of a special Congress and the convening of a new congress by the double blow of the Speaker's gavel as a "recess"—was not unknown to the wily Czar.

But the Second Duma, though elected under threat and pressure, was even more radical than the first. As a result of the balloting, there convened at the assembling of the Second Duma 117 Constitutional Democrats, 97 peasant labor members, 83 socialists, 39 Polish delegates, 34 Octobrists, and 63 reactionaries, or governmental supporters. Out of 455 members, the Government could only count on the support of 97.

Finding this Duma to be even more revolutionary in temper than the first, Stolypin informed it that "The Duma has not been granted the right to express disapproval, reproach, or mistrust of the Government"—and dissolved it on June 3, 1907. Many of the members inquired with some heat why they had been called together, if they were to be nothing but yes-men for the Administration; and Stolypin, to prove who was master, had all the members of the Social Democratic faction arrested and tried for high treason; and the majority of them were sent to Siberia. A new electoral law was promulgated—again without the consent of the Duma—giving the peasants and workingmen still less representation. From 1907 to 1917 the Duma was a mere rubber stamp, a plaything, with no more power of independent thought or criticism than the American House of Representatives.

**THE GATHERING OF THE STORM.**

But by the law of November 9, 1907, the peasants' land was not increased. They were merely ordered to divide up. By this action they were compelled to fence their lands, build new houses on or adjoining to their land, and introduce new methods—all without money. There were famines in years of good crops. In 1911 and 1912 there were twenty million peasants who had not enough bread to feed themselves and their families. In a land where the soil was rich, the people industrious, and their wants few, famine covered the land in the midst of plenty.

Meanwhile the industrial workingmen had no right to organize themselves for their own defense. The cost of living was mounting by leaps and bounds, but strikes to raise wages were still illegal.

Confiscation and suppression of newspapers was widespread. In 1913 the Russian newspaper Life was suspended 11 times in 19 days; Workmen's Truth had 15 out of 17 issues confiscated; Northern Truth had 19 confiscations and 2 fines in 25 days. Many newspapers had as many as six or seven editors in jail at the
same time—for no special offense; just to keep the government’s hand in. But still, officialdom had not reached the pitch of absolutism practised by Postmaster-General Burleson. If one issue of a newspaper was suppressed, the next was judged on its own merits. Objectionable articles were cut out, and the rest of the paper allowed to appear. Whereas in free America, the Postmaster-General first declares unmailable one issue of a paper for some sentence or word he dislikes—without telling the editors which word or sentence it is; and then bars the newspaper from the mails for having missed one issue; and then declares any one who distributes the said newspaper by hand guilty of espionage and treason. Russia in its palmiest days of absolutist Czarism was never so efficient.

Still seeking to stem the tide of revolt, which was growing deeper and stronger all the time, the Government strove to divide and distract the working class by fanning the embers of religious bigotry. The Mendel Bailis trial was carefully engineered in order to convince the great masses of Orthodox Russians that at Passover time the Jews kidnapped and killed small Christian boys, in order to mingle their blood with the Passover bread. Every resource of the unscrupulous and alarmed autocracy was brought to secure a conviction; but Bailis was acquitted.

Meanwhile the Intellectuals, disgusted by the apparent collapse of all their hopes, largely deserted the revolutionary movement and took to studying theosophy, says Olgin. They had secured the Duma,—and what good was it? The intellectuals thought everything was lost. But everything was not lost; the seed was merely germinating. The great masses had always before them an example what persistent agitation could do. They were thinking. The debates in the Duma, ineffectual as they were, formed topics of discussion in the remotest hamlets of great Russia. The masses were learning to read. The Russian Giant had been awakened, and was lying inert, passive, gathering his strength after his long slumber, before arising.

In the years 1913 and 1914 the air was electric with strikes. They rolled over Russia in an unceasing tide, following one another like billows of a great sea. On May 1 of 1914, the traditional May Day strikes called out 220,000 workers in Petrograd, 50,000 in Moscow, and in Riga 50,000. It was this which figured largely in the decision of the Kaiser and his German war-lords to force the great conflict, pending for twenty years, at the moment when the Russian giant seemed torn by internal dissensions. And then came the Great War.

THE GREAT WAR.

The Great War proved that the Government had learned nothing since the Japanese conflict. The bureaucracy was as incompetent, as graft-ridden as before. They could do nothing themselves, and they prevented any one else from doing anything. Ammunition filled with sawdust, guns which were defective, food which was uneatable, brought defeat and disaster
upon the armies. The National Union of Zemstvos provided practically all of the usable food, and the Industrial Military Committee supplied clothing and munitions, so far as they were supplied at all. But they were hampered by the bureaucracy. The demand for a responsible Cabinet increased and multiplied; became insistent; became challenging. All Russia, ranging itself behind the war, found that the government which had entangled the country in the war was not only helpless, but stubbornly refused to be helped. In the summer of 1916, the Czar issued an edict prohibiting all conventions, all meetings, all conferences of every kind.

Then the hand of Germany began to be discerned in the topmost circles. High officials were found to be guilty of betrayal of their armies to the foe. The Black Hundreds, they who had lynched and terrorized in the name of patriotism and loyalty, began pressing the Czar to conclude a peace with Germany, abandoning the allies, in order to avert the coming Revolution. In the Duma the significant words were heard “It is the patriotism of the Government itself which is under suspicion.”

The story of the actual precipitation of the Revolution is well-known. In the closing days of February, 1917, mass-movements in Petrograd began to assume formidable strength—and the soldiers refused to fire on the people. Even the Cossacks, when summoned to disperse the crowds, rode among them gently, saying “If you please—Comrade!”

After appealing again and again, in vain, to the Czar for some action, and receiving nothing in reply but an order to dissolve the Duma, the Duma assumed control of the Government, declared Nicholas II. deposed, and formed a Provisional Government with Prince Lvoff, President of the National Union of Zemstvos, as the premier, and Paul Milyukoff as foreign minister. Czar Nicholas abdicated in favor of his brother, Grand Duke Mikhail; and Mikhail abdicated in favor of the provisional Government.

The Autocracy was ended!

FORMATION OF THE SOVIET.

But the momentum of the Revolution could not be stopped with such a half-way institution as the Provisional Government in control. The Workmen, the Soldiers, and the Peasants of Russia organized in Soviets—Councils—and elected representatives to a general council of all Russia. Paul Milyukoff and Prince Lvoff were representatives of the Capitalist interests, who had desired to obtain freedom from the stupid restrictions of feudalistic Czarism, but who were at one with the capitalist classes of Britain and France in their desire for imperialistic expansion. They therefore accepted the war as theirs. But not so the workers. As a matter of history, the Revolution was accomplished by two diametrically opposed classes, and for two diametrically opposed aims. The Capitalists were in favor of a more vigorous prosecution of the war, in favor of the secret treaties, and in
favor of imperialistic programs of expansion. The Workers were opposed to the war, abhorred the secret treaties, and promptly denounced all imperialistic program of expansion. To them it was the Czars' war.

While Nicholas was still in power, and during the formation of the Revolutionary forces, the great masses of the people had become more than anti-Czar; they had come to detest the whole system of exploitation, including the exploitation of the working class by those who own the lands and the means of production. By the stupid reactionaries who surrounded the Czar, the capitalist development was held back until the proletarian development caught up with it—and outpaced it. It is this fact, new in history, which makes the Russian Revolution a thing totally different from the American, French and English Revolutions which preceded it.

The workers, therefore, represented by the Council of Soldiers, Workmen's and Peasant's deputies, demanded of Milyukoff and Lvoff that they take steps to secure as promptly as possible, peace—not a separate peace, but a general peace; not an imperialistic peace, but a democratic peace; not a German peace, but a Workers peace. As means to that end they demanded that their new government secure from the Allies a statement of what they were fighting for, in order that they might judge whether these aims were worth continuing to fight for.

Meanwhile the Soviets, with which the real power lay, was busy with its work of restoring Russia to the people of Russia. The land was confiscated and divided among the people; the banks were nationalized; the church land was confiscated; the workmen took over the factories and issued orders to the former owners and managers; the Czar's debts were repudiated. The whole structure of capitalist "improperty" was declared invalid and wrong, and the fabric of an Industrial Republic was busily reared among the dust and confusion of the war.

Lincoln Steffens tells how the Soviet members, when asked why they let Milyukoff and Lvoff remain in power, conducting negotiations with the allied nations, replied: "Why, we haven't the time to attend to those things. We are busy settling the important issues—the restoration of the land of Russia to the people." When some progress toward satisfaction had been made in the "important issues", then the Soviet turned its attention to foreign affairs.

Milyukoff and Lvoff had ignored the Soviet, and ignored its demands. Therefore the Soviet deposed Milyukoff and Lvoff, and installed Kerensky in the place of supreme power, with this mandate—to secure from the Allies a restatement of their war aims, and a general conference to take steps for peace negotiations. Pending this, the soldiers ceased fighting.

These demands were flatly refused by the Allies. Lloyd George replied with his famous "war to the knockout" speech. The United States, on which Russia had counted as its ally among the Allies, sent a fraternal commission—headed by Elihu Root!

Now thousands of Russian workmen had returned from the
United States to Russia. They came from the steel mills, from the silk mills, from the coal and copper mines, from the garment shops, from the railroad camps and the construction camps. And they came with scars and wounds both in body and in soul, received during Labor's conflicts with Capital in the great industrial struggles in the United States. They came from tenements and slums and from the great wastes where a laborer is pitted singly against the power of merciless corporations. And by the thousands they scattered over Russia to tell the story of what had happened to them in the United States. At the cross-roads, in the village streets, in the inns and the union meeting halls, they told the story of how American capitalism treats those who struggle here for industrial democracy. And when the name of Root was mentioned, it was always as the foremost representative and counsellor of the forces of organized corruption that they spoke of him. Under such circumstances, the resentment and open hostility of the Russians toward the Root Commission was not only intelligible—it was inevitable.

THE STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE.

Failing to get from the Allies any statement of war aims or any peace conference, or indeed any reply at all, the Soviet called an international Socialist conference in Stockholm. The American Socialist Party elected three delegates—Berger, Hillquit, and Algernon Lee, who were refused passports by the State Department. The matter did not come before the Cabinet, nor before the Senate, nor before the House of Representatives. The third assistant to the secretary of State announced “I have definitely made up my mind that Hillquit is a pro-German; therefore he cannot go.”

Following close upon this decision of the United States, France and Great Britain also refused to allow their Socialist delegates to go. The Stockholm committee of neutrals, composed of Dutch and Scandinavian Socialists, remained there for months, but the Allied governments were adamant.

THE GREAT BETRAYAL.

Kerensky was told by the allied representatives that unless Russia again joined in the war against Germany, they would consider her as an enemy; but that if the Russian armies entered the struggle, they would back him up in his plans for a reorganization of Russia on Socialist lines. Kerensky, desperate, saddled with a task too great for him, committed the fatal error; he believed the Allied promises. Rushing to the front, where Russian and German troops had concluded an armistice and were fraternalizing as fellow-workers, he commanded the Russians to charge against their official enemies.

Lincoln Steffens tells the story; how the Russians replied to Kerensky: “But we have no arms, and our ammunition will
not fit our guns. We cannot fight. Besides, we have been fraternizing with the Germans and they with us; we are at peace with our comrades.” But Kerensky said: “The Allies will trust us only if we charge; so you must make some sort of a demonstration.” And then the Russian soldiers laid down their arms, and with hands uplifted charged—without warning, under a barrage from their own artillery—against the Germans, who met them with machine gun fire and mowed them down in their thousands.

And then—having sacrificed their lives and broken the truce at the instigation of the Allied diplomats—they learned how imperialism keeps its faith; for Lloyd George said in the House of Commons “We abandon Russia to her fate!”

**WILSON’S CHALLENGE.**

Stung by those words, and roused to indignation by the treachery of England to her ally, Woodrow Wilson hurriedly summoned both Houses of Congress three days after Lloyd George had repeated this before the House of Commons; and on January 8, 1918, he sent this ringing challenge and rebuke back across the water to Lloyd George:

> “The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy!”

But long before these words were uttered—on the very heels of the attack which the Russians made, and of the revelation of the Allies intentions—Kerensky, charging the diplomats with treachery, laid down his portfolios and departed, at night, sick, shaken, and defeated. For the Korniloff counter-revolution had been instigated, according to his own newspaper, the Djen, by Sir George Buchanan, British ambassador; and according to Louis Edger Browne of the Chicago Daily News, the allied diplomats, at the very hour when Kerensky, all but hopeless, at the extremity of his desperation, was striving to make them realize the true situation—were charging him with insincerity. They did not and would not understand that the real power in Russia lay with the Soviet and not with the Cabinet. And hence the Soviet put in power Nikolai Lenine and Leon Trotzky, charging them afresh with the duty of bringing about a general conference, a revision of war aims, and a universal democratic peace.

**TROTZKY’S NEGOTIATIONS.**

On November 20th Trotzky sent to the Allies an ultimatum asking for a revision of the treaties, with the warning that if no reply was received by the 23rd, Russia would begin armistice negotiations. No reply was received, either accepting or refusing or postponing an answer. Thereupon Trotzky proposed a general armistice. Again there was no reply. On December 5th negotiations were suspended, and seven days given to the Allies to state their war aims, in case they still refused to participate in the Conference. There was no answer.
On December 12th negotiations with the Germans at Brest-Litovsk were resumed, and an armistice was concluded. Trotzky then issued his third ultimatum, giving the Allies three months before peace with Germany was consummated. There were still no signs of a reply, either of acceptance or refusal, not even an acknowledgment of receipt. Under these conditions, the Russians did the best they could. They announced that they were no longer at war, but that they would not sign the German peace terms which included annexation of Courland, Livonia and Esthonia to Germany.

Germany then began the invasion of Russia. The Bolsheviki government hastily summoned all Russians to a guerilla defense, and is now organizing a revolutionary army. The peace which Germany dictated Lenin signed, stating at the same time that this was done under duress, and only to give the Russian Revolution a respite in which it might regain its strength.

WHY THE GERMAN SOCIALISTS FAILED.

Meanwhile, from the day of the deposition of the Czar, the Russian working-class has sent out continual appeals to the working classes of every other country to follow their example, and rise and overthrow their capitalist masters in every country in the world. They banked their all upon this belief; that the working classes of Germany and Austria would not permit an invasion of Russia. And indeed, when that invasion began, a general strike spontaneously started in Austria and Russia which for seven days set the Central Empires in an upheaval. Why was it that the German Socialists were unable to take control of this strike and develop it into a Revolution that would upset the Czar?

The reason is given in a letter written by Rosa Luxemburg to a Russian Socialist in July, 1917 (published in The Liberator for April, 1918), after Kerensky had persuaded the Russian soldiers to fire upon the Germans, during the truce, at the instigation of the Allied diplomats:

"So, you have broken the peace," said Luxemburg. "The Russian revolution was everything to us, too. Everything in Germany was tottering, falling. For months the soldiers of the two armies fraternized, and our officers were powerless to stop it. Then suddenly the Russians fired upon their German comrades! After that, it was easy to convince the Germans that the Russian peace was false. Alas, my poor friends! Germany will destroy you now, and for us is black despair come again!"

It is not true that Russia betrayed the cause of the Allies. But it is true that the Allies betrayed Russia into the hands of Germany. And the reason is clear. Russia had set the example, and had issued an appeal to the working classes of all the world which was causing the fire of the PROLETARIAN REVOLT to kindle in every nation. In the United States the People's Council was organized; in England the British Labor Party was planning to take control of the Empire; in Italy and in France, in Germany and Austria, the working classes were rallying to the tremendous...
appeal of Russia. The Stockholm conferences were forbidden, not because there was any danger of a German trick, but because the master-classes of the world fear, more than anything else in the world, the formation of the Third International of Labor, which shall shake them all from their thrones.

When President Wilson, again challenging all the diplomats of the Allied powers, sent a greeting of fellowship and goodwill to the Russian soviets, the following reply was adopted:

“The All-Russian congress of soviets expresses its appreciation to the American people, and first of all to the laboring and exploited classes in the United States, for the message sent by President Wilson to the congress of soviets, now at this time when the Russian Socialist Republic is living through its most difficult trials.

“The Russian Republic uses the occasion of the message from President Wilson to express to all peoples who are dying and suffering from the horrors of this imperialistic war, its warm sympathy and its firm conviction that the happy time is near when the laboring masses in all capitalist countries will throw off the capitalist yoke and establish a Socialist state of society, which is the only one capable of assuring a permanent and just peace, as well as the culture and well-being of all who toil!”—Speed the day!

Unshaken, unterrified, unafraid, the Proletarian Revolt waits for the day of its accomplishment. No matter what may come, never again can Russia be under a cloud so dark as has obscured it for ten centuries and more. If Germany does annex Russian provinces containing thirty million Russians, then the revolutionary Socialist movement in Germany simply receives an augmentation of thirty million uncompromising foes of the autocracy.

“We did not overthrow the Czar in order to bow beneath the yoke of the Kaiser” cried the soldiers to Trotzky as he went to Brest-Litovsk. “We have made peace only in order to give the Revolution a breathing-space,” said Lenine, when he signed at the dictation of the German General Staff. Russia’s revolutionists are too old hands at the game to be terrified by any signs of “Verboten” erected by newly arrived German officialdom. By the inclusion of Russian provinces in his empire, the Kaiser has simply sealed the speedier doom of his own autocracy.

The clouds loom dark; but the day begins to strike through the clouds. The dawn-light is red, but by that sign we know that the day shall be long and fair; for its name shall be Brotherhood, and it shall shine upon a world at peace!
Lecture V.
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THE LABOR IDEA

The History and the Future of the International.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE WORLD.

1.

And now we have passed in review the history of that imperialism which has overshadowed the world in various forms and under various names even until the present day. We have found that the wide-ranging flight of the Roman Eagle was impelled by the strident clamor of the brood of hungry eaglets in the home nest, whose hunger, never sated, demanded the blood and the flesh of the nations of the whole world to cram their ravenous maw. The lion of Britain, to feed its cubs at home, struck down its own poor and the helpless natives of every other race, in order that the well-favored sons of its aristocracy might develop their own peculiar theories of "noblesse oblige" out of the spoliation of the world. We have seen how the stupid greed of the Czar's nobility kept the starving peasants and the toiling workmen of Russia in a subjection so deep that when they finally broke from beneath the yoke, they shattered the whole Imperialistic structure that was reared upon their misery. We have seen how all the elements of an Imperialism as merciless as any of these are found rapidly crystallizing in our own land; and we have seen how the junkers of Germany, wrapping around their strutting forms the togas of old Rome and the faded shadows of older Wotan and Thor, have sought to seize their share of the loot of the world, and in so doing have brought upon mankind the fearful conflagration of the Great War.

Each of the histories we have recounted bears strongly upon this present hour. Roman Senator, Pirate of the Spanish Main, and Lutheran Reformer; the black desolation wrought by Clive and Hastings in India and by Cromwell in Ireland; Mohammed, from his desert crossroads barring the way to India and impelling Columbus to seek a new outlet for Trade with India—all of these enter the problem which confronts us. For it is to us that the tremendous task is appointed, that we should devise even in the midst of the upheaval and downfall in which we stand, a new order of Society that shall remove from the world forever the curse and the threat of war.
It is plain that this Commonwealth of the World must first remove from the thoughts of men, from beyond the range of possibility, that factor which has forever launched armed conquest to satisfy the cry of Greed; namely, the hope of private profit at the expense of public woe. Wherever a possibility is left to exist that by the starvation or the deprivation of multitudes one man or a group of men may profit; wherever there remains the merest chance that by the murder of helpless victims, the mutual slaughter of armed men, the rape and desolation of provinces and tribes—or even by the continual threat of these things held in suspense against the consciousness of men—profit may come to the lords of fear and gold, there the seed of Militarism and of Imperialism and of War lurks, ready to germinate, spread, and scatter its frightful fruit.

Speculation in death must be ended; speculation in famine, in poverty; in torture; speculation in human misery, which is the root of Capitalist economics, must be rooted out of the earth. And there is but one means whereby that can be done—the abolition, complete and entire and permanent, of private ownership of any public necessity; and the writing into the fundamental law of every nation that shall take its place in the Fellowship of Nations this cardinal requisite, without which no nation shall be considered civilized;

"ALL THE NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE NATION BELONG TO ALL THE PEOPLE OF THE NATION. ALL THINGS NECESSARY FOR THE COMMON WELFARE BELONG TO ALL THE PEOPLE."

Without this prime stipulation, there can be no contract of peace. Without it, the League of Nations or the League to Enforce Peace becomes simply the covenant of a gang of robbers to unite in holding the victims down while they are in common robbed. But with it, the peace and honor of the world is set and established upon a sure foundation. And this is Labor's idea of Internationalism; a community of free peoples, each the master of the works of its own hands and the wealth of its own territory; each guaranteeing to every worker the full social value of the product of his toil; and each people and community exchanging fairly with every other community the products of its toil without barriers or boundaries.

And out of the vast wreckage and destruction of the world war, the stately outlines of the great white Temple of the Human Race begin dimly to appear.

But let us trace the history of this idea of Labor's International. For it has a history; often a dark and bloody history, indeed; but without its history it could have no future, and its future is the brightest hope that shines against the black clouds which encompass us.

THE FINAL CONFLICT.

Along with the Internationalism which yoked the nations together under one dominant power for its own gain, there has always gone a struggle of the exploited classes in each nation
to overthrow the imperial power. Most of these attempts were drowned in blood. Revolutions there were in Greece and Egypt and Rome and in Europe of the middle ages, whereby the workers and the poor strove to cut the chains that bound them down; but these are obscured by the war-cries and the triumphal paeans of the conquerors. In these our days has it come about that the Internationalism of Labor has a high opportunity to achieve its supremacy over the Internationalism of Capital; and the struggle which looms ahead of us is perhaps darker and bloodier than any the world has ever yet known. The great war of the International Working Class against the International Money Power is even now shaping in the midst of the great struggle of the nations.

Rapidly the Great War is altering its emphasis from the vertical cleavage between nations to the horizontal cleavage between classes. For in every country at war the greed of the exploiters uses every endeavor to increase their profits at the expense of the agony of the nation and of the world; and in every country Labor, slow to comprehend, slow to unite, is at last feeling the scourge of their greed and is resolving that come what may out of this war, none shall coin the blood of the world's best and bravest, and the sorrow of the mothers and wives of all humanity, into the vampire gains of private greed.

It was in Russia, where the old Caesardom of the Eastern Roman Empire persisted longest unchanged, that the Revolution of the workers broke suddenly through the ancient crust and held aloft before the startled eyes of the whole world the Red Flag of the International Proletariat as the emblem of that new Socialist Republic. It was in England, the classic land of Capitalism, that the British Labor Party suddenly assumed control of the destinies of the British Empire, and announced a program of reconstruction which swept its foundation from under British Speculative Capitalism. It is in America that the challenge of Russia has been accepted by a President who in words at least has held before the world the high vision of a future without secret treaties, without tariff boundaries between nations, and with all the benefits taken out of war by depriving victorious nations of any shadow of gains from war. Let us trace now the course of that evolution which made these great things possible.

THE GREAT INTERNATIONAL.

As Rome spread its shadow across the world, bringing the nations under the power of its thirst for gold and blood, the First International of Labor was organized in the slums and labor quarters of the great cities of the world by the apostles of Christ. The Christian Church in its beginning was an international proletarian union, with hospitals, lodging-houses, and relief agencies in every city of the world. The superintendents of these relief agencies, under the name of Bishops, formed a network of honest administration, on which Constantine Caesar, disgusted by the dishonesty of the Greeks and the stupid greed of the Roman
officials, placed his reliance for the administration of the whole financial system of the Empire. It was largely this reason which led to the taking over of the Church by Constantine, and to the officialization of Christianity.

But the International ideals of Christianity were formulated long before the days of the apostles. It was in the strife between the great commercial empires of Egypt and Mesopotamia over the control of the Way of the Sea which leads from the valley of the Nile to the valley of the Euphrates, that Israel attained its independence, balancing between the locked shoulders of the two battling giants as they strove one with another for the commercial headship of the world. Out of the vast arid wastes of the Arabian desert the Hebrews irrupted into the highly civilized land of Canaan, at a time when Egypt was preoccupied with the internal upheaval occasioned by the young King Amenhotep IV. This vigorous reformer sought to uproot all the old fetishistic and totemistic religions and supplant them with the religion of the Sun of the Hundred Hands, and civil war resulted thereupon. Mesopotamia at that time was also busily occupied in readjusting its own internal economies in the strife between Northern Assyria and Southern Chaldaea. The Assyrian giant soon consolidated its strength, and began to move south on Egypt again, and in the process crushed out of existence the tiny kingdom of Israel. Judah continued to live amid its rocky fastnesses and to gaze down at the glittering strife of the kings from its perch on the crags of Zion, until Nebuchadnezzar stormed the mountain fortress and carried its people away prisoners to the River Euphrates.

Then arose a line of world-heroes in Northern Israel, at the time when Assyria's might loomed dark and menacing to the north, who first formulated the theory of an international union of the poor. Until that time it had been an axiom that, whenever the armies of one nation were victorious over the armies of another, the god of the victor had defeated the god of the vanquished. But in Israel Amos and Hosea had developed the theory of the Class Struggle, teaching that Yahweh, God of Israel, was the God of the poor, and that he was bringing the Assyrians to punish the ruling classes of Israel for the oppression of their weaker brethren. In the kingdom of Judah this startling new conception was taken up by Micah, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. When the Babylonian captivity was brought to an end by the edict of Cyrus, the claim of Israel's prophets that there is but one God, that his people are the poor, and that Israel is chosen to be the bearer of this good news of the ultimate victory of the poor of the world, became established in the religion of the Jews.

Christianity took up and universalized this conception. It foretold the ultimate triumph of the meek, the lowly, the oppressed, and the workers, over all their oppressors; and pending the great Day of Redemption, it organized the workers and the poor for mutual relief. Under Rome's domination the struggle was between Emperor-Worship, the religion of the ruling classes, and Christianity, the faith of the working classes. And
through its superior organization and "morale", Christianity was taken over and made the prop and mainstay of that Imperialism which it had been organized to overthrow.

But the Church did not yield without a struggle. Disgusted by the worldliness and corruption which speedily crept in, devout spirits fled out into the desert, and there in caves and desert huts kept alive the spirit of revolutionary Christianity, flocking into the cities on great occasions and raising the cry of rebellion against the Caesar-worship which dominated the "civilized" church. Benedict of Nurscia organized the hermits—"desert-dwellers"—into communities of the common life and covered Europe with their monasteries.

During the long chaos of the Dark Ages, when the foundations of the world seemed to be out of course, the International Church kept alive the theory that the whole human race is akin. Dukedoms and baronies changed their borders with every fresh raid, and languages altered and varied with every province. But wherever the weary traveller might stop after a day's journey, he was sure to find a hospitable monastery, in which as a member of the International Union he might claim rest and entertainment for the night. Monks formed the only reliable postal system, for they could carry messages and letters from end to end of the world, free from molestation. The Cathedrals maintained the only schools and colleges. All that there was of learning was preserved through the age of destruction in the libraries of the monasteries. The only poor relief, the only orphan asylums, the only refuge from endless wars, were found in the arms of the International Church.

BREAK-UP OF THE GREAT INTERNATIONAL.

But with the coming of Protestantism, this International Union, both in its civil form of the Empire, and in its spiritual form of the Church, was shattered. Lutheran princes and Lutheran states, chafing under the yoke of the restrictions of Empire and Church, used the new religion of Luther as a pretext for asserting their claim to absolute and unrestricted sovereignty in their own realms, without let or hindrance or question from any other power.

Nomadic ethics were still theoretically the ethics of the Christian world. Rent, interest, and profit-taking were forbidden by Church law. Jews might not lend at interest to Jews, nor Christians to Christians, but Jews might lend at interest to Christians. And inasmuch as that was almost the only profession left to Jews, they made use of it. Every once in a while the property of the Jews would be declared forfeit, and thus emperor, king, and bishop would come into possession of all the money wrung by the money-lenders through their usurious rates from needy subjects.
THE DIVINE RIGHT OF KINGS.

But Capitalism, rising toward the close of the fifteenth century, was unwilling and unable to observe these ancient restrictions. The International Union was broken up into States and State Churches, and the idea vanished from among men, as an actual, practical theory. In place of the sublime conception of the divine right of the Emperor came the “divine right of kings”, a doctrine of nationalistic capitalism, which strove to undermine the older theory. But the divine right of kings was a poor, weakling successor to that magnificent theory of the unity of the human race with its two natural heads, the Pope and the Caesar. Yet it did service for a time, sanctioning the oppression of the workers of the several nations by the lords of the land, using the king as their mask.

THE SOCIAL CONTRACT.

About the end of the eighteenth century Voltaire and Rousseau began to develop the philosophic theory of the Social Contract. According to this, society is a voluntary agreement among men, and all just government rests upon the consent of the governed. The theory of natural human rights began rapidly to undermine the theory of the divine right of kings. For it came upon a world growing sick of kings, a world in which the working classes had been reduced to a pitch of degradation that ancient Rome could hardly rival, and in which the capitalistic classes were beginning to chafe against the hereditary principle. This new philosophy of young French thinkers started the great ferment which resulted in the terrific explosion of the French Revolution, in which the misery of the proletarians of France joined hands with the growing dissatisfaction and unrest of the middle classes to blow the Bourbon kings off their throne. Immediately borne on the strong wind of idealistic phrases, the French Revolution sought to become international through the sending of armies into all the neighboring monarchical states to stir up their working classes into a revolt similar to that of their own. But the working classes of other nations were not ready. In England, the religious revival of John Wesley produced an emotional outlet whereby steam could be blown off until the labor movement could attain a slower, more methodical organization. And the monarchs of Europe united to crush out the revolution. The counter-blow of the revolutionary armies produced the Dictatorship of Napoleon which grew into the Empire. But Napoleon’s dream of a revival of the international empire of the Roman Caesars was drowned in the blood of Waterloo. The phraseology of the philosophers was not a sufficiently strong basis for the overturning of the world.

THE UTOPIANS.

Yet the ferment of the new ideas of Voltaire and Rousseau did not end its working with the French Revolution. In every
nation a series of Utopian philosophers arose, who, horrified by the miseries of their own time, portrayed an ideal condition of human society in which fellowship should take the place of savagery, and happiness instead of misery crown the world. But there was no plan for establishing these Utopian dreams on a firm foundation. In France, the generation of Utopians included St. Simon, Fourier, Proudhon, and Blanc, who thought that the ills of mankind could be removed if some scientific plan of association were sketched out, in accordance with which small communities could be formed to set an example of idealistic communism before the eyes of the world. Fourier for ten years went home every day at noon and waited in his room for an hour, hoping that some day a benevolent millionaire would come in and give him enough millions of dollars to start his new society.

In England, the classic land of capitalism, the condition of the working classes earliest became unendurable. Nowhere outside of the pages of Dante's Inferno can be found a picture so horrible as the description of the mills of Northern England during most of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth. Wretched pauper parents saw their more wretched children taken from them by the parishes and driven, chained in hundred or two hundred lots, among the factories and mills, and sold to the highest bidder to be shovelled into the iron furnace of capitalist industry as the children of old Phoenicia were thrown into the blazing furnace of their great god Moloch.

English philosophers of that period were busy devising systems to prove to the working classes that their condition was just and right, and could by no means be remedied. The "iron law of wages," the theory of population originated by Malthus,—these and many similar doctrines were used to stave off any working class revolt. But such philosophical proofs of the justice of their condition did not outweigh, in the minds of the desperate workers, the horrible facts which confronted them; and in all the industrial cities, there were mobs, burnings, factory wreckings, and riots, resulting in nothing but massacre of the rioters and an even more hopeless settling down of the gloom of despair.

Robert Owen, first of the English Utopians, entered a cotton mill at New Lanark when a small boy, and by the age of 19 was its manager. What enormous profits were made by the cotton factors of that time may be gauged by his statement that he could buy a pound of raw cotton for five shillings—about $1.25 and sell the manufactured product for $46—a profit of $44.75 on a single pound.

Owen became convinced that much better and cheaper yarn could be produced by contented and well-fed workmen. He succeeded in inducing a number of British capitalists to put sufficient money into his new ideals to establish a model cotton factory. He paid his workmen well, gave them clean, sanitary, well lighted and well ventilated shops, and built villages of neat homes for them to dwell in. The results were as he had said; well fed, contented workmen produced better work than the miserable paupers
who manned the other mills. But his stockholders became dissatisfied at the amount of money he was giving to the workmen. It was true that they were receiving huge profits out of that well-paid labor; but the stockholders could see nothing but the money their own pockets were not getting.

Owen, after many years spent in endeavoring to reform conditions in the cotton mills of England, established a cooperative colony at New Harmony, Indiana, where he sought to put into practice his theory of an ideal communist colony. But this colony soon died.

Nowhere did the attempts of Utopian philanthropists to found a colony in which the principles of communism might be successfully applied, reach any degree of success. But they did serve the purpose of holding before the eyes of men the ideal which contrasted so sharply with actual conditions around them. The great ventures of the Icarians in Texas, of the Fourierist phalansteries in New England, of the Oneida Community in New York, all of these kept alive the idea of a better system of social organization than any which obtained upon earth.

The Charter movement was the first organized attempt in England to secure betterment. Backed by no political or economic organization, but relying simply upon the appeal to the natural "rights of man," the Chartists sought to persuade Parliament to enact a Bill of Rights granting adult manhood suffrage, payment for members of Parliament, abolition of rotten boroughs, and a number of other mild reform measures. But England was wildly alarmed. The Duke of Wellington, victor of Waterloo, was put in charge of the Home Guards of the City of London, and he drew his men up in battle array to repel the fierce and vicious Chartists; so that instead being borne in a triumphal march to the Parliament Buildings, the Charter petition, with its boasted three million signatures, was carried to the Commons, through the rain, in a hansom cab. The Chartist movement collapsed in a torrent of ridicule. But there were those who did not laugh. Frederick Denison Maurice and Charles Kingsley, two priests of the Church of England, founded the Christian Socialists in England in 1848. Their idea was something of a mixture, the Guild Socialism of medieval times, with a strong tincture of the Utopian schemes of Robert Owen. And it was from this Christian Socialist propaganda, both in England and in France, that Karl Marx took the first impulse toward the organization of the International.

"In every industrial center prior to 1850," writes Robert Hunter in his "Violence and the Labor Movement", "the working class movement was a thing of riots, insurrections, machine breaking, incendiarism, pillage and even murder." The poor were brutalized too far to perceive the advantage or even the possibility of peaceful organization. Periodical outbreaks against the capitalist system which doomed them to a living death were produced by the boiling up of deep, but blind, resentment. The mob spirit prevailed; strikes lasted for weeks, during which rioting was answered by massacre; and at the end there was nothing but
despair. But out of this formlessness and chaos the cooperative movement took its rise in the Rochdale Pioneers, who began with a total capital of 28 pounds, and who now do a wholesale co-operative business of many millions of pounds a year. It was on the basis of the economic independence secured by these co-operatives that the British Labor Party achieved its strength; just as it was through the cooperative system of the primitive Christian Church that the Empire was finally compelled to acknowledge its rival’s strength.

Meanwhile in Germany, the League of the Just was organized as a sort of debating club to discuss the proper organization of society. Later this organization changed its name to the League of the Righteous. Finally it became the Communist League. Karl Marx joined a branch of this society in Brussels, and it was for them that he and Engels wrote the world-famous “Communist Manifesto.” But although the Communist League applauded the document with vehemence, they never understood it. Marx resigned from their ranks in 1850, having lost patience with them because he could not drive out of their heads the idea that they could revolutionize the world by some sudden dash of heroism, and through the exercise of will-power, splendid self-sacrifice, and personal action. In his letter of resignation Marx says:

“The majority have substituted the dogmatic spirit for the materialistic: just as the democrats make a fetish of the words “the people”, so you make a fetish of the words “the proletariat.” Like them you substitute revolutionary phrases for revolutionary evolution.” They had, he said, inherited too deep a strain of the “sentimentalism and dress parade” of the revolutionism of the secret sects.

LIFE OF KARL MARX.

And here we must consider the salient facts in the life of Karl Marx, founder of the International Workmen’s Association whose gigantic figure casts its shadow across the events of the present day.

Marx was born on May 5, 1818, in Treves, Rhenish Prussia. In 1824 his father, born a Jew, went over to Christianity, and with his whole family was baptized into the Lutheran Church. Karl studied law, history and philosophy at the universities of Bonn and Berlin. During his studies, he met Bruno Baur, founder of the so-called “Tubingen school” of Biblical criticism, and most destructive of the higher critics. All of the young men of that generation were drinking deep draughts of the Hegelian philosophy, whose cardinal principle is that events in the world of men are not static, but dynamic. It was the beginning of the age of Darwin, and the foundations of all old things were being profoundly shaken by the theory of evolution.

Marx’s vigorous espousal of the destructive views of Baur prevented his attaining his ambition, a lectureship in one of the
State Universities. He therefore became an editorial writer on the Rheinische Zeitung, which was suppressed by the censor in 1843. Thereupon he went to Paris and began publication of the “Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher”—of which only one number appeared. Marx's editorial ventures met with disaster, one after another. He was as unpopular as Leon Trotzky. In May 1848 he started the Neue Rheinische Zeitung,—which was suppressed the same year. And his journalistic career was never assured until he began writing for—the New York Tribune.

While in Paris, Marx formed an acquaintance with Friedrich Engels, who was a clerk in his father's cotton factory in the North of England. Engels, a German born, was also a Hegelian; and Marx and Engels found that their ideas were practically unanimous on most important subjects. They worked out the neo-Hegelian application of the doctrine of dynamic evolution during interminable conversations in the threadbare garret where Marx lived, subsisting on enthusiasm and carrots.

It was while in Paris that Marx came into sharp conflict with the great French Utopian, Proudhon, who had written a book called “The Philosophy of Misery” to prove that the worse off the working class became, the sooner it would revolt and establish idealistic conditions. Marx wrote a tart reply called “The Misery of Philosophy”, in which he ridiculed the great Frenchman. Theodore Roosevelt never seems to have mastered the distinction between the “Philosophy of Misery” and the “Misery of Philosophy”, for in his ravings against Socialism he constantly attributes the views of Proudhon to Marx, who repudiated them.

From Paris Marx went back into Germany by way of Brussels. He took an active part in the ferment of the Revolution of 1848 through his editorials in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, in which he advocated the non-payment of taxes and organization of armed resistance to the King of Prussia. He was indicted and tried for nigh treason, sedition and conspiracy; and while he was found not guilty, he was warned never to do it again, and was banished—first to France, then to London, where he spent practically all of the rest of his life.

In London he spent years of the direst poverty, subsisting on the small remittance, hardly ever more than seven dollars a week, which he received from the New York Tribune. All of his children born in London died of malnutrition—otherwise called starvation. Spargo, in his Life of Marx, tells how Jenny Marx—high-born daughter of a wealthy house—attempting to nurse her children while she herself was starving, found that the baby lips drew blood, instead of milk, from her breasts. And it was at this time that Marx received from Bismarck the offer of a high post in one of the royal universities of Prussia; which Marx, in the midst of poverty, refused, that he might devote his life to the cause of the organization of the workers of all nations, to overthrow the power of kings.

During the fourteen years from 1850 to 1864, Karl Marx spent practically all of his time in the British Museum, studying,
comparing, digesting, and writing. Those fourteen years dragged heavily along; many a time he was smitten with the conviction of the hopelessness and uselessness of all his endeavors. But for Marx those years of poverty were what years in prison are to many great souls—what the years of obscurity were for Lincoln; the period of germination of the seed that was later to yield rich harvest.

ORIGIN OF THE "RED SPECTRE."

In 1862 a number of London concerns inaugurated the London International Exhibition, whose most famous feature was the Crystal Palace. Though an advertising scheme of the hated exploiting class, this Exposition, first of all the marvellous series of World Expositions, drew together members of the working classes of every European nationality. French, German, Italian and Belgian workers came together, and observed the strength of the British labor unions and cooperatives. Ties of acquaintance and friendship were thus formed. In the following year, the Polish insurrection broke out and was forcibly suppressed. A protest by the English workmen was forwarded through Paris, and communications were exchanged between the French and English groups. The French workingmen sent a delegation to London, which resulted in the issuance of a call to the labor and revolutionary organizations of every country in Europe, and in September of 1864 a convention was held in St. Martin's Hall, London, at which the International Workingmen’s Association was formally launched, with Karl Marx as its first presiding officer. In the preamble to its rules and its program, the significant statement was adopted: “The emancipation of the working classes must be the work of the working classes themselves.” This was written by Marx, who so far as the record shows, never in his life did a stroke of manual toil.

But the International was composed of many divergent elements; the Proudhonians from France, the Mazzinians from Italy, and, worst of all, the Bakouninists from everywhere. All of them were strong on phrases, but weak on organization. They had inherited from the “Age of Phraseology”, which ushered in the French revolution, a profound conviction that victories are to be won by the proper verbal formula. Marx, in his “Eighteenth Brumaire,” tells of the grief of those ardent idealists whose hope is pinned on the constant iteration of the magic words “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity”, when confronted by the potent control, in the hands of the master class, of the “Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery!”

LINCOLN THE INTERNATIONALIST.

One of the greatest factors at this International gathering was the strong and open sympathy of Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, with whom Marx exchanged many letters. Lincoln’s writings testify his appreciation that it was the
hand of Karl Marx which saved the Union, at its darkest hour, from the disaster which would have plunged it into ruin.

For Lincoln was an internationalist. In his speeches, in his messages, and in his private utterances, time and time again he uttered the central thought, the rallying cry of Labor's Internationalism. Marx was a careful student of all of the world's periodicals. His letters to the New York Tribune show that he had read the editorials in practically all of the American newspapers. Certain it is, then, that again and again he must have pondered the debates, the speeches, and the state papers of Lincoln; and must have known well that great saying of Abraham Lincoln:

"THE STRONGEST BOND OF HUMAN SYMPATHY, OUTSIDE OF THE FAMILY RELATION, SHOULD BE ONE UNITING ALL WORKING PEOPLE, OF ALL NATIONS AND TONGUES AND KINDREDS!"

And in those words is written the charter of Labor's International. It is as an echo that we hear the cry of Marx:

"Workers of all countries, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains, you have the world to gain!"

Together those two sentences form the keystone of the great arch of fellowship which spans across the dividing gulf of narrow nationality. Lincoln leaves us in no doubt as to his convictions, at any time of his career. Such words as these find their echo in the Socialist movement—and nowhere else in the wide world.

But if Marx found sympathy in the great heart of Lincoln, he found bitter opposition at the hands of his own associates. Proudhon and Mazzini and their followers soon grew dissatisfied with the insistence of Marx on the economic, almost to the exclusion of the idealistic, side of the great revolution; they withdrew; but the struggle with Bakounin and the anarchist group which followed him grew more and more intense, until finally it wrecked the International.

In brief, the difference between Bakounin's plan and that of Marx is thus outlined by Hunter:

"Bakounin states what he wishes; Marx states what he believes is possible. Bakounin wants the whole world free, now, at once. Marx knows that before the working class can obtain freedom, certain political and economic conditions must prevail. Bakounin insisted on the abolition of the right of inheritance, to which he traced all the evil of the modern capitalistic system; but he refused absolutely to work for the political power necessary to make that abolition of inheritance effective."

Marx refused to adopt Bakounin's ideas; and the result was that Bakounin, instead of fighting the capitalist system, fought Marx and Mazzini. Them he described as the "greatest enemies of the human race." At every convention, at every conference, his ingenuity was devoted to baffling all the plans and proposals of Marx. Robert Hunter's book, "Violence and the Labor Movement" sketches in vivid and powerful pages the titanic struggle
between these two giants; one the Father of Terrorism—Bakounin; advocate of the Propaganda of the Deed; devout adorer of the devil as the arch-rebel;—and Marx, the father of scientific political Socialism; advocate of the propaganda of Education; and expounder of the Economic Interpretation of all history, current as well as past.

The First International threw Europe into an ague of terror. The teeth of statesmen chattered at its name. Every strike, every desperate deed, every conspiracy, every threat of political or industrial disturbance which occurred between the Mediterranean and the White Sea, was laid to the International. Although the body was very weak, and could only raise an occasional strike fund for the assistance of some labor group involved in a struggle with its masters, the shadow of the “Red Spectre” hovered over Europe. It was very much like the I. W. W. at the present time, which is credited by the capitalist newspapers with everything that happens which they dislike.

But at the heart of this “Red Spectre” lay the canker of Bakounin’s insane jealousy of Marx. Wearying of the struggle, and disheartened by the horror of the suppression of the Paris Commune, Marx put to the Congress of 1873, at The Hague, a motion transferring the general headquarters of the International to New York—which was equivalent to killing it. The motion passed by a very narrow majority, 26 to 23. No adequate explanation has ever been given of Marx’s idea in doing this. It seems that he must have determined to kill the International with his own hands, to prevent the anarchists from doing so.

In any event, the statesmen of that period rejoiced with rejoicings loud and long. “Socialism is dead!” they cried, and exulted over the laying of the Red Spectre. In New York a feeble attempt was made to keep the International alive, but in 1876, at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition, a scant dozen delegates met and adopted a resolution permanently dissolving the International Workingmen’s Association.

**BIRTH OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL.**

These rejoicings over the death of Socialism were premature, and like the reports of the death of Mark Twain, were “greatly exaggerated”. In the thirteenth year after the dissolution of the First International, the Second International sprang into life, at the one hundredth anniversary of the fall of the Bastile. On that immortal date, the Fourteenth of July, in the year 1889, nearly four hundred delegates from all the Labor parties of the world met and declared that the International Workingmen’s Association was again in being.

There were present at this convention 221 French delegates, divided into two opposing groups of “possibilists” and “direct actionists.” There were 81 Germans, escaped from the Bismarckian tyranny, then in the full tide of its anti-Socialist re-
pression. Twenty-two delegates came from England; from Belgium 14; from Austria 8, from Spain 2, from Holland 4, from Italy 5, from Russia 6; there were present delegations from Sweden, Bulgaria, Roumania, Norway, Denmark, Portugal, Bohemia, Poland, Hungary, and five came from the United States.

The old division between Parliamentarians and Direct Actionists, which had wrecked the First International, persisted. The congress of 1889 resolved itself into two groups, which met separately. Fusion was not effected. But in 1891, at the Congress of Brussels, it was possible for Vandervelde, the brilliant young leader of the Belgian Socialists, to cry "A new thing has occurred in history; the revolutionary Socialists and Trade Unionists now find themselves united!"

At the Congress of Zurich, in 1893, the main subject under discussion was the General Strike. A vote was taken to exclude Anarchists, which were defined to mean all who opposed the attainment and use of political power. In 1896, at London, the battle between Parliamentarians and anti-Parliamentarians was renewed with vigor, and resulted again in the exclusion of anti-parliamentarians. In Paris, in 1900, the principal subject of discussion was the ministerial question, which had been brought to a sharp crisis by Millerand's action in accepting a portfolio in the cabinet of Waldeck-Rousseau without the consent of the French Socialists. And again in Amsterdam, in 1904, the question of coalition with other parties was hotly debated. In Stuttgart, in 1907, Labor Unions and Suffrage were the principal topics; in Copenhagen, in 1910, Cooperatives and Unemployment; and on the agenda for the great Congress of Vienna, which was to have been held in 1914, the supreme and dominant topic was the preservation of the world peace.

COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL.

We are all familiar with the disheartening, disastrous collapse of the Second International; how the delegates from all countries in the world were gathering to Paris, instead of Vienna because of the threatened imminence of war; and how the German Socialists, after a bluff of loyalty to the International, voted for the war-credits; how the Belgian and French Socialists entered the cabinets of their beleaguered countries.

How the Austrian Socialists outdid the Germans in their devotion to the cause of the Kaisers is told by Leon Trotzky in the pages of his book, "The Bolsheviki and the World Peace." And the bitterest pages of that bitter book are those in which he quotes Karl Kautsky's defense of the position of the German Socialists.

"What should we Russian Socialists say to the Russian workingmen," says Trotzky on page 163, "in face of the fact that the bullets the German workers are shooting at them bear the political and moral seal of the German Social Democracy? 'We cannot make our policy for Russia, we make it for Germany,' was the answer given me by one of the most respected
functionaries of the German party when I put this question to him. And at that moment I felt with particularly painful clear-

ness what a blow had been struck at the International from within.

"In his speech at Essen," Trotzky goes on, "Karl Kautsky
drew a terrifying picture of brother rising against brother in
the name of a "war of defense" as an argument, by no means
as an actual possibility. Now that this picture has become a
bloody actuality, Kautsky endeavors to reconcile us to it. He be-
holds no collapse of the International.

"The difference between the German and French Socialists is
not to be found in their standards of jugdment," writes Kautsky,
"nor in their fundamental points of view, but merely in the dif-
ference of their interpretation of the present situation; which,
in its turn, is conditioned by the difference in their geographical
position! Therefore, this difference can scarcely be overcome
while the war lasts. Nevertheless it is not a difference of prin-
ciple, but one arising out of a particular situation, and so it need
not last after that situation has ceased to exist!" (Neue Zeit,
337, p. 3.)

On this Trotzky comments: "The standard of judgment is
one and the same for the German Socialist cutting a French-
man's throat as for a French Socialist cutting a German's throat.
If Ludwig Frank takes up his gun, not to proclaim the "differ-
ence of principle" to the French Socialists, but to shoot them in
all agreement of principle; and if Ludwig Frank should himself
fall by a French bullet—fired possibly by a comrade—that is no
detriment to the standards they have in common. It is merely
a consequence of the "difference in their geographical position!"
Truly, it is bitter to read such lines, but doubly bitter when they
come from Kautsky's pen!"

This collapse of the International under the stress of the
war madness is not at all inexplicable. For in the period be-
tween the first and second Internationals, the Socialist and re-
volutionary groups in each nation, devoting their energies to or-
ganization among their own people, built up strong, autonomous
national groups. The First International!, though genuinely
"international," was a weak and ineffective thing; the second
International was really a federation of autonomous national So-
cialist parties, agreeing theoretically in their common purpose of
bringing to an end the world wide system of capitalistic ex-
ploration, but still retaining their strongly national character-
istics. Since 1900 an International Socialist Bureau was main-
tained at Brussels, with a secretary who was the one permanent
and paid officer of the International movement. On the outbreak
of the war this office was moved to The Hague, and Camille
Huysmans, as secretary, did what could be done to keep the
International alive. But at the outbreak of the war, the nation-
alistic characters of the several groups, stamped in during their
long struggle with their respective governing classes, proved
stronger than their international characteristics, which had really not yet been brought face to face with their International antagonist.

BUILDING OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL.

But in the Great War, and in the facts revealed by it, the International Socialist movement has come face to face, amid the crash and thunder and flame and blood of the great world-wreckage, with the International Capitalism which is its foe. We discovered that the Armaments Trust is international; that the stock of the Krupp Company was distributed among English, French and Americans as well as Germans; that it was likewise with the Creusot works of France and the Bethlehem, Midvale and Bessemer companies in this country. And more than any other single fact, the attitude assumed toward the Russian Revolution by all the capitalist governments in the world—in particular by the capitalist press—has shown to us all that a purely nationalistic Socialism cannot prevail against—cannot even fight—an International Capitalism.

Constantly during the conflict the Socialist and labor forces of the world have been stretching out their hands, groping through the smoke and confusion of the battlefield to grasp the friendly hands of their comrades in other lands. Even amid the horror of the first outbreak, some semblance of unity was preserved. In September, 1915, forty delegates met at Zimmerwald, in Switzerland, from Germany, France, and ten other nations; and there, while their own countries were cutting one another's throats, they renewed the pledge of International fellowship. The British delegates were not allowed to go. The same forces met again at Kiental in Switzerland in April of 1906. At The Hague, on July 30 and August 1, of 1916, a conference of Socialists of neutral countries was held. Algernon Lee was the delegate from the United States; delegates came also from Holland, from Denmark, from Sweden, and from Argentina.

THE STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE.

Early in 1917, the American Socialist Party cabled to all the Socialist Parties in Europe, suggesting that an International Socialist Conference be held. A committee composed of Dutch and Scandinavian Socialists thereupon issued the call for such a meeting, naming Stockholm, Sweden, as the place. Their plan was for the neutral committee to confer first with the German and Austrian Socialists, and get their point of view; then with the Socialists of the allied countries; and if any ground of agreement were found between the two bodies, to hold a joint conference. To this meeting both German parties, the Majority party and the Independent, sent delegates; the Belgians were largely represented, and also the French. But the British Government refused its consent, and the conference seemed hopeless.
Then came the Russian revolution, and with its coming the plan for an International Socialist Conference gained in strength and in prestige. The All-Russian Soviets issued a call for the Socialists of all countries to gather at Stockholm in August. Arthur Henderson, Labor member of the British cabinet, went to Petrograd and conferred there with Tcheidze. He came back afire with enthusiasm for the proposed gathering. The French Socialist party again elected delegates; both the German parties, the Austrian Socialists, the Hungarian Socialists, the British, Belgian, Bulgarian, Italian and American Socialist parties, all elected delegates and applied for passports from their respective government.

But the United States of America blocked the way. A subordinate official in the Department of State made up his mind that Hillquit, Berger and Lee, who had been chosen by referendum, were "pro-German," and therefore he refused them passports. Following this lead, Great Britain and France also withdrew passports. After hanging on until October, the Dutch-Scandinavian committee was compelled to announce that the project would have to be postponed. Almost immediately the All-Russian Soviet deposed Kerensky and put Lenin and Trotsky into power, charged with the duty of compelling the Allies to revise their war aims; and constantly, day by day, the All-Russian Soviet sent out its appeals to the working classes of all other nationalities to compel their own governments to revise war aims and bring about a peace by negotiation.

**THE SPECTACLE OF GOMPERS.**

Meanwhile the organized labor forces of the world, which in most countries are closely allied with the Socialist organization as the political wing of the workers movement, were trying to bring about a Labor conference; and here they ran against the Bakounin of the Third International—Samuel Gompers. The amazing, humiliating spectacle presented by the American Labor movement during the world crisis can only be understood by an analysis of that English Jew who has handed over American Labor into the hands of its foes; for it was he who blocked every effort of Labor, and more than possibly it is his dark and sinister power which had blocked every effort of the Socialists, to unite beneath the warring lines during this conflict.

On May 24 Gompers replied to the invitation of the Dutch Federation of Labor for a Labor conference at Stockholm, refusing it on the ground that his permission had not previously been asked; that there was no time to select delegates; that he could not see how any good could come from such a conference, or from any participation at this time. Gompers had already cabled to Milyukoff in Russia, on April 2, warning him to "go slow" with the revolutionary movement; and he cabled to the All-Russian Soviet, approving Elihu Root as a delegate.

On June 27 the American Federation of Labor approved a telegram sent by Gompers to all the neutral countries, replying
to a proposal made by neutral labor federations for a Labor conference in September, saying:

“All such conferences are premature, untimely, and can lead to no good purpose. Such a conference as is contemplated would rather place obstacles in the way to democratize the institutions of the world and hazard the liberties and opportunities of all people.

“If an International Union Conference is to be held it should be at a more opportune time than the present or immediate future, or in any event the proposals of the American Federation of Labor for an international conference should receive further and more sympathetic consideration.”

This—in spite of the fact that he had not only not made any such proposals, but had sternly set his face against all proposals which were made.

But the International could not be so easily balked. In the first week of January, the British Labor Party held its epoch-making conference, in which the Cooperative societies, the Socialist parties and the Trade Unions of Great Britain united to form the organization which now dominates the Empire. They summoned an Inter-Allied Labor Conference, to which Gompers refused to send delegates, on the ground that he feared the proposed Inter-Allied Labor Conference was “paid for with German money!” Stung by this outrageous statement, the Inter-Allied Labor Conference elected three delegates to come to this country and try to instill some reason into Gompers’ head; but the British steam engineers refused to allow any ship carrying these delegates to leave any English port.

At whose instigation was this done? The British government did not block them. Did Gompers? If so, did our government obey his wishes? We shall be able to tell—after the war.

Meanwhile the People’s Council called a Conference of all Radical, Socialist and Labor forces in New York, and elected James H. Maurer as their delegate to go to Europe and enter into communication with the Socialist, radical and labor forces of Europe. But Maurer’s passport was blocked by Mr. Gompers, who, seeing that Maurer was to be allowed to go, decided hurriedly that he must be first on the ground. Whereupon he reversed his decision, selected a committee of his own, got them their passports, and sent them to England, while Maurer was held on this side cooling his heels with vague promises.

The behavior of the commission was by all odds the most astonishing thing in labor history. Instead of treating British and French Labor as comrades, they assumed the attitude of teachers to bad boys; and the result of their mission is an intense bitterness between American and European organized labor.

But it is as a guardian of American labor that Gompers is most astonishing. Before the declaration of War by the United States, in the first weeks of 1917, Gompers had summoned to Washington heads of all the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and got them to pledge their unqualified
endorsement of anything the Administration might do, in ad-

cance. In return for this pledge, Gompers was appointed Chair-

man of the Committee on Labor, of the Council of National De-

fense. But on that Committee, Gompers appointed half capital-

ists and half workers; so that the interests of American Labor

are safeguarded by such friends and wellwishers of the poor

toilers as August Belmont, J. D. Rockefeller, Jr., Cornelius Van-

derbilt, Daniel Guggenheim, and George Pope, President of the

National Association of Manufacturers.

Gompers' attitude is quite explicable. Having for half a
century maintained himself in power by consistently blocking
any political action by organized labor, he fights, as bitterly as
Bakounin did, and for the same reason, any attempt to organize
Labor into a political party of its own. Finding some sort of
political connection necessary, however, he toadies to whichever
political party will promise him what he seeks. The Democratic
Administration having made terms with Gompers, Gompers be-
comes an adjunct of the Democratic Administration. With such
stuff must the International deal!

THE FACTS IN THE CASE.

Gazing down the long sweep of events since the beginning
of the Christian era, certain facts stand boldly out to our view. The
first is that the Christian Church was able to unify the labor
movement of the Graeco-Roman Empire against the horrors of
imperial persecution through the strength of its cooperative in-
stitutions, as well as by the calm confidence of future victory and
by the warm personal ties developed between its members by
the religion which was the bond of unity. That primitive Inter-
national included within its membership Greek, Roman, Scythian,
Barbarian, bond and free, male and female, upon one plane of
membership, in a common hope for the overthrow of the cruel
system of blood and robbery which lay at the heart of the Roman
Empire.

After the breakup of the Empire into nationalities, the first
impulse to reorganizing the International Labor movement came
from the Idealists, the Utopians, who repeated the phrases which
had animated the early Christian movement, without always
understanding the solid economic basis on which it had moved to
victory. They did not always perceive that beside the Apostles'
task of preaching the Word of the Lord, there was also the
deacons' task of "serving at tables in the daily ministration" and
the task of the bishops in caring for the poor, the needy, the
sick, the wanderer, the hungry and those athirst.

The First International Workingmen's Association was a
group devoted to the organization of workingmen everywhere for
action; and it split over the difficult problem of reconciling Poli-
tical Democracy with Industrial Democracy. The long quarrel
between Direct Action and Parliamentary Action is rung in all
its changes in every International Congress from that of London
to that of Geneva.
The Second International was composed of strong, autonomous national groups, who had developed their political strength along with their economic strength, and had backed these up with the cooperative organizations on which they could rest independent of the capitalist control of commodities of life.

But the Second International was wrecked because these autonomous national groups were organized on a strictly national basis, and their Internationalism was a theory, not a fact.

We face at this hour, therefore, the problem of devising a Federation of the World in which Political Action and Industrial Action by the working class shall be harmoniously united—with the cooperative principle on the one hand and the national principle on the other—on a common plan of organization in which each nation shall fit into its due place in the world structure as the states of the American Union fit into their starry places on its flag.

**THE WORLD FEDERATION.**

First of all the steps that must be taken is to abolish the secret canker which eats at the heart of every nation, and spreads the foul disease of Imperialism around the world;—namely, Capitalism. For in every case, Imperialism, both ancient and modern, comes from speculation, for private gains, on a public necessity. In ancient Rome, in medieval ages, in modern Germany, modern England, modern America, modern France, private possession of public necessities has meant the launching of armies against other states, subduing the people of other lands in order to prevent the wealth accumulated in the hands of the few at home from falling into the hands of the many at home. Nor it it difficult to strike at the root of the whole matter. In almost every country Conscription of Life has been enforced, to obtain the man power for the bloody work of war. But if Life can be conscripted to fight the war, surely wealth can be conscripted to pay for the war,—and if it can be conscripted to pay for war, wealth can be conscripted to prevent war!

This is our opportunity; this is the supreme moment to press home the demand for the Conscription of Wealth. By which we mean, not the mere levying of highly graduated income taxes or excess profits taxes, but the very uprooting of the causes of all our ills; namely the permanent retention in the hands of all the people of all the natural wealth—copper, coal, iron, oil, silver, gold, water-power, and land—absolutely preventing and forbidding any private monopoly of any public necessity, of whatever sort, as a crime not only against the nation but against the whole of the human race.

And next we must consider how the natural resources are to be administered. Already the war has shown us that the old objections to public ownership are absurd. But a conflict—the old, old conflict—between political and industrial action will arise, unless we perceive clearly the causes of that conflict.
THREE STAGES OF SOCIAL LIFE.

Human society began in the nomadic, or wandering, stage; and nomadic society is always patriarchal in its organization and government. The reason for this is that in the Clan system, in which tribes rove from place to place, there can be but one bond of union, and that is the bond of blood-kin. Family rulership therein vests naturally in the father or eldest son; especially as nomadic life, with its accompanying constant warfare, in which a large proportion of the males are killed, leaves a surplus of women, and this inevitably produces polygamy.

But when the tribe turns from the nomadic life, and subsists no longer solely upon flocks and herds, but upon agriculture and the produce of its fields, then its boundaries are territorial. Every tribe acquires a certain definite stretch of land as its own and every one living within those boundaries is accounted a member of the tribe. During many centuries the Patriarchal or family system of government was grafted upon the Geographical or Political system of economics, thru the rulership of hereditary kings, or dukes, or overlords. And again, this hereditary system is a natural safeguard against incessant revolutions. For in fierce and warlike times, the throne is constantly a "thing to be grasped at", and unless there is a general agreement as to the successor, the death of every ruler is a signal for civil war; whereas if everyone agrees that the eldest son of the reigning lord is to become the next ruler, the life of the community flows on smoothly without constant upheavals.

But we have passed that stage. In course of time the Geographical society outgrew the Patriarchal government and adopted the habit of Political Democracy, which simply means that every one residing in a certain stretch of territory is equally interested in, and is given equal rights by the government of that territory. We have not yet reached the full development of the Democratic theory, for in very few nations are adult women considered free from the tutelage of their patriarchal husbands or sons.

The theory of political democracy is based upon the supposition that the whole community gains its living in farming. Political or Geographical government is based upon agriculture. But we have passed beyond the stage of agriculture, and are in the industrial era, in which Political, or Geographical, democracy no longer answers all the requirements of our lives.

For it is of far more concern to a workingman at the present time to have a good boss than to have a good sheriff. He cares very little who the alderman from his ward may be if he can have a good foreman to work for. And the reason is simple. It is easy to move from place to place, town to town, city to city, state to state. But it is not so easy; it is increasingly difficult, to move from job to job. Every great district is dominated by some metropolis; as, New York on the Atlantic Seaboard, Chicago in the middle West, St. Louis and Denver in the Southwest, San
Francisco on the Central Pacific coast. And every metropolis is dominated by a few blocks of office buildings and banks. In one single office-building there may be domiciled perhaps a thousand corporations, which may control factories, forests, mines, railroad and steamship lines, and industries of a thousand sorts, in every corner of the world.

In such circumstances Political democracy has lost its meaning. Consider, for example, the downtown Wall Street section of New York, or the Loop District of Chicago, which are represented in the City Council of those two cities by saloon-keepers. Hinky Dink and Bathhouse John speak in the city council of Chicago for the Art Institute, the La Salle Street banking district, most of the theaters, most of the department stores, a number of lodging-houses, and Hinky Dink's saloon. But the only one of the lot which is fully and fairly represented is Hinky Dink's saloon.

The cry for Industrial Democracy has increased in volume during the past few years. But few of us have taken the trouble to plan a means whereby Political Democracy, or Geographical representation, shall be fairly united with Industrial Democracy in any sort of a national government.

**OUR PROBLEM.**

Our problem, then, is this:

First to abolish the private ownership of public necessities in such manner that it can never again rise to confound us.

Second, to provide for the cooperative operation of these public necessities.

Third, to reconcile Industrial Democracy with Political Democracy in our scheme of administration so that all shall be represented both Industrially as Producers and Geographically as Consumers.

Fourth, to establish permanent control of the Executive by the Legislative department of our government.

By this means we shall have prepared our own nation to assume its place in a federation of nations, similarly organized. These principles are not new; they are not the fantastic visions of a utopian. They are the scientific principles which are being swiftly disentangled out of the conflict and confusion of the world war. Every nation which is talking Reconstruction is working along just such lines as those proposed. The difference is that we, being Americans, are accustomed to certain American modes of thought and procedure.

This book is written for the purpose of casting the Spirit of Internationalism which is sweeping the world into a form answering to American national ideas and history, so that we on our own soil may keep pace with that tremendous evolution going on so swiftly in Britain, in Russia, in France, and even in Germany.

My proposal is this; that the Geographical districts shall be represented, as at present, in our National House of Represen-
tatives—but by representatives proportionally chosen; so that if in any district one-fifth of the voters are Socialists, they shall have one-fifth of the Congressmen from that district. This plan is fully explained by the Proportional Representation League.

But the Industrial Communities must also be represented. Let us make use of our absurd and obsolete Senate, instead of abolishing it, to perform this function. Indeed, they do this now; but they do it underhandedly. Let us, for example, declare the Railroads of the Country to form one Industrial Community, and to be entitled to, say, twenty Senators, to be chosen by the workers themselves. Likewise the Mine Workers; likewise the textile, metal, food and building trades; likewise the physicians and teachers. The workers in each industry to select their own Senators in such manner as they may devise, save that it must be done in a “democratic fashion”.

We then shall have a Political Democracy and an Industrial Democracy meeting in the same Congress representing the people politically as consumers and industrially as producers. How shall they be harmonized?

Why, through the Administration. This country must adopt the system of Parliamentary Responsibility, in which the Cabinet must report to Congress and take orders from it. Every civilized nation in the world has such a system. The departments of the Government must be made responsive to the will of the people as represented in Congress; but in the system thus proposed, both industrially and politically represented.

For example; both the houses should hold joint sessions at least once a week. Before them come the whole Cabinet, to answer questions and make explanations. If either house passes a vote of censure, the Secretary thus censured is ipso facto dismissed from office, and cannot be reappointed to the same office until at least an interval has elapsed.

Thus the Geographical districts would be represented in the House; the Industrial Communities in the Senate; and both together would control the Administration.

This system would harmonize the conflicting elements in the long struggle between Political and Direct action. So far as I can see, it is the only system which can. The dual representation in each Nation would lead to similar dual representation in the International Congress. Each nation would send its delegates to the House and Senate of the World similarly composed.

We face the choice; either the League of Nations will be a capitalistic union composed of the exploiting groups in each nation united with all the other exploiting groups to keep labor down in each country; or it will be a world-wide union of the Creative forces in every country to make the world a fellowship. We must make our choice, and that soon. What shall our Internationalism be: Exploitive, or Creative? Shall it be a union of Speculators united for world-loot, or of Workers united for world happiness?
It is for us, as Americans, to set our own house in order. We must prepare to become worthy members of the League of Nations.

Congressional elections are approaching, and beyond that looms the Presidential election of 1920. The crucial moment is upon us. Never was it so important to consider our immediate necessities in the light of the past. Having considered the past, we must lay plans to accomplish what we desire. The supreme necessity is to start from where we are, with a clear idea of where we want to go, and some sort of knowledge as to the pitfalls which have betrayed the feet of other travellers.

It is in this spirit that the appended proposals for a new Constitution are offered; it is with the desire, not of prescribing a ready-made solution of all our ills, but of challenging attention to what I believe to be the best means of approaching the solution of the difficulties which we face.

No framework for an International Congress is offered. That must be devised by the working-class delegates from all the nations, when they shall meet. But America must prepare herself to meet with revolutionary Russia, revolutionary England, revolutionary Italy, revolutionary France, and revolutionary Germany and Austria—that as comrades united by a clear understanding we may all take hands to establish the International Federation of the World.
PROPOSALS FOR A NEW CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

We demand the Conscription of Wealth, democratic control and operation of all publicly necessary utilities; and therefore propose

ARTICLE 1: THE NATIONAL DOMAIN.

1. All natural resources contained within the territory of this country are inalienably the property of all the people of the country; and shall be held in trust for the people of the whole Union by the people of the State in which they are located.

2. All industries which are necessary to the welfare of the people of any state shall be owned and operated by the people of that state; and all industries which are necessary to the welfare of the whole nation shall be owned and operated by the people of the whole nation; in the manner hereinafter described.

3. Revenue derived from State industries shall be divided proportionately between the State and the Nation; and the National quota thereof shall be employed in developing and extending the resources and industries of backward or newly opened territories.

4. Revenue derived from national industries shall be turned into the national treasury direct, and shall be used to defray the expenses of government, pensions for old age, unemployment, sickness, and for the relief of all necessaries of whatever sort of all those employed in the national industries.

5. Use and occupancy shall be the sole title to land, which shall be held on leasehold from the national government, the rental to be fixed in accordance with the unearned increment in the value thereof.

We demand Industrial Democracy as well as Political Democracy, and therefore we propose

ARTICLE 2: THE CONGRESS.

1. The Congress of the United States shall consist of two branches: the Senate and the House of Representatives.

2. The House of representatives shall be composed of members chosen by proportional voting from the districts into which each state shall be divided; in such manner that the various parties which may be organized among the people shall be represented in accordance with their voting strength in each district. Districts shall be formed in accordance with the population returns shown by the national census; and shall be so apportioned that each member shall represent as nearly as possible fifty thousand persons. Members shall be chosen every two years, and shall take their seats upon the first day of December following their election.

3. The Senate shall be composed of members elected by the workers in the National Industries; and shall serve for two years, taking their seats
on the first day of December following their election. The number of Senators allotted to each industry shall be based upon the number of workers actively engaged in the national industry; and every person, of whatever age or sex or nationality, who is actively engaged in productive toil in such national industry shall be entitled to a vote for Senator.

4. An industry shall be declared to be a national industry upon Vote of the Senate ratified by the House of Representatives. The following are hereby declared to be National Industries, and entitled to the number of Senators set opposite their names;

Transportation 25; Mines 25; Food Industries (including farmers) 25; Textile industries 15, Building trades 15, Printing trades 15 Communications, including telegraph, telephone and postal systems 15, Teachers 15, Migratory laborers 15, Electrical workers 10, etc.

An industry desiring to be recognized as a national Industry shall petition the Senate for such recognition; and if it be approved, shall be submitted to the House of Representatives. The two houses shall in conference decide upon the number of Senators to which this national industry shall be entitled.

5. The same order shall be observed in regard to the constitution in the State Senates, which shall be elected by the workers in the State Industries. Provision for the senates of smaller political subdivisions shall be determined by the assemblies of each state.

6. New territories and new states shall be organized by the Congress on petition of the inhabitants thereof, in accordance with the custom heretofore followed.

7. Delegates to the International Congress shall be elected by each house from its own members; and the delegates from each house shall be ratified by the other house.

We demand permanent subordination of executive power to representative power, and therefore we propose

ARTICLE 3: THE ADMINISTRATION.

1. Executive power shall be vested in the President and his Cabinet. The President shall be elected by direct vote of all the people once in six years and shall not be eligible for reelection. He shall appoint his Cabinet, subject to the approval of both houses of Congress. The Cabinet shall consist of Secretaries of State, of the Treasury, of War, of the Navy, of Commerce, of Labor, of Public Health, and of Public Education, of Transportation, of Communications, and of Justice, and of such other members as shall be established by law.

2. At stated times the members of the Cabinet shall appear before a joint session of both houses of Congress, to answer questions, propose laws, and receive criticism of their conduct of the government. They may be summoned at any time to appear either individually before Congress or before any of its committees.

3. A vote of censure passed upon any member of the Cabinet by a majority of either house shall constitute the instant dismissal of that member; and he shall be ineligible for reappointment to his post until an
interval has elapsed; but he may be appointed to some other cabinet office at the discretion of the president subject to the approval of the congress.

4. All the records and archives of all the departments shall be open at all times to the inspection of members of the committees of House or Senate charged with duty in connection with that department; or to the inspection of accredited members of the faculty of any recognized university or college giving instruction in subjects pertaining to that department, or to accredited members of the several press associations; subject however to prosecution and punishment for misuse of this privilege.

We demand popular control of the judiciary; and therefore propose

ARTICLE 4: THE JUDICIARY.

All judges shall be subject to the recall by the people of the districts in which they shall be chosen to serve.

We demand that no privileges shall be enjoyed without services performed; and therefore propose

ARTICLE 5: NATIONAL SERVICE.

Every man and woman shall be required to render two years of national service between the ages of 18 and 21, unless physically disabled. Such service shall consist exclusively of constructive work, in the field, in the departments of irrigation, reclamation, reforestation, or construction of national public works. The service of women shall consist of work in public health, educational or service departments.

Exemption from this service shall be granted solely on the ground of physical inability. The franchise shall be given to every person resident in a political district for the officials of that district, and to every person working in any industry for the representatives of that industry. The vote of children shall in nowise be withheld, but may be cast by their parents until the child shall have attained the majority.

We demand that personal rights be kept inviolate; and therefore propose

ARTICLE 6: PERSONAL RIGHTS.

The right of free speech, free press, free religion and free assemblage shall be inviolate, and any official found guilty of infringing upon the public exercise of such rights shall be held to be guilty of treason. This right is exercised subject to legal recourse for the punishment of any abuse of it.

ARTICLE 7: AMENDMENT.

This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of both houses of Congress, ratified by a majority of the people at the next regular general election.
BOOKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

HISTORICAL. Each paper 50 cents; cloth, $1.00; postage, 5 cents extra.

THE MARTYR PEOPLES. A History of the Little Nationalities, in six lectures.

ISRAEL: The Crucible of God. IRELAND: The Sorrowful Mother.
IRELAND: The Sorrowful Mother. BELGIUM: The Storm Center.
POLAND: Land of the Four Eagles. ARMENIA: Crucifixion of the Soul.

IMPERIALISM. In Two Volumes.

I. Founders of Imperialism.
EGYPT: The United States of the Nile.
CHALDAEA: The Strife of the Cities.
ROME: Mistress of the World.

II. Modern Imperialism.
FRANCE: Daughter of the Empire.
SPAIN: The Shadow of the Moor.
AUSTRIA: The House of Hapsburg.

THE EMPIRE OF FRANCE.

THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE GODS. A Study of the Religions of Patriotism.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE COMMONPLACE, including:
The Philosophy of the Kitchen Chair.
The Philosophy of the Hobo.
The Philosophy of Buttons.
The Philosophy of Smoke.
The Philosophy of Paper.

POETIC

Each, paper, 25 cents; cloth, 50 cents.

THE CHOSEN NATION. A Dramatic Poem, presented to Judge Landis at the time of sentence.

THE SANGREAL. A Poetic Drama of the Arthurian Legend, from a new point of view.

POEMS OF A SOCIALIST PRIEST. Contains "Lyrics of a Tramp Reporter" and "Poems of a Socialist Priest."

SONGS OF THE ALAMO, AND THE CITY OF DREAMS. Heroic legends of the South and West.

JEAN LAFITTE. A Romantic Drama of the Battle of New Orleans.