

The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy &
A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR

ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana
LINCOLN STEPPENS, Connecticut
L. P. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island
HENRY F. RING, Texas
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio
FREDERIC C. HOWE, Ohio
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio

HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York
ROBERT BAKER, New York
BOLTON HALL, New York
FRANCIS I. DU PONT, Delaware
HERBERT QUICK, Wisconsin
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Iowa
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon

JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota
W. G. EGGLESTON, Oregon
LEWIS H. BERENS, England
J. W. S. CALLIE, England
JOSEPH FELS, England
JOHN PAUL, Scotland
GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand

Vol. XIII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1910.

No. 655

Published by Louis F. Post
Ellsworth Building, 357 Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents Yearly Subscription, One Dollar

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post
Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

Race Questions	985
Socialism and "Industrialism"	985
The New York Situation	987
The Religion of Politics	988
Chief Justice Steele, Democrat	988
Julia Ward Howe	989
The Death of Dolliver	989
A Deadly Parallel	989
The Company He Keeps	990
Chicago Newspapers	990
"Back to the Land"	990
Henry George, Jr. (with Portrait Supplement)	991

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

Oregon Railroad Amendment (W. G. Eggleston)	994
---	-----

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:

Teachers with Itching Ears (Geo. A. Totten)	995
---	-----

NEWS NARRATIVE:

The Republic of Portugal Becoming Settled	995
British Leadership in Land Value Taxation (with portrait)	996
The British Conference on Land Value Taxation	997
Joseph Fels in France	998
Railroad Strike in France	998
An Appeal for Free Trade	998
Roosevelt in Politics	999
Municipal Government by Commission in Massachu- setts	999
Initiative and Referendum Campaign in Colorado	1000
News Notes	1000
Press Opinions	1002

RELATED THINGS:

The Battle Hymn of the Republic (Julia Ward Howe)	1002
Uncle Sam's Letters to John Bull	1002

BOOKS:

The Old and the New	1004
Books Received	1004

Race Questions.

With an Indian invincible at the white man's chosen game, baseball, and a Negro the victor at his chosen test of superiority, force—exemplified in this instance in a prize fight—both sports requiring keenness of mind as well as skill of body, and the French proposing to organize a vast military army of native Africans, what can the white man say for himself? Will he reverse his reasons for keeping inferior races down, by arguing that their superiority makes it necessary?

+ +

Socialism and "Industrialism."

Out of the railroad strike in France comes a gigantic historical fact. We allude to the fact that this strike was quite distinctly a battle of "industrialism"—we understand the foreign name to be "syndicalism"—a recent manifestation of "class conscious" socialism. The difference is in its method, not in its purpose. The method of "class conscious" socialism has everywhere until recently been political, under the banner of a rigidly segregated party organization operating regularly within the general political scheme of parliamentary or popular government. But "industrialism" rejects "capitalistic politics" as defiantly as, in common with the other faction of "class conscious" socialism, it rejects "capitalistic" reforms.

+

Adherents of "industrialism" may, indeed, vote

the Socialist ticket at "capitalistic" elections, and this may somewhat conceal the magnitude of the "industrial" defection from political socialism, but as a movement "industrialism" neither sympathizes with nor participates in political campaigns—unless in so far as it may thereby influence Socialist parties to hold aloof not only from "capitalistic" parties but also from "capitalistic" governments. Its form of organization is industrial unionism, its principal weapon the general industrial strike.

+

By industrial unionism is meant labor organization coinciding with the larger divisions of industrial interest, rather than the narrower ones of mere specialty interests—all railroad employes, for example, instead of engineers, firemen, conductors, and so on. And not by loose federation, as with the American Federation of Labor, but integrally. Even the distinct industrial interests would be syndicated in a central committee with functions and powers not unlike the "holding" companies of capitalism. Nor would this organization be for industrial objects alone, not in the narrow sense of old trade unionism; but for industrial objects in that broader socialistic sense which identifies the political with the industrial as one. By the general strike is meant such a tie-up of industry, partly or completely in any of its spheres, or partly or completely in all its spheres, and at any time, as may be deemed best for the purpose in hand, whether that purpose be, in the old-fashioned distinctive sense, industrial or governmental.

+

In method, then, "political" socialism strikes at capitalism through the ballot of the "capitalistic" regime, whereas "industrial" socialism ignores that ballot, and through the ballot of socialists alone attacks "capitalism" as an alien enemy, and with the "general strike" for its weapon. But in purpose both factions of "class conscious" socialism aim at organizing the "working class" into a state within the state, a government within the government, an "imperio in imperium." The political faction would draw class lines (the socialistic substitute for sectional boundaries) by means of a party organization which regards all but members as nations regard unnaturalized foreigners. In this peaceful and evolutionary way the "political" socialist would patiently foster the socialistic state within the "capitalistic" state until in due course it had cast the latter off as the chicken casts off the shell of its mother's egg. But the "industrial" socialist has no such patience.

We should add, if we believed in the class conscious theory of human progress, that it has no such good sense either. Rejecting the ballot—which is not more truly "capitalistic" at the worst than any other weapon at the best, and is infinitely more human—"industrialism" proposes systematic class warfare by means which are defensible only as one of the impulsive crudities of a subject class resisting special cruelties, refined and subtle, of powerful persons or interests. Their means, weak at best, are almost geometrically progressive in weakness as their field of operations expands. In effect they would revive the old tactics which Karl Marx, not from cowardice, deliberately rejected. And in progressive countries no less than in reactionary ones, the inevitable climax would be street slaughters and capital executions needlessly provoked and uselessly suffered.

+

Let us explain that in criticizing "industrialism" we do not speak as one differing from that faction alone. The class conscious theory itself is in our view only the explanation—call it "scientific" or what you will—of a method, and a weak method, too, whether applied through the "general strike" or the "capitalistic" ballot. It is weak because effectively progressive impulses do not spring from selfishness, whether of person or of class. It is weak because the interests of labor do not coincide closely enough with present labor-class lines to make it possible to organize within any "capitalistic" state a "labor class" state of sufficient power to overthrow by violence or slough off by growth the political institutions that bind it. It is weak because it segregates the citizenship that adopts it from the larger and increasingly more influential citizenship that does not adopt it but which is in sympathy with its deeper purpose of economic as well as political equality. This "class conscious" program throws its adherents into practical opposition to every friendly no less than every hostile tendency. It makes them lukewarm, when not hostile, to effective movements for public ownership of public utilities, an approach to their own ideal, because those utilities would be owned by a "capitalistic" government. It makes them lukewarm or hostile in this country to the movement for the Initiative, the Referendum and the Recall, which "class conscious" socialists use in their own embryonic state within the state, but are often strongly inclined to object to the use of in the enveloping state. It similarly makes them lukewarm or hostile in Great Britain to the great movement for one of their own fundamental de-

mands, "the land for the people"—in this case partly because, from their intense looking at their own program of infinite detail, they are blinded to the possibilities of a program of comprehensive economic principle, but chiefly nevertheless to the influence of their "class conscious" theory of progress. Not all socialists are personally so affected. Vast numbers are not, and among these are some clear sighted, able and courageous leaders. But the influence of the "class conscious" theory is politically paralyzing to socialist organizations whenever the road to their ideal opens anywhere on the other side of their party wall. If some enemy of socialism, instead of its devotees, had devised its rigid "class conscious" theory, it could be no more obstructive than it is and is humanly certain to continue, to the influence of socialistic organization in promoting progress toward the socialistic ideal.

+

Equality of economic opportunities, and consequent eradication of all classes but the labor class, is an ideal that appeals to millions who do not subscribe to the arbitrary and in many respects crude and superficial creeds of socialistic organizations, quite as strongly as to the most fastidious socialist. But these millions are in and of the life about them. They realize that although there is a capitalistic class-consciousness, effective opposition in labor class-consciousness is as illogical and impossible in government as it would be in art or physical science. They know that the clash in human society is only superficially between hostile classes; that it is really between financial interests, which cut through class lines, and always will so far as we of this generation, with the experience of all the past to guide our reason, can foresee. And they either know or in some way sense the truth, that the exploiting class is to be wiped out, only by eradicating the special privileges which create and maintain exploiting power; and that these privileges the poorest class of the labor class, as a class, always has been and always will be as eager to get as the greediest class of the exploiting class, as a class, is keen to retain.

+

Be its weapon, then, the "capitalistic" ballot or the "general strike," the rigid class conscious type of socialism, this method of a hermit state within the people's state, is at its best the least hopeful proposal for realizing that social condition of political and economic democracy which we suppose most socialists to aspire to. Unless the "political" faction modifies the rigidity of its creed, it can reach

only minor levels of political success; but after the first advances, its recruiting opportunities are progressively narrowed by its own self imposed limitations. As to the "industrial" faction, the experience of last week in France is at least mildly significant of the fatuity of adopting tactics for political and economic revolution, which lie along the line of the very greatest, instead of the least resistance.

+ +

The New York Situation.

Our rather pessimistic view last week of the political situation in New York (pp. 937, 938), has called out three mutually exclusive suggestions, each of which we are asked to adopt and urge. In full consciousness that if we adopt any one of the three, we shall be regarded by even the best of our friends who sympathize with either of the other two, as having made at least "a grave mistake," we shall nevertheless consider them all frankly and possibly make a choice.

+

From the Socialist party side we are urged to advocate voting for Charles E. Russell. One correspondent, not a Socialist, writes that Mr. Russell is "Iowa's best product," and that our editorial question, "What is a really progressive New York voter to do?" is answered in our News Columns (p. 946) quoting Mr. Russell's platform. But the problem for New York progressives who are not party Socialists, can hardly be so simply solved. They know that either Mr. Stimson or Mr. Dix will be elected, and if they distrust one more than the other, they will vote for the other. This is the human nature of it when you take men in masses. And wicked, illogical and silly as we may concede it to be, since they might elect some one else if they would spontaneously pool their votes for one or another of the candidates whose election each regards as hopeless, we must nevertheless treat it as a fact, though only a mere fact, just as we should treat a vicious and totally illogical bull dog as a mere fact if he met us on our way home and wouldn't listen to reason. That being the view of the voting mass in New York (outside of side party membership), we are forced to conclude that in the mass this voter will vote for Stimson or Dix, unless he doesn't care which goes in, and decides either not to vote at all or to vote a protest. In the latter case he might vote for Mr. Russell. But wouldn't he consider more than the personality of Mr. Russell or his personal platform? He might consider that in voting for Mr. Russell's party he would be voting for the segregated labor theory of government, and this he