

EDITORIAL

## ART IN THE SENATE.

By DANIEL DE LEON

**E**LSEWHERE in this issue will be found the speech of Senator Elihu Root in favor of “free art,” and the answer of Senator Thomas puncturing the Root bourgeois duplicity.<sup>1</sup>

The two speeches together are a treat.

In line with the Top Capitalist goldbrick argument that the “Nation’s wealth” is the wealth of the Nation’s peoples;

In line with the Judas-kiss argument of the Protectionist Top Capitalist—who himself sets the pace in importing wholesale the “pauper Labor of Europe”—that “Protection” is intended to protect American “high-paid Labor”;

In line with the three-card monte arguments of the Free Trade Top Capitalist—who swiftly seeks to reduce wages when duties are reduced—that Free Trade, or Low Tariff, is meant to improve Labor’s breakfast table;

In line with the mealy-mouthed pretences of Top Capitalism—the law of whose existence is Strife, and whose prelacy blesses the homicidal weapons of its Armies and Navies—of love and affection for International Peace;—

In short—in line with the double-faced, double-tongued and double-minded nature of the Class whose political spaniel he is in the Senate, Elihu Root, seconded, typically enough, by Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, urged that the Nabobs who selfishly monopolize all the works of art that their coin can purchase, be exempt from a tax upon their ostentatious vanity,—urged the exemption upon the plea of making the poor happy.

Fortunately Root failed.

The fad of Art that has seized upon our Plutocracy has had an injurious effect

---

<sup>1</sup> [See “Art in the Senate,” *Weekly People*, September 27, 1913 (attached).—R.B.]

upon the artistic inclinations of the poor. The high prices that works of Art now fetch remove them further than ever from the reach of the masses. Worse yet, as Senator Thomas indicated, the fad has wrought evil to Art itself, in that the fad has promoted the building up of a business of manufacturing imitations and spurious creations with intent to deceive. Whatever the vulgar bourgeois touches he vitiates.

Fortunately, at this season, sentiments are being uttered in the Senate that tend to purify the atmosphere, and to protect Art from desecration.

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official website of the Socialist Labor Party of America.  
Uploaded February 2016

[slpns@slp.org](mailto:slpns@slp.org)



WEEKLY PEOPLE

46 Rose Street, New York. P. O. Box 1570, Tel. Beckman 3776. Published every Saturday by the SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY.

Subscription Rates: Domestic—One year, \$1.00; six months, 50c; three months, 25c. Foreign—One year, \$1.50; six months, 75c; three months, 40c.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1913.

Volcanoes cast forth stones, and revolutions men; so families are removed to distant places; human beings come to pass their lives far from their native homes; groups of relatives and friends disperse and decay; strange people fall, as it were from the clouds.

THE CASE OF FATHER SCHMIDT.

Murder is, unfortunately, no rare thing in our country—out of the columns of the "Sun and the Post" alone, of the seventeenth of this month, the reports of twenty-three murders can be picked.

Nor is the murdering of a young woman facing maternity, and murdered by the father in order to cover up his infamy, a thing unheard of in the land.

Nor yet is the superaddition of cold-blooded quartering of the victim's body, and the scattering of the victim's head, trunk and limbs to bewilder the blood-hounds of Justice,—nor yet is that horror a novelty.

All of these happenings are unfortunately too common; nor are they any longer peculiarly instructive.

It is otherwise with the combination of horrors that Father Johannes Schmidt of St. Joseph's Catholic Church confesses himself guilty of.

The degree imposing celibacy upon the priesthood was, no doubt, a masterpiece on the part of the papal mind that issued and enforced it.

Such an eruption is the case of Father Schmidt. "Well did the Vatican its business know

When, at the goal of universal power aiming, And the creation of a fighting army, That free from all entangling hindrances,

Upon the clergy imposed the sinful duty Of celibacy." Such is the estimate of the institution of celibacy—"a sinful duty"—expressed by Ferdinand Lassalle in his drama, "Franz von Sickingen."

tramontanism might reject on the ground of his being a Socialist—another giant mind, in a way a greater, whom Ultramontanism cannot so lightly affect to brush aside, summed up the institution of celibacy from another, the moral viewpoint. The summary was made by Francois Rabelais, himself a Franciscan and then a Benedictine monk, and all the time the friend and protégé of no less a Catholic dignitary than Cardinal Du Bellay.

Finally, long after Lassalle, from what country and what parishioners has the demand come of late in loudest notes for the abolition of celibacy? It came from among the Catholic laity and clergy of the Catholic Kingdom of Bavaria—Father Schmidt's own native land.

LA FOLLETTE TO BE ON THE MOVE.

The instant the Wisconsin Senator Robert Marion La Follette cast his vote in the Senate for the Wilson tariff bill and, while thus helping the bill to pass, emphasized the act by throwing some hand-grenades into the camp of the "Progressive Republicans" with whom he was supposed to be affiliated, the opinions went abroad that he had "removed himself from the Republican party," and that he was about to "jump into the Democratic party."

That La Follette is on the move is quite certain. Is it equally certain that he knows just where to go? On the stump in the recent campaign in the Third Congress district of Maine Bryan said: "The Progressive is a man who is ashamed to be a Republican, and hasn't the courage to be a Democrat."

On the stump in the recent campaign in the Third Congress district of Maine Bryan said: "The Progressive is a man who is ashamed to be a Republican, and hasn't the courage to be a Democrat."

That the Democratic party does not consist of Woodrow Wilsons the debate on the income tax clause of the tariff bill disclosed. While Wilson and those who share his socio-economic principles wield the income tax mainly as a lever of fortunes, John Sharp Williams of Mississippi voiced the sentiments of those Democrats who approve the tax as a revenue-getter only, and object to it as a socio-economic weapon.

As to the Republican party, it likewise is rent by similar differences of principle. The fact has manifested itself in the Progressive revolt.

Here are four distinct factions of bourgeois interests. They are bound to re-align themselves. Will La Follette take his stand with any of the four before they have taken shape?

La Follette is on the move—and so is Wilson—nor is there any telling how far the logic of events will cause them to move on.

"INVEST IN SPANISH AMERICA."

The fourth and last of the to-capitalists desirable things, which the International Trading and Developing Co. announces in "Below the Rio Grande" American capital will find in Spanish America, is "Cheap Cost of Living."

Of course, by a cheap cost of living the capitalist is not in mind. Even if his own cost of living be cheap he will indulge in expenses that will render his cost of living high. It is a requirement of his existence as capitalist. Were he to live cheaply his "credit" would suffer; and how many capitalists are there who can afford to sniff at credit? Most of them are like a row of bricks standing on the unsteady equilibrium of credit. No; by "cheap cost of living" the advertiser in "Below the Rio Grande" has not the capitalists in mind; he has in mind the humanity from whom the wage slave is to be recruited.

American capitalists whom "Below the Rio Grande" and its advertisers are operating upon. This series may be fitly closed with the words that closed the previous three articles:

Trading and Developing Companies may, or may not, be posted upon these facts. The College training that their leading geniuses have received may render them easy dupes; or they may have shed their College training, and, having made their "experience" at the cost of their own bank accounts, transfer their field of operation to this country, where, setting up an office for the developing of Spanish America, they turn their activities towards inverting the process—improving their bank accounts and thereby allowing others to make their "experience."

ART IN THE SENATE.

Elsewhere in this issue will be found the speech of Senator Elihu Root in favor of "free art," and the answer of Senator Thomas puncturing the Root bourgeois duplicity.

The two speeches together are a treat. In line with the Top Capitalist gold-brick argument that the "Nation's wealth" is the wealth of the Nation's peoples;

In line with the Judas-kiss argument of the Protectionist Top Capitalist—who himself sets the pace in importing wholesale the "pauper Labor of Europe"—that "Protection" is intended to protect American "high-paid Labor";

In line with the three-card-monte arguments of the Free Trade Top Capitalist—who swiftly seeks to reduce wages when duties are reduced—that Free Trade, or Low Tariff, is meant to improve Labor's breakfast table;

In short—in line with the double-faced, double-tongued and double-minded snarl of the Class whose political spaniel he is in the Senate, Elihu Root, seconded, typically enough, by Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, urged that the Nabobs who selfishly monopolize all the works of art that their coin can purchase, be exempt from a tax upon their ostentatious vanity,—urged the exemption upon the plea of making the poor happy.

The fact of art that has seized upon our plutocracy has had an injurious effect upon the artistic inclinations of the poor. The high prices that works of Art now fetch remove them further than ever from the reach of the masses. Worse yet, as Senator Thomas indicated, the fact has wrought evil to Art itself, in that the fact has promoted the building up of a business of manufacturing imitations and spurious creations with intent to deceive. Whatever the vulgar bourgeois touches he visitates.

Fortunately, at this season, sentiments are being uttered in the Senate that tend to purify the atmosphere, and to protect Art from desecration.

"EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW."

We shall not raise the curtain over the spectacle presented by Harry K. Thaw before the verdict of "not guilty, on account of insanity" was rendered by the jury before whom he was tried for killing the architect White. That would make the story superfluously long. We shall draw the curtain down upon all that preceded the verdict, and raise it only upon the spectacle that assaults the eye since he ran away from Matteawan.

He lands in Coaticook, Canada, where immediately a battery of high-paid lawyers act like a wall around him, and keep the New York authorities from taking the homicidal maniac back to where he belongs. From the battery, writs, injunctions, and motions to delay action are bombarded upon the Law. The battle shifts to the Shelbrooke. More writs; more injunctions; more motions. The tussle lasts over three weeks, when it should have ended in three hours. Finally, the acting-Secretary of State of Canada disgusted at seeing the "monkey" Law was being made of in "His Majesty's" Dominions, causes Thaw to be seized as an "undesirable immigrant," and, instead of handing him over to the New York authorities, gives the lunatic millionaire a further chance, by dumping him into the State of New Hampshire.

The scene changes: the show is the same. A new batch of high-paid lawyers: a new battery with identical ammunition. Writs, motions, injunctions, hearings, from and before Federal Courts, State Courts, and the State Executive, fall and follow thick as hailstones and interminably on the already battered head of the "Law," before whom, or which, there is supposed to be "equality."

Of all theories none compares with the theory of "Equality before the Law." It is a theory born at once of bourgeois prejudice and bourgeois visionariness.

When the bourgeois set up the theory, he, of course, ignored the existence of the proletariat; he contemplated the bourgeois only. To him the proletariat was either a thing that did not exist, or he looked upon the proletariat in the way the founders of this Republic looked at the Negro slave,—a mere chattel that "did not count." That notion was the child of class prejudice.

Among the bourgeois—so did the bourgeois reason—there was "equality before the Law," hence, they argued, "equality before the Law" would continue as a fundamental fact. The latter notion was born of bourgeois visionariness, a visionariness which, in turn, arose from bourgeois ignorance of economic laws. Economic equality is impossible even among the bourgeois; however equal they may start on the race, inequality speedily sets in.

Some bourgeois, the majority, are distanced by a minority. The superior economic power of the minority is speedily manifested before the "Law," and actual "inequality before the Law" becomes an ugly fact that no pundit can explain away, or smoothen over—as now exhibited in the instance of the millionaire insane criminal, who, were he a proletarian, would, in the first instance, have been executed; and who, were he a petty bourgeois, would have been bundled in short order back to Matteawan, none being found so poor as to do him the reverence of becoming his lawyer; but who, being a millionaire, can command lawyers by the bushel to stretch, cosset, and, who knows! even trick the law.

Economic inequality may be measured by the lengths of inequality before the Law.

REPORT OF DELEGATE

COLORADO STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR.

Denver, Colo., August 30, 1913. To the Officers and Members of Denver Typographical Union No. 49.

Ladies and Gentlemen: As your delegate to the State Federation of Labor, I desire to submit the following as a comprehensive review of the actions of that body:

There were present 152 delegates, representing 218 votes. The two miners' organizations controlled 85 votes.

Early in the session it became apparent that there were two mutually antagonistic elements struggling for supremacy in the Federation—one representing the policy of industrial unionism and therefore progressive; the other, composed of the stand-patters, or A. F. of L. craft unionists.

The progressive element was composed principally of miners, who had the active support of the brewers, as well as that of many intelligent and right-thinking delegates of the so-called miscellaneous crafts, on all progressive legislation.

The backbone of the reactionary element was made up of job-holders under the Secretary of State—employment bureau superintendents and employes, factory inspectors, etc.—and those whose profoundest wish is to solve the labor problem for themselves by some day leaving the ranks of actual workers to become oilers of the capitalist political machine.

The first conflict between these opposing elements was precipitated by a resolution pledging the moral and financial support of organized labor of the State of Colorado to the miners in the southern coal fields, in case matters there came to an issue.

The political job-holding element, while professing the greatest interest in the welfare of the miners, sought to earn their thirty pieces of silver, and the plaudits of the capitalist interests involved, by sidetracking their worthy resolution by parliamentary maneuvers common to men of their mental caliber. But the growing social consciousness of the workers could not be run into the ground, with the result that the job-holders were fattened out.

The second conflict and one which threatened to split the Federation, came on the report of the Committee on Resolutions.

Robert Ulrich, a member of the United Mine Workers, chairman of the committee, sought to revise the constitution and by-laws, with a view of bringing them into better accord with modern progressive unionism, to the end that all who are capitalist political job-holders first, and union men only because that is a necessary condition precedent for a "labor leader" to secure a political job, be debarred from holding seats in the convention.

WHAT IS "CAPITAL"?

A correspondent writes: "I encounter much confusion on what 'capital' means. Prof. Seligman in his book on economics says: 'Capital would then be defined as that part of wealth which is the result of production devoted to further production.' That looks pretty clear to me. Is the definition good?"

The definition is bad. It is bad because it is defective. It is defective in that, capital being a social phenomenon, its social "setting" is a necessary part of its definition, and the social "setting" is omitted from the definition.

The blacking, blacking-box and brushes of the shoeblack are "a part of wealth which is the result of production devoted to further production." So is the axe of the frontier settler who clears his own allotment; so is the needle, and the sewing machine to boot, of the housewife who makes her own dress, and mends the clothes of her family. All of these are "a part of wealth which is the result of production devoted to further production." If, in order to qualify as "capital," a thing need no more than prove that it is a "part of wealth," that the wealth which it is a part of was "the result of production," and, thirdly, that itself is "devoted to further production," then the boot-black's brushes, blacking and box, the housewife's needle, the pioneer settler's axe, are all "capital"—and by the same token "capital" would have existed from the day when the first savage, moving from the Middle, entered upon the Upper Status of Savagery by using the bow and arrow—a part of wealth which was the result of production and was devoted to further production. Of course the bow and arrow was not capital, and, by the same token neither is the blacking, brushes and box, nor the needle and sewing machine, nor the axe in the above illustrations, capital.

What is that token? The circumstance that they were and are used by their owner, him or herself; hence, that the "further production" to which they serve and are devoted is directly the property of their owner.

The social "setting" of capital is the existence of a layer of population that neither has, nor enjoys the opportunity to acquire, any part of "wealth which is the result of production and which can be devoted to further production." When society has developed to the point that that layer of population appears upon the social stage, then "that part of wealth which is the result of production and is devoted to further production" ceases to be operated by that other layer of the population which is in possession of it; "that part of wealth," etc., is then allowed by the social layer in possession of it to be operated by the social layer that is not in possession of it; with the final result that the social layer which is not in possession of "that part of wealth," etc., is compelled, in consideration of the opportunity to earn its own living, to allow itself to be exploited by earning also the living of the social layer which is in possession of "that part of wealth," etc. In the measure that the social setting of capital becomes more pronounced, capital itself develops, and the two—social setting and capital—acting and re-acting upon each other, the social stage is reached which becomes typical of capital, the stage when society is divided between the Capitalist Class and the Working Class.

Accordingly, the definition of "capital" is: "That part of wealth which, first, is the result of production; secondly, is devoted to further production; and thirdly, enables its holder to use it, and is used by him, in ways and manners that exploit the producers."

Truth is that which fits all the facts. Prof. Seligman's definition of "capital" does not fit all the facts.

issue, in connection with establishing a thoroughly democratic method of electing Federation officers, led the Pueblo delegation, headed by a superintendent of a state employment bureau, to threaten to withdraw the request of Pueblo for the next convention and to split the Federation. Here the miners weakened and compromised, and a harmony that in the nature of things cannot last long was restored.

That a social consciousness is gradually being awakened among the workers is evidenced by the unanimous concurrence in the following resolution:

Resolved, by the State Federation of Labor, in Eighteenth Annual Convention assembled, That this federation, being

(Continued on page six).



UNCLE SAM AND BROTHER JONATHAN.

BROTHER JONATHAN—Did you see the leading editorial in the New York "Times" of the 2nd of this month?

UNCLE SAM—What was it about?

B. J.—It was, generally, on the subject of the debates in Congress, the Senate especially, on the income tax.

U. S.—No; I didn't read the stuff. Anything special about it?

B. J.—A good deal—and instructive, too. It showed how some Senators proposed an 8 per cent. tax on incomes; how others bid higher, and wanted 10 per cent.; and how others bid higher still and wanted 20 per cent.—

U. S.—I don't need the "Times" to tell me that. I gather my information from the "Congressional Record" itself.

B. J.—And is what the "Times" says true?

U. S.—Yes; substantially.

B. J.—Well, if the facts are true, then you will have to agree with its conclusion.

U. S.—As to what?

B. J.—It concludes that such a heavy tax is harmful to the working class.

U. S.—Oho!!

B. J.—Yes, Siree. And the "Times" proves it. It says that the demand for labor depends primarily and chiefly on the supply of capital; that capital is derived from earnings; therefore, that if earnings are reduced, the growth of capital is reduced, and if the growth of capital is reduced the demand for labor is checked. That is cogent reasoning. Seeing you admit the facts regarding the attempts in the Senate to tax the incomes of capitalists heavily, you must admit the conclusion that such a tax will diminish the volume of capital, and hence injure the workers, because there will be less capital to employ them with. To me that's perfectly clear. It must be clear to every man of brains.

U. S.—Of whom you are one?

B. J.—Surely!

U. S.—Well, you are not, or you would not have been caught with the claptrap of the "Times."

B. J.—Claptrap!

U. S.—Jonathan, I happen to be at leisure, and also in the mood to straighten out the links in that wilderness of thoughts that you call your brains.

B. J.—I want you to understand—

U. S.—And I want you to keep still—to listen—and to answer. I shall give you a lesson in a little elementary reasoning, and a little elementary economics.

First as to reasoning:—

You say that because I admit the facts regarding the Senate to be true as cited by the "Times," therefore I must admit the correctness of the "Times" conclusions—

B. J.—And I say so again.

U. S.—Now, suppose I were to say that you have a pair of arms, a pair of legs, ten toes, at one extremity, ten fingers at the other, a pair of kidneys somewhere in your "innards," and a hat on top of your head—would not all my allegations of fact be true?

B. J.—Every one.

U. S.—And would you, because of such an admission on your part, be compelled to accept my conclusion that, therefore, your name is Obadiah Zedekiah Stickinthemud?

B. J.—My name is not Obadiah Zedekiah Stickinthemud!

U. S.—Consequently, it does not follow that, even if a man gives all the facts correctly, therefore his conclusion must be correct also. Catch on?

B. J.—Yes—

U. S.—That is kink No. 1 on reasoning. Now to the next.

Suppose I were to say that you have a pair of legs, a pair of eyes and a head, would not that be true, so far as it goes?

lesson on elementary economics. Did you ever hear of the "Wages Fund Theory"?

B. J.—I read in The People a short while ago an article proving that the theory was a swindle.

U. S.—Do you remember why a swindle?

B. J.—Because it was a theory according to which the capitalist claimed that, anxious tho' he was to pay higher wages he could not, on the ground that the wages he paid came out of the "Wages Fund," and the size of that fund did not allow any higher wages.

U. S.—Good! You got that straight. And why was the theory a swindle?

B. J.—Because it is the capitalist himself who keeps that fund low.

U. S.—Good, again! Now, don't you see the point? The theory of the "Times" is that very Wages Fund swindle. The "Times" argues as though there were a Wages Fund, and that the tax would lower the Fund.

B. J.—Then you think the tax will do good to the workers?

U. S.—There is no tax that works harm to the workers, because taxation, as a principle, does not come out of the pockets of the workers; and there is no tax that does good to the workers because the amount collected is not passed over to the workers. The whole taxation question is a question of the share of Labor's hide that the respective capitalists may retain.

ART IN THE SENATE

[The Senate having on the 6th of this month before it the clause of the Tariff Bill that lays a duty upon works of art, Elihu Root of New York led in the debate to remove the duty, and Charles S. Thomas of Colorado to preserve it. The essential portions of the two speeches are reproduced below. They depict the shameless effrontery of the Top Capitalist, represented by Root, and the word of civic decency that some of the Democratic Senators, in this instance Thomas, are just now the utterers of. Root was defeated.]

ROOT'S SPEECH.

We never get a picture or a statue on an engraving or any other object of art from anyone who has possessed it in Europe. So long as these articles remain on the other side of the Atlantic they never come to us. Once brought into our own country they soon find their way to the general public use.

The man who has made the collection, as a rule—not as an exception, but as a rule—when he comes to the close of his career finds that practically the only thing he can do with it to gratify his interest in the objects he has collected, to insure that the collection for which he has the affection of a collector, shall be useful, shall be preserved, and perhaps his name continued with it, is to give it to the museum of his own city.

It is in that way, sir, through the gifts of the paintings and the sculptures and the works of art generally which have been brought here by individual Americans, that the museums all along, from one ocean to the other, in all our considerable towns, have been built up and are being built up year by year.

It is not alone in the great cities that these museums are found. The museums in the cities of the second order of size—cities like Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, and Cincinnati—are worthy of the highest commendation and admiration; and they have grown up from the possession by Americans on this side of the Atlantic of the articles which make a museum.

While if you are going to look at the transaction with a microscope, the argument of my friend from Colorado [Mr. Thomas] would be applicable, that when a particular man who has the means to buy some paintings brings them in he should pay a tax upon them, because they are for his benefit; still when you come to the large view of public policy the imposition of such a tax is a hindrance to the development of the art of America, and it is checking the stream that has been flowing into America for the benefit of all our people.

Mr. President, I should like to state definitely exactly what the situation is as to this legislation, comparing the present law, which was enacted four years ago, the Payne-Aldrich law, with the bill as it came from the House and the bill as it is reported by the committee of the Senate.

Under the Payne-Aldrich law paintings, sculptures, engravings, etchings, and similar articles which are more than 20 years old are admitted free. Other works of art more than 100 years old are admitted free. Under the pending bill as it came from the House paintings, sculptures, engravings, etchings, and so forth, are admitted free whether 20 years old or not—that is, the age limit is taken off—and other works of art are admitted free when more than 100 years old. That is to say, the House bill enlarged the provisions of the present law regarding paintings, sculptures, and so forth, and made them more liberal, and kept the provision as to other

(Continued on page five)



# CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondents who prefer to appear in print under an assumed name will attach such name to their communication besides their own signature and address. No others will be recognized.

## A CARD FROM HARRISON.

To the Daily and Weekly People:—My address is changed from 517 Main street, East Pittsburgh, Pa., to 814 Penn avenue, Wilkensburg, Pa. Caleb Harrison. Wilkensburg, Pa., Sept. 13.

## A HARTFORD SOCIALIST DEAD

To the Daily and Weekly People:—An old Socialist, Samuel Joseph, cigar-maker, after a lingering sickness died and was buried today. In his younger days Joseph was an active member in the Labor Movement and a member of the Socialist Labor Party, although in late years he did not participate any more in any active work. Frederick Fellermann. Hartford, Conn., September 15.

## SUBS. ALL THE TIME.

To the Daily and Weekly People:—Business is worse here now than it was during the so-called panic of 1907. Rents have decreased, and many pieces of property can be had for the mortgage. Still, taxes have not decreased; in fact, a threat by the politicians to increase them by levying taxes on the full value of the property, is being made. With all this, though, I am able to pick off a subscription or two now and then. Still the Socialist party men here—especially the small property-holding middle-class—maintain that the WORKING CLASS pays the taxes. L. D. H. Denver, Colo., Sept. 14.

## TAKES "INT'L SOCIALIST REVIEW" TO TASK.

To the Daily and Weekly People:—The enclosed, copy of a letter sent to the "International Socialist Review," speaks for itself. I. W. W. Portland, Ore., Sept. 9.

(Inclosure.)

LOCAL 600, I. W. W., 66 SIXTH ST., PORTLAND, ORE. Portland, Ore., Sept. 3, 1913.

International Socialist Review, Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sirs:

Local 600, I. W. W., (Detroit) at its last regular business meeting, September 2, 1913, instructed its secretary to inquire of the "International Socialist Review" why it cut out all mention of the Detroit I. W. W. in the article which was sent to it by the Strike Committee of the Oregon Packing Company strikers of Portland, Ore., and why it did not publish with the picture of the Strike Committee the names of that committee and the organizations to which they belonged. The photograph which was sent to the "International Socialist Review" was numbered, and the names and organizations of the committee were sent along. Also the signers of the article had their organization's name written behind theirs. Yet the "International Socialist Review" cut that out, too.

Further, the secretary of Local 600, I. W. W., (Detroit), was instructed to demand in behalf of the Local a rectification of this error or whatever it was in your next issue.

Fraternally,  
Secretary,  
Local 600, I. W. W.,  
Geo. P. Reuter.

## PORTLAND S. L. P. ACTIVITIES.

To the Daily and Weekly People:—On Saturday, August 30, at the Sheriff Word Recall meeting at Arion by the actives of Section Portland. On Sunday, August 31, Section Portland held its annual picnic at Rohses Park; \$125 was realized. On Monday, "Labor Day," the Socialist Labor Party actives sold 100 Reinstein pamphlets to the paraders. In the afternoon, Comrades Mary and Rudolph Schwab went to the electrical workers' picnic where they had been invited to speak. The picnic was held at Estacada Park, outside Multnomah County in which Portland is situated. Yet Sheriff Tommy Word sent two of his deputies out there. These tried to prevent the comrades from speaking by threatening the electrical workers with all sorts of dire misfortunes if they allowed it. But the electrical workers were not bluffed, and Mary Schwab delivered a real labor day address. Reinstein pam-

phlets were sold. On Friday a short meeting was held at Sixth and Oak streets, just before the business meeting of the Section; 83 pamphlets were sold. On Saturday 100 Peoples were sold at the Recall meeting. On Sunday afternoon a meeting was held on the Plaza. Henry Schoen, Rudolph Schwab and Mary Rantz Schwab spoke; 169 Reinstein pamphlets were sold. On Sunday night a joint meeting was held with Branch 1 of the Socialist party in its hall. The crowd was very small; \$5 worth of S. L. P. literature was sold. Mary Rantz Schwab was the principal speaker. She dealt with the three positions held by the revolutionary labor movement in America today: pure and simple ballot action, direct action, and the position of the Socialist Labor Party,—economic and political action. The Socialist Labor Party here is in fine shape. In the last three weeks the average literature sale per day has been \$5. The Section is building up fast.

Rudolph Schwab,  
Org., Section Portland.  
Portland, Ore., September 8.

## CAMPAIGN OPENED IN NEWARK.

To the Daily and Weekly People:—Section Essex County, Newark, N. J., fired the opening gun of the campaign Saturday night, September 13, when Comrade Butterworth of Paterson, S. L. P. candidate for Governor spoke on various phases of the labor question to a very large crowd. In his convincing manner Comrade Butterworth explained the need of organizing politically under the banner of the Socialist Labor Party, and economically in a class conscious industrial union, and from the questions asked after his talk it would appear that his remarks were well directed. The chief concern of his hearers seemed to be how the value of the labor of each working man would be determined under the Industrial Republic. This was very ably answered by the speaker. A good many copies of the July 5th issue of the Weekly People were distributed, and ten pamphlets and one sub. card cold. H. M. Newark, N. J., September 16.

## S. P. "ACTIVITIES."

To the Daily and Weekly People:—The activities of the Socialist party have again assumed some life owing to the approaching election. On Thursday evening in Troy, at the corner of Fulton and River streets, Mr. William E. Duffy of Syracuse addressed a meeting, and at the close of his talk it was stated that the meeting was opened to questions. An S. L. P. member who happened to be in the audience asked why it was that the Socialist Labor Party and the Socialist party did not get together. The reply was that the Socialist Labor Party did not amount to anything; that it was like a lot of little puppies that were barking at a great big St. Bernard; of course, the latter being the Socialist party. The speaker then mentioned the large and growing voting power of the several countries. His questioner was not satisfied with this and followed with another question when Duffy became aware that it was an S. L. P. man that was after him, and he retorted, "If you don't stop I will call a policeman and have you removed." At this the S. L. P. man subsided.

It was somewhat different at Albany. On Friday evening, Duffy spoke in Schenectady and while there he was advised of the happenings of the meeting of the Socialist Labor Party on Sept. 7 at Seneca Park, when the administration and the Socialist party generally was handled without gloves. The "chasing of votes" was made very plain to the audience as the mission of the Socialist party, along with "fat offices for us." Also, the hypocritical attitude of the membership in its stand on the position of economic organization was clearly shown. But, finally, the actions of Mayor Lunn and ex-Assemblyman Merrill in their part played in the Sulzer protest meeting were exposed and the membership of the S. P. was called upon to prefer charges of perjury, dishonor and treason against them and expel them from the party. This latter of course was something harsh and severe against them and was sufficient to cause the Gazette to give it prominence on the front page the following morning.

Now, Duffy being apprised of this, and also knowing that there is to be another Sulzer protest meeting, which is to be held in this city on Wednesday evening next, at which time, it is advertised, Mayor Lunn and the candidate for mayor in the coming election in this city, Mr. James C. Sheehan, will be speakers, caused it to have it announced through the press that he would talk on the Sulzer impeachment at the meeting on Saturday evening. I decided to be present. The speech, with slight exception, was the usual one of development of society and industry. His review of the unrest and discontent caused him to say, "Thank God for that discontent." A little later he said "This discontent is divine." The thought occurred to me that if God was to be thanked for the discontent and that it was divine, then the system and evils which he mentioned must have emanated from God.

In a burst of enthusiasm he got off with this, "If the workers could be brought to realize that their condition was due to the fact that the tool-owners were not tool users, and that the workers were not tool-owners," we could be rid of the system in six months. He spoke of the Socialist party fighting the system "sanely," and that they must "question this right on the economic and political field." Nothing more about the economic field, but into political activities of the working class. He then stated that every political party was representative of a certain class thus leaving the Socialist position of two classes only, and that it remained for the workers to have a party of their own. This party he cited was the Socialist party, which was the same as other parties, meaning that they represented a particular class. Then followed the financing of the party and the necessity of the working class controlling their own party. Then the collection. Announcement was then made by the chairman of the meeting that on the succeeding Saturday evenings meetings would be held and that the audience was invited to come around.

Then it was stated that the meeting was opened to questions. I said, "Mr. Chairman—" but got no further, as Duffy, having descended from the platform, had been tipped off that Phoenix was present and would cause some trouble. At the sound of my voice he immediately mounted the stand and started in to abuse me, by misstating my relations to the movement and ending by saying that I was a "renegade" from the party. Exception was taken to this, and what with hoots and hisses by the deluded followers, it seemed as though we were to have a very stormy time. My insisting on being heard, and this in a clean parliamentary way, aroused more ire and abuse, and brought the refusal to allow me to ask any question. Then followed Mr. Duffy in trying to explain my connection and severance from the Socialist party by stating that he was a member of the State Committee which met in Binghamton in July, 1912, when a letter from me asking for a hearing on my affairs with the party was requested, and "that it was voted to lay same on the table, where it still remained." There was quiet for a few minutes, but as I would not cease demanding that I be given the same amount of time on the box to reply to Duffy's statements—and my request meeting with favor in the audience—the "bunch" folded its tent and blew away, the chairman announcing that the meeting stood adjourned.

An after meeting lasting a few minutes only was held, the audience remaining and hearing some plain truths about my severance and the conduct of the Socialist party in general, which truths were not very beneficial to the local movement. It is to be said to the credit of Duffy that he ridiculed the position of the Socialist party in taking any sides in the Sulzer affair and stated that we were not concerned with either side, but that we were concerned in "stopping the loot" from the working class. He learned something from the S. L. P. F. C. Phoenix. Albany, N. Y., Sept. 14, 1913.

**KEEP IN TRIM!**  
WITH  
**VEDA-CASCARA**  
THE BEST REMEDY FOR  
Habitual Constipation  
AND  
Torpidity of Liver  
100 PILLS 25¢  
H. L. BERGER  
CHEMIST & APOTHECARY  
257 AVE. C&E 36 ST. N.Y.C.

When you have finished with this paper pass it on to a friend.

## PROPOSED PERMANENT PARTY PLATFORM

[The National Convention of the Socialist Labor Party, session of April 10, 1912, adopted the following Resolution for a permanent platform of the Socialist Labor Party:

"That this National Convention instructs the N. E. C. to issue a call for a permanent Platform of the S. L. P. which shall stand from Campaign to Campaign, besides the special platform that may be adopted from Campaign to Campaign covering the issues of said campaigns. That the call specify that the State Committees select that platform which the members of their respective States may submit to them. That the platform so selected by each of the State Committees be published in the Party press for discussion and final action be taken at next Convention."

## DISCUSSION.

To the Daily and Weekly People:—I wish to answer the query and criticism of Comrade Reimer (Weekly People September 13 1913), to wit:

"Does not this paragraph presuppose the continuation of the present Congress of the United States, and does it not accredit the political State with a power which we of the Socialist Labor Party have constantly maintained lies in the integrally organized Industrial Union? In other words, are we to enforce the fiat of the ballot with the ballot?"

That the foregoing query and criticism may be answered clearly it becomes necessary to separate them.

1. Does not this paragraph presuppose the continuation of the present Congress of the United States?

Paragraph 2 of Article XVIII, to which Comrade Reimer refers, is the enacting clause of the proposed amendment. "The Congress of the United States shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article by appropriate legislation" means just what it says. If the "appropriate legislation" necessary to enforce the terms of the amendment necessitated the continuation of the present Congress, then the present Congress would continue. If, on the other hand, the "appropriate legislation" as Duffy, having descended from the platform, had been tipped off that Phoenix was present and would cause some trouble. At the sound of my voice he immediately mounted the stand and started in to abuse me, by misstating my relations to the movement and ending by saying that I was a "renegade" from the party. Exception was taken to this, and what with hoots and hisses by the deluded followers, it seemed as though we were to have a very stormy time. My insisting on being heard, and this in a clean parliamentary way, aroused more ire and abuse, and brought the refusal to allow me to ask any question. Then followed Mr. Duffy in trying to explain my connection and severance from the Socialist party by stating that he was a member of the State Committee which met in Binghamton in July, 1912, when a letter from me asking for a hearing on my affairs with the party was requested, and "that it was voted to lay same on the table, where it still remained." There was quiet for a few minutes, but as I would not cease demanding that I be given the same amount of time on the box to reply to Duffy's statements—and my request meeting with favor in the audience—the "bunch" folded its tent and blew away, the chairman announcing that the meeting stood adjourned.

An after meeting lasting a few minutes only was held, the audience remaining and hearing some plain truths about my severance and the conduct of the Socialist party in general, which truths were not very beneficial to the local movement. It is to be said to the credit of Duffy that he ridiculed the position of the Socialist party in taking any sides in the Sulzer affair and stated that we were not concerned with either side, but that we were concerned in "stopping the loot" from the working class. He learned something from the S. L. P. F. C. Phoenix. Albany, N. Y., Sept. 14, 1913.

By no stretch of the imagination can the paragraph be said to accredit power to the Capitalist Political State to enforce the terms of a demand made by the workers. From the fact that a majority of that Congress would be composed of workers (presumably members of the I. W. W.) it would be fair to infer that while elected according to the rules of Capitalist politics, they would, when assembled, still be workers, still be members of the I. W. W., and, being such members, they would not undertake to do ought with the Capitalist Congress but provide a decent burial place for it.

As to enforcing the fiat of the ballot with the ballot. Yes. The manufacture of a commodity does not complete the cycle of production. An article manufactured and reposing in a warehouse is not produced. The cycle is not completed with the election of men pledged to the enactment of the amendment. That they may complete the job they must enact the amendment—and in so doing they must use the ballot—they must cast their votes after they shall have assembled as a Congress. Yes, the fiat of the ballot will be enforced with the

## ART IN THE SENATE.

(Continued from page four)

works of art. The bill as reported by the committee goes back, and instead of liberalizing the Payne-Aldrich provision as to paintings, sculptures, and so forth, it fixes the limit at 50 years instead of 20 years, and entirely repeals the provision regarding other works of art. So the House has liberalized the Payne-Aldrich bill, and the Senate committee has narrowed it and made it less liberal.

This is not a question of logical reasoning about what ought to be and what ought not to be. It is a question of the working of human nature. The House provision is going to contribute to the building up of our museums and put at the service of all our people, fully and freely, the inestimable privilege of seeing the works of art of all times and all lands. The provision reported by the committee is going to put a serious obstacle in the way of building up our museums and in the way of securing those benefits for our people.

Mr. President, I suppose we ought to think of something besides the merely material things which are necessary for life. I think we all recognize that. In all the wonderfully liberal provisions of our legislation in regard to education we realize it. It is certainly true that the happiness of a people does not depend merely upon having sufficient food and clothing and shelter. After all that, what is there to make a people happy? What can there be beyond the material things and beyond the consolations of religion to make life more happy for the millions of people of slender means in our country than opportunity and encouragement for the cultivation of taste, than to enable them to bring up their children with capacity for receiving pleasure from the countless works of genius which it is possible for us to set before them?

Mr. President, I think no one can observe the poor people of some of the European countries—France, for instance, is a notable example—without realizing that the poor people are happy largely because they love everything beautiful, because in all about them in nature and in art they find the means to gratify their taste for beauty. The greatest happiness in life comes from things not material. It does not come from eating and drinking and wearing fine clothes; it comes from the elevation of character, from the love of beauty gratified, from the many influences that ennoble mankind.

I think we have no higher duty, sir than by our legislation to promote the opening to Americans of every opportunity to secure these means of happiness. I feel certain that the narrowing of these provisions by the Senate committee will be an injury to the people of the United States and that the liberal policy of the House will be a great and lasting benefit to them.

## THOMAS' SPEECH.

I am more than ever convinced, after listening to the Senator from New York, that our only difference upon this subject is one of viewpoint. The Senator believes that works of art, all contributions of genius to the common stock of beauty and of artistic creation, should be permitted to come to our shores and be welcome, whether they, after arrival, are to form parts of a private collection or of a public one, because he believes that in the end the private collection will become a public one, since it is assumed that sooner or later all of these articles do find their place in public galleries.

Now, I am neither disputing nor asserting, because, in the first place, it does not, I think, concern the argument, because if it be true that these works and collections do ultimately become public property, then it makes little difference whether a duty is imposed upon their importation when designed for private collections or not. If, on the other hand, it is not true, then there is the greater argument, in my judgment, in favor of the imposition of the duty.

I quite agree, indeed the expression is so beautiful and so natural that it finds response in every human heart, that "a thing of beauty is a joy forever." But because it is a thing of joy forever, because it possesses an attribute which gives a sort of public proprietary interest in it, because every man and woman and child in existence should be privileged and permitted to see it, to drink in its beauty and to receive all the idealism and inspiration that can

be obtained from it, because of that fact, I say, these works of genius should not be immured in the palaces and homes of the rich. I consider it a crime against the aesthetic taste of mankind, an offense against that love of beauty which has caused successive generations to preserve these wondrous creations and to hand them from the one to the other.

I believe therefore that every nation should frown upon the obtaining and holding of these treasures as private property for the enjoyment of the few or to satisfy the ostentatious vanity of those who may be able to afford them and make the practice as expensive as possible.

It was my privilege, not many years ago, to visit a private gallery of paintings. Occasionally I have been allowed a glimpse beyond the portals of the wealthy and powerful. I saw as attractive and beautiful and wondrous a collection of paintings as there is perhaps upon this continent outside the city of New York. As I enjoyed this splendid opportunity, which as a whole and in detail forms one of the happy experiences of my life, I felt that these beautiful, valuable, glorious paintings should be long to mankind and should not be in any private collection, accessible only to those to whom the proprietor in his generosity or magnanimity might extend the privilege. When he confidently informed me of the enormous price which three or four of the gems in this collection had cost him, it instantly occurred to me that the amount which he had been required to pay, and which he willingly paid, rather than any desire to gratify himself or his country after his death, constituted the chief motive which inspired the purchase and the collection.

Now, I believe it is wise to place a duty upon the importations of these invaluable treasures when they are acquired for private purposes and for such purposes alone, and this, Mr. President, whether ultimately or not these collections find repose in public galleries for the benefit of the high and the low and the rich and the poor.

I know, as was said by the distinguished Senator, that the poor are made happy because of the pleasure that they derive by coming into contact and association with the beautiful, and it is because I know it that I would require them all to be accessible to the multitude.

No one, I believe, appreciates a beautiful picture, a fine piece of statuary, more than the average man, woman, and child. The besotted and the ignorant, like the wise and the good, are lifted, temporarily at least, from the dull level of their menot-

## LETTER BOX

OFF-HAND ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

NO QUESTIONS WILL BE CONSIDERED THAT COME IN ANONYMOUS LETTERS. ALL LETTERS MUST CARRY A BONA FIDE SIGNATURE AND ADDRESS.

L. D. H., DENVER, COLO.—When our Labor Leaders demand a "practical, workable" plan of organization, what they have in mind is an organization that will square with their ideas of Unionism. Their idea of the Union is a body organized to secure the highest wages and best conditions for the members of the body, at the expense of all other workers whether of the same, or of other crafts. Consequently, their idea of the Union is in defiance of economic laws and of the Class Struggle. Consequently, the Union of our Labor Leaders is the most impracticable and unworkable imaginable. In the course of economic and social evolution such Unions become "practicable and workable" only to some Inner Circle.

E. T. C., MANCHESTER, ENG.—The passage in J. Ramsay Macdonald's answer to Belloc: "that state of society under which the industrial idea of co-operation and the political idea of representative government can be blended and used for both political and industrial purpose" is a mass of confused ideas. Especially "in the air" is the notion that makes representative government a political idea. Representative government existed long before the political State arose in man's history. There was representative government at the tribal stage when the mother right still obtained—a stage far removed from the political.

G. O., DETROIT, MICH.—The value of both silver and gold is a shifting magnitude. Gold being actually our standard, debts contracted under it are payable in the amount contracted for, regardless whether the value of gold has gone down or up. It is otherwise with our silver coin. There is at least a tacit guarantee—we think even a statutory guarantee—that in case of the decline of silver, the coin acts as "token money."

M. D. C., PHOENIX, ARIZ.—A war with Mexico would raise so many possibilities that it would be risky to tell exactly what the issue would be. Theoretically, Mexico would be defeated and

would forfeit her frontier States.

P. M., NEW YORK.—The Socialist Movement of America will have its tactical moves determined by the sociological topography of the land. A Movement that here is molded by the sociological topography of any other country is in the air.

C. P., PIQUA, O.—Matter was published in the Daily of September 13.

A. S., NEW YORK.—The Painters' affairs have been lengthily treated in these columns.

"READER," NEW YORK.—At Copenhagen Berger cut no figure whatever. On the International Bureau he was not allowed to speak, his claim to membership in that body being denied.

A. C., KANSAS CITY, MO.—The proverb is "The best throw of the dice is to throw them away." Upon that wise principle the best way to speculate is not to speculate at all. Small speculators are merely flies in the spider-web of stockbrokers. As to the concern referred to we know nothing about it.

C. H., PITTSBURGH, PA.—The Golf answer to Trautmann never reached the office.

R. H. R., ROCHESTER, PA.—Arrive too late for correction.

J. B., BAY CITY, MICH.—Before the Socialist Movement can get really under way in Europe, the remaining vestiges of feudalism must have been wiped out at least in the leading European nations.

"READER," ST. LOUIS, MO.—Father Poland's pamphlet "Socialism, Its Economic Aspect" was handled in these columns in 1905 when it came out. It isn't worth tearing up a second time. Let the dead bury their dead.

D. J., NEW YORK; C. L. P., DAVENPORT, IA.; T. C., DENVER, COLO.; K. E. C., HOUSTON, TEX.; J. J. W., NEW YORK, N. Y.—Matter received.

be obtained from it, because of that fact, I say, these works of genius should not be immured in the palaces and homes of the rich. I consider it a crime against the aesthetic taste of mankind, an offense against that love of beauty which has caused successive generations to preserve these wondrous creations and to hand them from the one to the other.

I believe therefore that every nation should frown upon the obtaining and holding of these treasures as private property for the enjoyment of the few or to satisfy the ostentatious vanity of those who may be able to afford them and make the practice as expensive as possible.

It was my privilege, not many years ago, to visit a private gallery of paintings. Occasionally I have been allowed a glimpse beyond the portals of the wealthy and powerful. I saw as attractive and beautiful and wondrous a collection of paintings as there is perhaps upon this continent outside the city of New York. As I enjoyed this splendid opportunity, which as a whole and in detail forms one of the happy experiences of my life, I felt that these beautiful, valuable, glorious paintings should be long to mankind and should not be in any private collection, accessible only to those to whom the proprietor in his generosity or magnanimity might extend the privilege. When he confidently informed me of the enormous price which three or four of the gems in this collection had cost him, it instantly occurred to me that the amount which he had been required to pay, and which he willingly paid, rather than any desire to gratify himself or his country after his death, constituted the chief motive which inspired the purchase and the collection.

Now, I believe it is wise to place a duty upon the importations of these invaluable treasures when they are acquired for private purposes and for such purposes alone, and this, Mr. President, whether ultimately or not these collections find repose in public galleries for the benefit of the high and the low and the rich and the poor.

I know, as was said by the distinguished Senator, that the poor are made happy because of the pleasure that they derive by coming into contact and association with the beautiful, and it is because I know it that I would require them all to be accessible to the multitude.

No one, I believe, appreciates a beautiful picture, a fine piece of statuary, more than the average man, woman, and child. The besotted and the ignorant, like the wise and the good, are lifted, temporarily at least, from the dull level of their menot-

nous and sordid lives by the ideals which they encounter in some of these priceless, wondrous collections.

Now, it is possible when a provision of the law requires that when these treasures are obtained merely to gratify a fad or the ostentatious fancy of a rich individual and segregated from the public and immured in their private residences, that for the privilege of doing so they should pay a duty thereon to the Government of the United States?

That is the theory of this bill upon this subject. If within five years after their acquisition they are given to the public, donated or sold to any gallery or other institution which allows the public for five days in a week, eight months in a year, access to them, the duties are refunded. An inducement is thus extended to the public spirit of the owners.

I think that a more judicious provision could not be made; and when it is further considered that these properties, when more than 50 years of age, are exempt from these duties entirely, and can be brought here absolutely free of duty, we have, in my judgment, framed a system as applicable to this sort of commodity, if that be a proper expression as applied to a work of art, that is as near just as it is possible to make it.

I referred the other day to the fact, Mr. President, that the widespread custom of investments in these expensive creations have resulted in the building up of a business of manufactured imitations, spurious creations, palmed off upon the unsuspecting or the careless or the ignorant as genuine, that has assumed very large proportions. Certainly the best love of art is the identical one who frowns upon and would discourage as a general proposition, independent of its fraudulent and miserable character, the development or the continuation of such a pursuit.



## The Billy Goat

G. H. Lockwood, Editor.  
The S. P. Monthly that stands for

## UNITY

and INDUSTRIAL as well as Political Action. S. L. P. comrades should read it. Trial sub. 25 cents for 6 months. "THE PRIEST AND THE BILLY GOAT," a 10 cent pamphlet with a yearly sub. at 50 cents. Send now.

The Lockwood Publishing Co., Dept. 60 Kalamazoo, Mich.