

idealism of Kant and Hegel have culminated in the autocracy of the Prussian State. The "freedom and equality" of 1789 quickly vanished in the corruption of the "contractors" and the rule of the Corsican; and from that to the politically entrenched bondholders of the new third estate. The Liberalism of the mid-Victorian period, with its national aspirations and reformist Parliament, has become—the dictatorship of the Foreign Office; and the "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness" era of Washington has yielded to the oligarchy of Wall Street. Surely there is a world of difference between the Parliament of "national freedom," "individual liberty"; and "personal initiative" of the days of Bright and Cobden, of Wilberforce and Shaftesbury, and the Coalition of Lloyd George. The Gladstone of "free trade" and "Home Rule" and "Manchesterianism" developed into the standard-bearer of Imperialism; and his political descendants now render homage to Cromer and Curzon, to Milner and Rhodes. Surely the Lincoln who dominated the Cabinet of the 60's expressed a social equity that has no existence at the political bargain counter of today. A difference not alone in aim and scope, but also in means and power.

It is natural in the terms of capital that representation in the period of its growth should embrace a wider body of interests that in its day of decline. It is just as natural that power and control should go with it, in steady procession, from social interest to political trust. And no matter whether President or

King, or Parliament or man that forms the medium, if there is privilege to save, privilege shall find a way of salvation. From the common point of view that Parliament represents social interest it is consequently true that Parliament has ceased to function. It is beside the point to say it never did so completely. The relevancy is in the social belief that it really does so, and the undoubted fact that it once represented a wider following. The apathy of the modern electorate would seem itself to indicate that. With the development of business from national industry to Imperialist finance, the function of Parliament, as the bulwark of property in national industry, has been considerably abrogated and transferred, medially through the Cabinet to the Foreign Office. For as the ruling class of today is the (foreign) syndicate and concession holder, its will and law, its life and being, is summarized in the Foreign Office. The Foreign Office is its hope and profit, in the Foreign Office it holds absolute power, and the Foreign Office is entirely beyond the reach of Parliament—as presently constituted.

Consequently, when Comrade McD. says that "although Parliament does not directly supervise the affairs of a nation, it in no way discounts its importance," he voices a sentiment more than a fact. Because the affairs of the nation have given way to the affairs of the foreign concessionaire. Because Imperialist finance, not national industry, is the centre of social gravity; and because the export of capital has necessitated an authority whose scope

has broadened from the concrete nationalism of the 19th century to the mandatory internationalism of the 20th. That is why the Cabinet—observed in general, and not in isolated cases—dominates Parliament. And that is why, if one holds a preponderant influence in the Cabinet, that one (visible or invisible) will be the Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Also, that is why Boards of Trade and Munitions; local councils and committees; Food Control and Railway Rating, and all the growing—but at the same time subordinate—paraphernalia of national affairs is committed and submitted to the care of the National Parliament. It has been created and equipped for local government. It is endowed with national powers of control, and to its care is entrusted the domestic regulation of industrial property. But it is subservient to the greater finance, and confused and entangled with the intriguing departments and committees of foreign investments. And in this specialized—yet interdependent—government, where the full data of affairs is centralized in the Foreign Office, the old time national parliament has no real control. For it does not know what is transpiring in the Machiavellian counterplay of the international chancelleries. It can act—like a marionette—only after the trap is sprung; and then only in acquiescence.

It is in the light of such considerations that I said—and still say—that Parliament is but a name; that it lives on the prestige of tradition; that it is stripped of real authority, and that its functions are but the sanctioning of Cabinet decrees.

The Melting Pot

By Katherine Smith

THE September number of "Scribner's Magazine" contains an article by Frederick C. Howe, former Commissioner of Immigration port of New York, entitled "Has the Westward Tide of People Come to an End?" Of course, with his very unusual chances for observation and compiling of statistics he shows a more profound knowledge of the causes underlying emigration than is often found among bourgeois writers who undertake to educate the people on such subjects. Though his statements are in no wise intended to confirm the Socialist position so much straight shooting could hardly fail to hit the bull's eye occasionally, and throughout a very interesting article there continually creeps out the strain of economic determinism.

After reviewing in a pregnant paragraph the movement of peoples dating from the emigration of whole nations from India and Persia and Central Asia to Europe, to the centuries after the over-running of the old Roman Empire by the various eastern tribes which obliterated old cultures, he has this to say:

"For six or seven centuries immigration came to an end. Population increased. The struggle for existence became more severe. The feudal system reduced the worker and the farmer to serfdom. Wherever the conditions of life were most difficult there the desire to escape was the most insistent. With the opening up of America the westward movement began again. It started from England, not because of a desire for religious liberty so much as because England possessed ships, while conditions of life in England, following the enclosure of the common lands, made it necessary for people to escape. The same was true of Scotland as it was of Ireland. For three centuries old Europe has been depopulating herself in response to the urge of greater economic opportunities in the new lands to the west."

The old Puritan legend could hardly be betted dispelled by a Peter Leekie or any other Socialist writer. Then after some statistics of the quotas of the various nations contributing of their peoples and their priorities he says:

"Just as economic conditions in Europe crowded the population out, so economic conditions in America shaped our attitude toward immigration and our laws on the subject as well. We think of immigration in terms of races. We assume that the problem is an ethnic one. Our thoughts and our discussions run along human, religious, moral lines.

The protest of the 'old immigration' against the 'new immigration' is based on the illiteracy of those who are coming now, on their lower standard of living, on their alien culture, by many on their alleged different standards of morality. More recently there has been a general assumption that the 'new immigration' was not adapted to parliamentary government and American political institutions. The discussions in the press, in the books, and in Congress have been along these lines."

Then follows a paragraph dealing with the feeling of race superiority with the tendency to engulf the Anglo-Saxon race by the greater fertility of those of the Latin and Slavic races, especially the latter, then:

"Despite the emphasis placed in the ethnic side of the question our immigration policies have been determined by economic rather than racial considerations. They have followed changes in the economic conditions in the older countries. For emigration out of Europe has been shaped by the poverty of Europe. The alien has come from countries when the struggle for existence has been most severe. The filling in of America has been controlled by the poverty of Europe rather than by any policy of our own. At the same time our attitude toward immigration has been moulded by economic considerations in this country. It was largely, almost exclusively, moulded by the free lands of the west. So long as there was land to be had for the asking there was no protest against immigration. Rather every influence urged the freest possible admissions. Up to seventy years ago, and even later, people generally felt that the great west would never be filled with people. It was hardly conceivable that the land would all be taken up. Land speculators preceded the settlers. They took up land. They laid out towns. They owned the press. They influenced men in Congress. Western States cried out for settlers. They cared not whence they came. That was true up to 1895. Then we began to appreciate that the land was fast filling in. As a matter of fact there was little free land as late as 1890.

"About this time our industries began to take on enlarged form. Mines, mills, and factories grew with great rapidity. Our industrial development in the twenty years before the war was both rapid and in the direction of massing of capital into big units. Railroads were being built, cities and towns were growing with great rapidity. There was need of workers of every kind, especially for artisans that we had not trained in this country, and for unskilled workers which were not to be had. So the employers and the contractors urged that the gates be left open. They organized agencies to stimulate immigration. They joined with the steamship companies and sent runners to central and southern Europe to speed up the movement. For twenty years our immigration policy was shaped by contractors, employers and steamship companies. It was supported by public opinion, in the main eager for industrial development. During these years central and southern Europe emptied itself of 15,000,000 people, of whom one third or one-fourth

returned to their native lands."

Though the whole article is well worth while, the columns of the "Clarion" will hardly permit it in its entirety. However, to those to whom thirty-five cents does not constitute a fortune, an investment in "Scribner's" of September would afford much food for thought, as there is also another article on "The Immigration Problem" in the same number, which rounds out and completes that of Mr. Howe.

Having given a fine statistical account of immigration to the United States, and, incidentally, a bit to Canada, he remarks:

"In all probability the age-long movement from the East toward the West has come to an end. America is no longer the hospitable mother of the restless, the discontented and the impoverished of other worlds."

This after dealing with the laws recently enacted to restrict immigration:

"This is a portentous fact. It is possibly the most portentous fact in our recent history."

Then he gives the reasons, always economic, of the trend eastward of the immigration of the future, including a neat little history of the effect of the development of machinery to the present and a prognosis of its effect in the future, always evading the possibility of a proletarian revolution in this country, but accentuating the probability of a great response in the call of the east, and ending with:

"If men can satisfy their wants easier in Europe than in America, if they can escape from the status of workers and become owners, if they can rise in the social scale, if they can solve the problem of life easier in some other country than they can here they will surely do so. If the history of man is any guide to us, men will go where conditions of life are easiest. They will follow the call of their stomach. They will venture a new life as the farmers of the west ventured into Canada, as the forefathers ventured to America, and later to the prairies of the west. There may, in fact, be an exodus from this country within the next ten years. The history of all America testifies to this as does the history of the human race. For man has been an immigrant from the beginning of time. He has cared little for the heat of the sun or the cold of the Arctic circle. He has cared little whether he was governed by a Pope, by a King or by himself. Given a chance to rise in the world and to keep what he produced man has followed that call, and the world is what it is today largely because of that fact. It may be that the raw material that America has received from Europe will return to the countries from which it came. It may be that one of our great contributions to the future of the world will be the men who go from our mills, our factories, our mines our cities, to contribute their training and their abilities to the re-building of the countries that gave us so generously of their children in the past."

To the last of which we students of the Materialist Conception of History can say "Amen," and to most of which we can irreverently say, "We told you so."