

THE OMAHA SUNDAY BEE MAGAZINE PAGE



New Maanish Sailor of Moire Ribbon, Showing the Odd Tassel Trimming.



Dinner Bell Hat with High Trimming of Roman Striped Silk.



Masculine Sailor, with Crown Trimming of Scarlet Feathers.



Girlish Costume with New Hip Pockets and Cutaway Jacket.

More New Hats

LADY DUFF-GORDON, the famous "Lacile" of London, and foremost creator of fashions in the world, writes each week the fashion article for this newspaper, presenting all that is newest and best in styles for well-dressed women.

Lady Duff-Gordon's Paris establishment brings her into close touch with that centre of fashion.

Lady Duff-Gordon's American establishment is at Nos. 37 and 39 West Fifty-seventh street, New York City.

By Lady Duff-Gordon.

IN this song of the hat I have so many interesting things to tell you that I know not where to begin. There are so very many different kinds of hats that I know not which to offer you first. Perhaps when one gets down to the last analysis the Watteau chapeau will be found to be the greatest favorite of the Spring. There is more than one shape in this class. The one with which we are

most familiar is, of course, that which is turned up at the back, but one which will hold just as high a place in fashion's esteem is uptilted on the side. Such hats are trimmed with flowers or loops of ribbon.

And, speaking of ribbons, I wonder how you are going to like the new lacquered ribbon which is so much the rage just now here in Paris. Of course, like everything else which can be procured in the department shops, it is bound to become very common.

Personally I do not like it. It is bareh and unpleasant, I think, therefore when I use ribbons I use the moire. It is just as effective and far more feminine than the lacquered ribbons.

Fashion is a queer jade, and because of her queerness is ever fascinating. There never was a more feminine period than the Watteau This Spring, therefore, we are utterly feminine when we place a flower-trimmed hat of that period on our carefully coiffed head. We wear with this a draped frock of flowered silk and present the essence of femininity.

The next hour we may turn and become thoroughly masculine in our appearance. The Louis Philippe is the most chic of the so-called masculine shapes. When trimmed with a band of stiff moire belting or of the lacquered ribbon and held in place with two hat pins the "mere man" effect is most pronounced.

G. Bernard Shaw Explains Why Socialism Is Not a Class Struggle

By George Bernard Shaw.

(From an address delivered before the British Socialist Party, the Independent Labor Party and the Fabian Society.)

I HOLD it to be my firm opinion that the trouble with us, the trouble which occurs in our movement, is superstition; by which I mean not the literal sense of the word, but the beliefs, extending over from a former state of things which have got incorporated in the political faiths and beliefs which have now their expression in socialism.

There is one thing that we must shake off in the socialist movement, and that is the old idea that we are engaged in a class struggle and that our movement is a class movement. Now, let me put a case to you. Here may I tell you that I belong to the capitalist class. I am not what would be called to-day a rich man, although my father would have regarded me as a very rich man, and, although I may be regarded as in a poor position by the really rich people.

I live an extremely simple life. My wants are very few. I have always said quite frankly that I do not desire modern luxuries from that standpoint—but give me a nice house in the country, a comfortable flat in town, a good motor car and a few thousands a year and you will not find a more contented man. Having made this very moderate demand, I may point out before I go any further that as a capitalist there are no fewer than fourteen persons who are dependent upon my capitalist income, and I am always inviting people to take away that income and make a success of it.

I do not think that any one of these people I refer to is a Socialist, but I rather suspect that they are all pretty strong Conservatives.

That is all very well—but four out of five adult men in this country are workmen. It seems encouraging that when you have four to one against you that I have fourteen members of the working class behind me fighting in defense of my income. And this proves to me that when the time comes for a real struggle you will not find that the working classes are all on the one side and the capitalists on the other side.

I have felt all my life the danger of this doctrine, and that it is wrong to place all the working people on the one side and all the people who have any property on the other side, because when it does come to a definite confrontation the other side will be exceedingly strong.

Unfortunately, the longer we allow the class distinction to continue, the stronger it will become. If you go back to the economic history of the last twenty or thirty years, the most marked feature is the enormous increase in the rich middle classes of the people and the great increase in the general prosperity, and that

means that these fortunate people are employing some working men directly while they employ more working men indirectly, and this brings you more people with increments which are unearned, and they are therefore parasitic upon the country. And that means that the working classes are parasitic upon them. That they are, in fact, parasitic upon each other.

Now you will only look at the electoral figures. You have found that the people working in the industrial centres in the north of England can get their labor members into Parliament. Radical politics are strong, and Socialism gets a hold. But if you look at the south of England, if you look at the fashionable parts of England, and I include parts of London, you will find in those constituencies that even a Liberal has not a ghost of a chance. Although there is a preponderance of workmen, you will find, indeed, that these are the sort of constituencies which the anti-Socialists are willing for us to contest to-morrow at our own expense—they are so sure of them.

When you come to the middle class—I will deal first of all with the professional class—you will find that the poor class of professional men are very poor, that they are very dependent upon the work of their own hands, that they are very ready and very valuable recruits to Socialism, and that many of them do not know that they are Socialists, and strong Socialists at that.

Coming to the better middle class, in the middle class the intellectual class, the professional class, is very largely Socialist, and the business section is not absolutely opposed to Socialism.

But when you get to the upper classes, in spite of the preaching of revolutionary ideas among them you will find that there is a remarkable division among the idle rich who are practically—I do not like to use any expression which would hurt their feelings—but they are really—vermin in the commonwealth. Their capital is mischievous, they consume our food and wealth, and we get nothing out of them. This is the idle rich, vagabond, smart-set class, with their general bad manners, a thoroughly low-down class, which is a disgrace to Europe and the delight of hotel keepers.

And yet you find, even in that class, another class of people who really might be said to be ladies and gentlemen in the same real sense of the word, who have some sense of duty and who are conservatives of the old school. They have, I repeat, some sense of public duty. They may not exercise it intelligently, but they do make some slight attempts to demand justice, and to make some slight attempts to alter for the better the position of the poor people. Their views on the subject may need a little alteration perhaps. They organize the territorialists. They do all sorts of things of that kind, but they are as a class entirely different in tone from the other class, and they furnish a very considerable number of recruits to Socialism, considering their numbers.

If you will take it from the top to the bottom, Socialism is not a class question, nor will the struggle be a class struggle.

When the struggle comes there will be workmen fighting against workmen.

When the labor party is in the majority I shall begin to believe that it knows what it is talking about. There is no use in blinding ourselves to the magnitude of the work before us. There is no use in imagining that we shall be in possession except for a few rich people. And that is my reason for saying that we cannot any longer go on the idea that we can organize Socialism on a class basis.

That must be all classes.

I am a sufficiently old Marxist to believe that industry will be the basis of the new order. One of the things that we have actually done in our long propaganda is to create among a large number of the people of this country a conviction that income is distributed in a monstrous, anti-social and unjust manner, and the whole question is the redistribution of that income. That is common ground. It is very easy for me to meet a Socialist who still clings to the term of the class struggle and the class war, because that has nothing to do with the question. The real question is whether income is going to be distributed in the perfectly monstrous and wasteful manner it is at the present time. Once consider the action of putting all the means of production into a common property and the world will think.

Having said that I want to say a word about the practical application of my statement that a class party cannot represent the Socialist party. I am going to the Labor party in Parliament. A good deal of the work I have done has been in organizing the Labor party. I have had something to do with its literature, but I have known perfectly well at the same time that a mere labor party, as long as it was a class party, would not really solve the question in this country. For the matter of that, I have found that some of the men who have done the best work in the Labor party, Mr. Keir Hardie for instance, are not very typical persons of the class they represent, as you might suppose. I do not think you will agree that Mr. Keir Hardie is a typical British workman. He is a typical Highland chieftain.

Now I venture to say that not only must we have on our public bodies something which represents many larger views than the class views of the working class of to-day, but we must also have that same something in Parliament.

There is another thing that is wrong with the Labor party, and, curiously enough, it is wrong with the entire House of Commons. I have said that the House of Commons did not really represent the people of England to-day, because conditions of election to the House of Commons are such that it tends to select a particular type of man who is a successful business man, and this means a man who has been all his life engaged in getting hold of money—very largely other people's money.

Now a man who does that may be in his way a very able man. He may be very good at his business. He may have a very good knowledge

of the business side of things, but at the same time he may be, and he generally is, politically and economically ignorant to an extraordinary degree of the causes that come before him.

The Cabinet, again, although it has Liberal pretensions, does not make a pretense of consisting of Liberals at all. When there is a Liberal majority at an election immediately a Cabinet is formed you have men like Mr. McKenna in it. (Hisses.) Now you need not be very hard on McKenna; he is not a Liberal because he is not anything at all. He has not risen to the dignity of being describable in any political terms. But the House of Commons does not know that, and this Liberal body of people does not know what Liberal principles mean. They will go and prosecute Tom Mann under the Muliny Act and put him in prison and they think it the most natural thing to do, but they do not know that it is against Liberal principles to do so.

They are men of business and they begin and end there and until we throw in representatives of Liberalism and throw out the representatives of business we shall not make much progress. There are thousands of commercial clerks and workmen who know more about it than they do.

Let us come to the Labor party. What is wrong with the Labor party? (A voice: "It's rotten.") What is wrong with the Labor party is that it tends to select for Parliament a particular type of man, a very much better type of man than the commercial man who lives among the middle class parties. It tends to select the trade union secretary, and although he may be an admirable man he also has spent his life in the technical work of trade unionism, the elaborate work of getting out piece work lists, questions of wages, and organization without which he could not go on. The man may be a first rate trade union secretary, but he may know nothing of general application and that is the reason that, although you paid these men of whom it is possible you cannot speak in too high terms personally, you cannot conceal from yourselves the fact that when they get up against clever lawyers and men experienced in public life they are not really able to hold their own.

I do not want to use a term which is often applied to myself offensively, and that is the term "intellectual." But the real fact is that whether you are intellectual or not you cannot really fight great social questions unless you have made a study of scientific politics. You must have men of wider culture. I want to see the party which represents labor in Parliament extended. I want to see it above all the working classes. I want to see not men engaged in technical businesses, but men who have been agitators, who have all their lives been engaged in dealing with questions from a political point of view. I want to see the men who have been accustomed to talk in the Labor party the Socialist party to include the Labor party and to include all the other things in the whole question of the working classes, in the whole material resources of this country and in the distribution of income on a wider basis than

the working class basis altogether.

There is no good in the old basis of making people believe we are all quarrelling. There is nothing in the quarrel. We have a Fabian Society, but we have hardly had a working man in it until we got Mr. Keir Hardie. We had one working man and we held on to him. But the working classes as a rule would have nothing to say to us and so we have been a feeble middle class body. I believe the brains in it are good and that we have a strong middle class in it, but the economic development has turned them into proletarians. The movement is good, but we have had to take advantage of this movement—we have had to swing in.

I do not know what will happen in the House of Commons next, or what may happen if you get a single transferrable vote. You may have a number of groups, and under this old party system we may have many groups. Now, what was the origin of the present party system? Well, the party system, which is supposed to be a peculiarly English production, is really a system which was recommended by a clever Scotchman to a Dutchman. The Dutchman happened to be King of England "of glorious, pious and immortal memory," as Sir Edward Carson would say. At that time the Kings of England made up their Cabinets by choosing men of different parties, a Whig here and a Tory there. The thing was all mixed up.

The Dutchman was trying to organize a big European war, and he said: "I must have a House of Commons that will support me in this war."

The Scotchman came along and said: "I will tell you how to do it. Instead of a Whig here and a Tory there, choose all Whigs. They will be so anxious to stick in they will back you up through thick and thin."

And the result was that the party system came in for the first time and the Government supported the King, and King William was able to wage his war.

Afterward the Duke of Marlborough went back to the old business of having Whigs and Tories and some of them nothing at all. But he was in the European war business and he was forced at last to go back to the Scotchman's method.

That is how the party system came in and that is why we see the party system is indispensable. It is absolutely necessary. We want the solid wall behind us. I do not know that we shall always want it—but it was nice for King William and the Duke of Marlborough. The origin of the party system is primitive. I think it is worth while trying to remind you of that. There may be a time when we may get some brains into Parliament, when we may get more independence in Parliament, and there will be a great deal more of a bigger and certain element in Parliament representing the brains of the country altogether. And I do not know anything that is more likely to triumph than a united Socialist party in this country which will have to come into its own.

You may not agree with me to-night; people do not agree with me to-night, but they do twenty years later. Now I leave it for the next twenty years for you to think over.