

February 22, 1913

Five Cents

The New Review

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

Clique War and Class War *H. S.*

The Presidential Election In France . . . *Paul Louis*

Socialism in Canada *W. E. Hardenburg*

The Panama Canal: Its Economic Significance
M. Pavlovitch

A Timely Warning "Reviewer"

The Labor Bills in New York *Paul Kennaday*

The Storm *Louise W. Kneeland*

Women of Want *Herman Montague Donner*

The Truth About the Irish Players . . *Andre Tridon*

The Grill of the Winter Wood . . . *J. William Lloyd*

Light (Translated by *Sasha Best*)

150 Nassau Street

New York

The New Review

Published Every Week at

150 Nassau Street, New York City

by the

New Review Publishing Association

Alexander Fraser, *President*
Moses Oppenheimer, *Treasurer*
Joseph Michael, *Secretary*

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

One Year, . . . \$2.00 Six Months, . . . \$1.00
Foreign Countries, \$2.50 per year
Single Copies, 5 cents

*Entered at the New York Post Office
as Second-Class Mail Matter*

It is our purpose to make THE NEW REVIEW reflect truly every tendency of Socialist thought. This is made evident from the list of writers, European and American, who are contributors to its pages. This list includes the names of some who are not Socialists, but who have evinced a readiness to serve the cause of progress and humanity according to their own light. All articles are signed, and we assume no responsibility for the views and opinions of any writer. This is the only way to have free and untrammelled discussion.

All articles appearing in THE NEW REVIEW have been especially written for it, excepting those that are stated to be translated; in the latter case the translation has been made especially for us. Reprints will not be resorted to except in extraordinary cases, and then due credit will be given to the source.

Some of the articles to appear in future issues of THE NEW REVIEW

THE PROBLEM OF NATIONALITIES IN
THE AUSTRIAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

By *Gustav Eckstein*, of Berlin.

STATE SOCIALISM AND THE INDIVIDUAL

By *William English Walling*.

THE SUNNY SOUTH AND POVERTY

By *Mary White Ovington*.

SOCIAL CLASSES IN THE UNITED STATES

By *Isaac Halevy*.

STRIKE TACTICS

By *Phillips Russell*.

THE INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATIVE ALLIANCE

By *Albert Sonnichsen*.

THE EXHALATION, A SHORT STORY

By *Allan Updegraff*.

The New Review

Copyrighted, 1913 by New Review Publishing Association. Reprint permitted with credit

Vol. I.

FEBRUARY 22, 1913

No. 8

Clique War and Class War

While this is being written, the battle that has been raging in the streets of Mexico City for nine days past appears to be still undecided. Conflicting reports are current. The statement that Madero has finally resigned and that he is to be succeeded by De la Barra, who is to serve for a second time as provisional President of the Republic, is contradicted by a later statement to the effect that Madero refuses to resign and that he has renewed the battle. In any case, however, the mere fact that the rebels have been able to maintain themselves for so long a time in the heart of the capital would indicate that the days of the Madero government are numbered.

During the past week the occurrences in Mexico have been engrossing the attention of the press and of the Washington government. While the latter is busy despatching warships to both coasts of the distracted country and preparing regiments for embarking or crossing the border, the former is discussing "our duty toward Mexico," our obligation to the resident foreigners, American and other, and the applicability or non-applicability of the Monroe doctrine at the present juncture. Armed intervention is looked forward to as a possibility, but one to be dreaded and put off as long as possible rather than to be sought and plotted for. "Intervention would be the beginning of a hundred years' war," is the reported opinion of military circles in Washington, and an Administration approaching the end of its term is naturally not over-anxious to rush into so mad an enterprise. In this respect, at least, the present situation is the very reverse of that of two years ago, when President Taft

mobilized an army on the Mexican border for "grand manœuvres," and warlike intervention appeared imminent. On this change in the attitude of the government toward troubled Mexico the American people, and particularly the workers, may well congratulate themselves. An invasion of Mexico would surely be a calamity to the people of Mexico, but an even greater calamity to the people of the United States.

Not that we share the opinion of military circles in Washington as to the great difficulty of conquering Mexico. If the Philippines could be conquered and retained, notwithstanding occasional little revolts, so can Mexico. The highest military authorities have blundered so frequently and so fatally, that we have lost all confidence in their expert opinions. It was no less an authority than Field-Marshal von der Goltz, at one time Inspector-General of the Turkish army, who predicted at the outbreak of the present war in the Balkans the speedy victory of the Turks. That prediction led us at once to suspect that there must be something rotten in the military state of Turkey, and now we suspect with equal readiness the ability of the Mexican people to unite for effective resistance against foreign aggression. On the contrary, the entire succession of events during the past two years points toward a complete disorganization of the Mexican state, a total inefficiency on the part of the ruling classes of Mexico, and a demoralization that has permeated all classes of the population. In fact, whatever little information is obtainable as to the real state of affairs points to the ominous conclusion that just now there is no Mexican nation. There are 10,000 families who own the greater and the best part of the land. There are a few thousands of native and foreign capitalists who own all the valuable mines and industries. There are a few thousand civil and military officials offering their services to the highest bidder and ready to cringe on their knees before anybody who grasps the reins of power. And there are many millions of natives, of pure Indian and mixed blood, who have been reduced to a degrading and brutalizing peonage. But of a Mexican national feeling there is no trace to be found anywhere. In fact, the only social classes that are capable of developing a national consciousness and feeling—a landowning aristocracy recognizing its feudal or patriarchal obligations, a peasantry more or less contented and loyal, or a prosperous and aspiring bourgeoisie—are conspicuous by their absence. The long regime of Diaz, with its wholesale land grabbing, its vast grants to foreign and native plutocrats, its destruction of whole tribes of prosperous Indians, and

its infinitude of tyranny and degradation for the masses of the population, that regime so belauded by the press coolies of international capitalism, has dried up the very sources of Mexican national life. For a generation the tyranny of Diaz was maintained through an alliance of the governing clique with foreign capitalists, but as the event showed, it was built on a foundation of sand. The victory of Madero was the hollow victory of a rival clique that never obtained real power. The revolts of Orozco and the other military leaders failed, not because of the strength of the new regime, but because foreign aid was not forthcoming. Zapata appears to be the only leader with a real popular following. Judging from the hatred with which he is regarded by our capitalist press and the atrocities, real or imaginary, that are imputed to him and his bands, he seems to be a leader of desperate peasants, desperately bent upon re-taking possession of the lands that had been theirs and their fathers' and wreaking bloody vengeance upon their oppressors. Peasants in revolt have never been very squeamish in their choice of means of retaliation, nor have they manifested constructive talent unless under exceptionally favorable conditions. It is, therefore, not likely that the Mexican peasants will succeed where the English, French, German and Russian peasants failed. And if now the military revolt of Felix Diaz appears to contain possibilities of success, this is undoubtedly due to the support of foreign capitalists.

It is because the Mexican people is in a state of almost complete disintegration that we incline to the opinion that American intervention would meet with no effectual resistance. Moreover, we are convinced that if the working class of this country were now in control of its government, an intervention that would promise the restoration of the land to the peasants, the abolition of peonage, and the establishment of popular government would be hailed with joy by nine-tenths of the Mexican people, just as the conquering hosts of the French revolution were received with open arms by the oppressed middle and lower classes of Switzerland, the Netherlands, Germany and Italy. But at present intervention can have but one result: The subjugation of Mexico by American capital, which would thus gain a vast accession of strength both in wealth and in military organization, while the power of the American workers would be correspondingly diminished. It is for this reason that intervention in Mexico would be a calamity to the American people, and it is for this reason that "Hands off Mexico!" must be the peremptory command of the

American working class to the outgoing Taft administration as well as to the incoming Wilson administration.

But while our capitalist press and government are trying to centre the attention of the American people upon the war of plutocratic and military cliques going on across the border, it is the duty of the Socialist press and party to direct attention to the civil war that is now raging within our own country. Since last April the coal miners of West Virginia have been on strike, and the sufferings which they have had to endure both at the hands of the coal barons and of the state government cry out to heaven. The strike resulted from an attempt of the United Mine Workers to organize these people and incorporate them in the general organization, and demands were made for an increase in wages amounting to twenty per cent., a reduction of the working day to nine hours, and recognition of the union. The companies replied by evicting the miners from their homes, which are owned by the companies, by bringing under false pretenses thousands of strikebreakers, by introducing an armed force of special police to terrorize the strikers as well as the strikebreakers, and by inducing Governor Glasscock, one of Roosevelt's original seven governors, to declare martial law in the district. For nearly a year past the miners and their families, who have been camping in tents on the hillsides, have been subjected to all sorts of outrages. At least thirty of them are reported to have been killed, and about 150 are to be tried by a Military Commission. Among the latter is Mother Jones, who has been participating in every big fight of the miners during the past ten years.

Some idea of the violent and lawless methods resorted to by the coal barons of West Virginia, the state in which the Elkinses and the Davises and their kind are purchasing United States senatorships at auction, may be obtained from the report of the German consul at Cincinnati, Dr. Oskar Mezger, of which the *Volkzeitung* has published a resumé. Three German workingmen, who had recently arrived in this country, were hired last December for work in the coal mines of West Virginia. They were unaware of the strike until after they had arrived and had been put in charge of armed guards. When they wanted to leave they were threatened with violence and forced to go down into the mines. Wages they received none, having been told that they must make good the cost of their transportation to the company. Finally, after four weeks of enslavement, they managed to escape.

The consul thereupon, under instructions of his government's Ambassador in Washington, made an investigation on the spot.

He found there very few Germans, "for most of them had made their escape," and the few remaining German strikebreakers complained that they were compelled to leave nearly all their earnings in the company stores, that at meals they were surrounded by armed guards, and that at night armed guards were posted at the doors of their miserable huts. The consul protested to the companies against this treatment, promised the workingmen the protection of the German government whenever they should invoke it, and issued a warning to all Germans to stay away from the West Virginia mines. It is also reported that the Austro-Hungarian government will take steps for the protection of its subjects in these mines.

Now, it is not to be supposed that either of these governments will be as energetic in defense of the rights of poor workingmen as it would be in defense of capitalists and capital, and since the investments in this country of German and Austro-Hungarian capitalists are in no way menaced, no armed intervention, such as our government may be "compelled" to undertake in Mexico, need be feared. Nevertheless it seems to us that these occurrences should cause the flush of shame on the cheek of every American. No one expects us nowadays to be better than the rest of the world. The day in which America was the world's leader in democracy and all that springs therefrom is now past and gone. But at least we ought to try not to become a mockery and a byword among the nations of the earth. But this is, indeed, what we are rapidly becoming. The treatment to which the working class of America is being subjected, whether in Colorado or in Alabama, in West Virginia or in New York, does not find its parallel in any other great capitalist country. Some of our bourgeois social reformers have been forced to a recognition of this fact. but it is of infinitely greater importance that the American working class itself shall clearly recognize this fact and adjust its activities accordingly, industrially as well as politically.

H. S.

The Presidential Election In France

By PAUL LOUIS (Paris)

France has a new "President of the Republic." January 17, 1913, exactly one month before the expiration of M. Fallières' term of office, the Congress meeting at Versailles elected M. Raymond Poincaré, President of the Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs.

It is of course known that there are noteworthy differences between the conditions of a Presidential election in France and those obtaining in America. Equally different are the prerogatives of the First Magistrate installed at the Elysée and the one who sits in the White House.

The French President is elected by a joint Congress of the members of the Chamber of Deputies and of the Senate, the combined bodies numbering at present 897 electors. The people have no voice in the selection of the Chief of the State. Among the senators who use the ballot at Versailles are some who hold office for life and are independent of any electoral sanction from the people; of the others, a third were elected in 1906, another third in 1909, the remaining third in 1912. At these elections nobody knew who would be the candidates before the Congress on January 17, 1913. The deputies who make up two-thirds of the Congress have been in office since May, 1910. The electorate at that time could take no account of the change of power to follow three years later. Thus both senators and deputies voted in the Presidential election according to personal preferences, without worrying about the opinions of their constituents, of which, for that matter, they were generally uninformed. It is true that a large portion of the bourgeoisie openly favored M. Poincaré, but the working classes, which constitute the vast majority of the nation, evidenced only a slight interest in the choice about to take place. The Presidential election in France is a strictly parliamentary affair and is worked out in the lobbies of the Chambers.

This is thrown into greater relief by the fact that aspirants for the office of President reveal their candidacy only at the last moment, and so public opinion, ordinarily very slow in formation, is not at all aroused. France never offers the spectacle of oratorical Presidential campaigns to which America has become accustomed. Candidates are not called upon to present themselves to the people, to traverse thousands of miles haranguing millions of people. Their task simply is to win over to their cause a few

party leaders and at the start a few score of parliamentarians. It is a matter of dinners and receptions, of secret advances and promises of cabinet appointments. These negotiations remain unknown to those who do not live in the government circles.

The prerogatives of a French President are likewise quite different from those of a President of the United States. Cabinet officers are responsible not to him but to Parliament. He must appoint them from the majority party and with reference to the wishes of the majority. He can, of course, before sanctioning laws that have been passed, require a new consideration of them, but of this right no use is made. He can likewise communicate with Parliament, and so with the people, by delivering a message. Here again is a privilege that has lain idle. He can finally, with the support of the Senate, dissolve the Chamber of Deputies and order a new election; but since MacMahon, in 1877, no President has had recourse to this measure, and such an action would now seem almost revolutionary.

Indeed, in the eyes of many people of the capitalist class, the President of the Republic in France has only a decorative function, namely, that of receiving ambassadors, paying visits to foreign rulers, and unveiling statues. The Socialists have always contended that it is ridiculous to support a politician, at the cost of \$250,000 a year, to perform such a superfluous function.

On the eve of the election of January 17, 1913 (we may recall in passing that the successful candidate sits for seven years in the Elysée), the theoreticians of the "Do-nothing Presidency" were at swords' points with the theoreticians of the "Active Presidency." The latter already had their candidate in view, and they maintained that the first magistrate should derive his prestige not from his office, but from his own personality. They considered it essential that he should be a man well known throughout the nation, that he should even be popular in one way or another, that he should have some intellectual distinction, and especially that he should be gifted with some energy, in order, should occasion arise, to resist Parliament. On this theory, the President would become a sort of elective sovereign, who would not limit his activity to signing bills as a matter of form, but would have on them his own personal opinions.

The others held that the President should not express ideas peculiar to himself. Let him rather spend his time hunting, let him live in one of the government buildings and entertain the Tsar of Russia or the King of Bulgaria. Let him be invariably submissive to the dictates of the parliamentary majority. If,

above all, he pay close attention to the opinions of the majority leaders, everything will go smoothly.

We should observe that the theory of the "Do-Nothing President" has more or less continually prevailed. Grevy, who was to come to such an unhappy end in 1887 through the scandals of his son-in-law Wilson and who was forced to resign, has been the only President between 1875 and 1913 to play any part in the affairs of the country. I mean, any serious part before entering the Elysée. In 1848, under the empire and after the fall of the empire, he had been a militant of the Republic, not of the social but of the bourgeois Republic. He was especially famous for having proposed in 1848, before the Constituent Assembly, an amendment that, if passed, would have prevented the Second Empire. His successor, Carnot, had no other merit than that of a celebrated name. Casimir-Périer, the representative of a coalition of reactionary large capitalists, was far from being a man of the first calibre. He had been selected because his tenacious, even violent character, was attractive to the bourgeoisie, at that time much concerned over the growth of Socialism. But Casimir-Périer resigned his office after a few months, because his ministers kept him aloof from important affairs. Félix Faure, whose mentality was not superior to that of the petty bourgeois so well described by Marx, was only an upstart. Believing himself the direct descendant of Napoleon I, or better yet, of Louis XIV, he conceived the notion of having a presidential uniform made for him. He was the personification of brazen self-sufficiency. Loubet and Fallières belonged to that class of born politicians who have no use for ideas, and who develop their careers within party cliques with a dexterity to be explained only by a total absence of definite opinions. These men were the realizations of the dream of a "Do-Nothing President."

In short, the fighting spirits of the Third Republic—I speak of the bourgeois republicans—have never attained to the highest magistracy. Neither Gambetta (who, to be sure, died young), nor Jules Ferry, nor Goblet, nor Waldeck Rousseau, nor Henri Brisson knew the glories of the Elysée. M. Poincaré, who indeed has a mind of high quality but who has never been a fighter, not even a fighter for the bourgeois republic, has been more fortunate than these men. In him the partisans of the personal presidency have scored a victory. It is worth while therefore to see who M. Poincaré is, what ideas he brings along with him, and to what he owed his election.

M. Poincaré comes from the old Opportunist party, the moderate party founded by Gambetta. He shares the tendencies and the preferences of this party. M. Poincaré, that is, in spite of his taste for literature and art, in spite of his personal uprightness, which no one questions, has never stood for the complete emancipation of politics from business interests. He is a member of the French Academy through the tolerance, not to say complaisance, of the Royalists and Bonapartists. We cannot say that he played into the hands of the Monarchists, or even of the Clericals. It is certain only that he filled a very lukewarm role in the fight on the Roman Church. Social reforms, even the most moderate, have found in him an adversary rather than a champion. He represents in the supreme degree the upper bourgeoisie. He incarnates their hatred of Socialism, their deference to plutocracy, their chauvinism. Many people felt that since the upper bourgeoisie is still predominant, it was best to place in office, as its personification, a man of real worth.

Let us not deceive ourselves. M. Poincaré, in many respects, is less a man of "the people" than his predecessor, M. Fallières. He will be much more inclined than M. Fallières to vigorous measures against the working classes, and he will especially champion with much greater enthusiasm an energetic and militant policy in foreign affairs.

Nothing has contributed more to his election than his Lorraine origin (Lorraine having been cut in two by the Treaty of Frankfurt which ended the France-Prussian war of 1870-71). The upper bourgeoisie, from economic interests, the lower bourgeoisie, because it expects vaguely from an act of national vengeance some renewed industrial and commercial vitality, have both become imperialistic again, and are fondly caressing the idea of a war. Well then, M. Poincaré as Minister of Foreign Affairs, succeeded in creating the impression that he had talked back to Germany much more firmly and loudly than his predecessors, an impression, by the way, that is quite inaccurate. Under his ministry came the restoration of the nocturnal military marches, which so delight the hearts of the professional patriots. By a skillful manipulation of jingoism, by flattering the upper bourgeoisie in its permanent program of reaction, by wheedling little by little the public press, by seducing the intellectuals of unstable opinions, M. Poincaré has managed to overthrow the obstacles scattered in his path by tenacious adversaries.

These adversaries were quite numerous. Among them were

M. Antonin Dubost, President of the Senate; M. Paul Deschanel, President of the Chamber of Deputies; M. Ribot, formerly President of the Council and at present Senator; M. Pams, Minister of Agriculture—all belonging to the same environment, to the propertied class of which they represent different cliques. They all strove to unite under their various candidacies those people whom Marx sixty years ago used to call the "Tricolor" republicans (and who still deserve that name), and the partisans of governments that have fallen. It would be extremely difficult to differentiate these candidates from one another, or from M. Poincaré, by examining their social characteristics. They have all grown up in the posts they have occupied or still occupy through the support of large capital. The Senate, which placed M. Dubost at its head, comprises manufacturers with the highest incomes, directors of mines, administrators of powerful trusts, business agents who have secured election to the Senate the better to further the interests confided to them. M. Paul Deschanel is the son-in-law of one of France's most famous men, and his virulent attacks on Socialism, more than any other effort of his, have contributed to his notoriety. M. Ribot represents the old provincial bourgeoisie, who would gladly restore suffrage on a limited property basis, and who would deprive the people of all influence over legislation. M. Pams, finally, was entirely unknown to the public three years ago. But he is very rich, making, it is reported, some \$200,000 a year in the manufacture of cigarette paper. As proprietor of a chateau and a steam yacht, he had the means of making himself attractive to his colleagues in Parliament, and he was not afraid now and then to come to the rescue of those among them whose expenditures happened to exceed their salaries of \$3,000. In the election, chauvinism, the appeal to business interests, contempt and fear of the working classes, the most cynical corruption, all played their respective parts. Once more we have been able to gauge the degree of degradation into which the French parliamentary world has fallen through its submissiveness to the owners of capital. M. Poincaré, of all the bourgeois candidates, was not only the one who presented the highest personal qualities, he was the one who, by disposing of patronage over the numberless offices of the French bureaucracy, possessed also the most efficient means of exerting influence. In a bourgeois democracy like that of France, everything is up at auction. The election of M. Poincaré seemed far less scandalous than that of M. Pams, and Socialists expressed the opinion that if they were

to choose, they would exclude M. Pams rather than M. Poincaré. As a matter of fact, the Socialists were but slightly interested in the whole business. They were certain, at best, to find in the Elysée one of their adversaries, and furthermore the choice of an occupant of the Presidency has little importance in relation to the problems of social life.

The Socialist party likewise had its candidate, but purely as a matter of form, "of protest," as the phrase goes. It was M. Vaillant, a private citizen and one of the most vigorous propagandists of French Socialism. In the eyes of the working classes, M. Vaillant worthily exemplifies the Commune of 1871. The fact that our party entered the Presidential campaign in no way implies that it supports the maintenance of this office, which it has always considered useless, not to say harmful, and for the suppression of which it has always striven. The party desired rather to consolidate its forces in the Congress and prevent, in addition, the scattering of its votes among the other candidates. M. Vaillant received 63 votes on the first ballot, and 69 on the second. There are 72 Socialist deputies in the Chamber, but none in the Senate. Defections, therefore, did occur, but fortunately they were few in number.

In the Socialist delegation, some cast their ballots for M. Pams, the candidate most favored by the Radicals and also the one most suspected of financial corruption. Others inclined towards M. Poincaré, who, however, derived his principal strength from the Moderate Republicans and the Monarchists. The general attitude of the Socialist party can only be approved in every respect.

As regards its effect on social evolution, this election has only insignificant importance, whether the successful candidate be a radical or a conservative. It makes very little difference also to the proletariat. For a long time past the Radicals and the Moderates, while still preserving distinct labels for the convenience of their ministerial deals, have mingled forces and unified their programs of action against Socialism. M. Poincaré was finally elected by 483 votes against 290 for M. Pams. After all, the policy that M. Pams would have followed if elected, would have been identical with that of Poincaré.

The class struggle in France has taken on an increasing acuteness, just in proportion as industry has consolidated and as the proletariat has become conscious of its interests and its rights. In days past, the struggle was between the Republican party and the Monarchists; then it was between laic society and the Catho-

lic Church. The whole history of the Third Republic is made up of these combats, which were only recently ended by the law compelling the separation of Church and State. It was at that moment that the Socialist factions came together in harmony along the lines of the International, and at that moment also that syndicalistic organization came to the front. The capitalists then felt themselves in danger and more than ever called for vigorous action against the Socialists on the part of the State. To-day we are in the thick of this struggle. On the background of this immense conflict, the competitions for the office of President dwindle almost to insignificance.

Socialism In Canada

W. E. HARDENBERG, C. E.

Although but little mention seems to be made in American and European circles of the progress of Socialism in Canada, it should not be inferred that there is no movement here or that progress is not being made.

Canada is at present passing through a stage of great expansion and "prosperity." The stream of immigration to the West, lured on by the cry of "free land," is increasing yearly, and British capital, ever on the alert for new fields of exploitation, sees in the undeveloped resources of the Dominion opportunities far in excess of anything to be found in Britain. Consequently, railways are being constructed, new towns spring up over night and factories and industrial plants are rapidly dotting the prairies that but recently had been uninhabited.

The result of this feverish activity is, naturally, to create a demand for labor-power, which, during the summer months, is approximately equal to the supply. Hence, there is not so much unemployment as in the United States and Great Britain, and real wages are a little higher. Although this condition does not obtain in winter, still on the whole it is probable that the Canadian worker is somewhat better off than his American or British fellow. And as the majority of working animals, here as elsewhere, seem to be bovinely contented so long as they get their fodder and a stall, it will readily be seen how this factor alone militates against our efforts.

Another thing to remember is that Canada has a population of only about seven and a half millions, spread over an area larger than the United States. This makes organization work difficult and expensive, and in many districts practically impossible. Thus comrades living in the country are, in many cases, owing to the enormous distances that separate them, absolutely precluded from forming locals and carrying on propaganda.

But it is the election laws—relics of feudalism as they are—that hinder us probably more than anything else. In Dominion elections all candidates must deposit \$200 with the nominating officer before they can run at all. And this deposit is forfeited unless the unsuccessful candidate receives one-half of the number of votes received by the successful one. Under the most favorable circumstances, then, in a three-cornered contest, the Socialist candidate, to save his deposit, must get more than one-fifth of the total number of votes cast.

This same rule is in force for the Provincial elections in all the provinces but Ontario, except that the deposit in this case is generally limited to \$100. And in municipal elections, as a rule, none but property-owners are allowed to vote.

It will easily be seen that these rules practically keep us out of all elections, except in the larger centres, where the locals are stronger and can raise the amount of the "fine." Even then the loss of the deposit is a serious matter and often cripples propaganda work for months afterward.

It is for these reasons that we have practically no statistics on Socialism in Canada, for in but very few ridings are the Socialists strong enough financially to put up candidates and thus ascertain their strength.

Another drawback to the progress of Socialism in the Dominion—to my mind, however, a minor one—is the fact that the movement is split up into two approximately equal parties, the Socialist party and the Social-Democratic party.

The Socialist party was the pioneer of the movement in Canada. It sent out organizers over the whole Dominion and created provincial organizations in every province. This was done by the self-sacrifice of the early comrades and in the face of insuperable difficulties. Yet, in spite of these, it elected two members to the Provincial House in British Columbia and one in Alberta.

The Social-Democratic party had its origin in, 1909, 1910 and 1911 in secessions from the Socialist party, particularly in

Ontario. It was alleged that the Dominion Executive Committee, located in Vancouver, was undemocratic and arbitrary in its actions.

The Socialist party of Canada has always been noted for its extremely scientific proclivities and the clear-cut and revolutionary tone of its propaganda. The platform is brief and to the point and does not contain a single immediate demand. In fact, the whole spirit of the party is well expressed in its motto: "No Compromise, No Political Trading."

Judging from the platform of the Social-Democratic party, it would seem that the real reason for the secessions was a revolt on the part of the reformist element of the Socialist party against the revolutionary attitude of the Vancouver officials. This view is strengthened by the fact that the constitutions, by-laws and methods of working of the two parties appear to be almost identical.

Be that as it may, both parties are doing good work and conflict but little, in many instances working hand in hand. The Social-Democratic party has its chief strength in Ontario, although it has some following in British Columbia, where the two representatives of the Socialist party have recently been led into its fold. This leaves the Socialist party with but one parliamentary representative in Alberta.

Both parties seem to be about the same size, with possibly the Social-Democratic party in the lead. The organ of this party, Cotton's Weekly, has a circulation of nearly 30,000. There is, I believe, a strong sentiment in both parties for a union, and it is probable that this will be achieved sooner or later.

At any rate, there is no doubt that the movement is in a healthy condition here and that its growth, while perhaps not so rapid as in the United States, is steady and sound. Moreover, Socialist sentiment is rapidly increasing, especially in the West. Thus the British Columbia Federation of Labor has repeatedly indorsed Socialism, while a suggestion that the United Farmers of Alberta affiliate with the Alberta Federation of Labor for mutual aid in combating capitalist exploitation, was only rejected by the United Farmers after a prolonged discussion.

From these observations, it will be seen that Socialism in the Dominion is slowly but steadily pushing forward, so that when the time comes for the workers of all countries to cast off their chains and stand erect like men, Canada will not be behind.

The Panama Canal: Its Economic Significance

By M. PAVLOVITCH (Paris).

When the Panama Canal is finished, a new world route, almost parallel with the equator, will girdle the globe. What will be its influence on international commerce and how will the relations of Europe and America, struggling for possession of the great Asiatic market, be affected? Despite assertions that the canal is primarily of strategic importance, it is clear that this monument of engineering skill, the greatest known in history, has as its basic purpose the opening of the markets of the Pacific. The United States undertook the task of building the canal to gain supremacy in the ant hills of the yellow world. The whole problem consists in unloading, at the lowest possible price, the products of American factories on the swarming millions who people the coasts of the Pacific, and for this the shortest and therefore cheapest route is necessary. Let us see how far the Panama Canal solves this question, in what degree it increases the chances of the United States gaining supremacy in the Pacific.

According to the latest data, the foreign commerce of the Celestial Empire with the principal countries, in 1910, amounted to the following:

	Imports into China	Exports from China.
Great Britain	£9,552,267	£2,518,133
Hong Kong	23,085,393	14,637,956
British India	5,918,334	610,520
United States	3,338,890	4,347,220
Germany	2,876,856	1,796,294
France	371,719	5,227,830
Russia and Siberia	2,160,460	6,188,105
Japan	10,334,017	8,294,331

As may be seen from these figures the United States by no means occupies first place in the commercial relations of China. The lion's share in exports, especially, belongs to Great Britain. Turning to other Asiatic markets we shall find that in 1910 there were imported into Japan manufactured goods to the value of 94,700,911 yen* from Great Britain; 106,361,497 yen from British India, and but 54,699,166 yen from the United States. As for India, the Asiatic market next in importance to China, her commerce with the United States is insignificant as yet, the imports amounting to but 1.5% of the total. They lag behind those of Germany, Belgium, Austria-Hungary and other countries.

* A yen is equal to about 50 cents.

But it is not only in the Asiatic markets that Europe, chiefly Great Britain, is ahead of America. The same is true of all the countries washed by the waters of the Pacific Ocean. Thus the imports from Great Britain into Australia in 1910-1911 amounted to £36,646,441 and from the United States only £6,449,829, about one-sixth of the English imports. But what is of especial significance, even South America has remained chiefly Europe's customer; England, Germany and France all ranking ahead of the United States in selling there. This has been especially humiliating to American capitalists with their motto of "America for the Americans." The average share of the United States in the foreign commerce of South American countries is between ten and fifteen per cent. In general it may be said that despite the wonderful advance of her industry in the last decades and despite her advantageous geographical position, the United States has with difficulty kept up to the struggle in the Pacific against Japan, Germany, and particularly Great Britain, which still retains the world's commercial supremacy. The reason for all this, which seems incomprehensible at first glance, lies in the advantage which the Suez Canal has heretofore given to the European powers in the struggle for supremacy in the Pacific. To reach the coasts of China or Japan, American ships have to traverse about 2,700 miles more than English or German ships. To compete with Europe in Pacific waters the United States has to surmount the colossal advantage of a shorter route which the Suez Canal gives to Europe. In the struggle for industrial supremacy in the Pacific Ocean, the Panama Canal will be a mighty weapon in the hands of the United States. If we are to believe American scholars and writers, the Atlantic period of the world's history is already nearing its end. The centre of gravity in economic life is being rapidly transferred to the Pacific Ocean, hitherto lying in the backyard of history. To quote Roosevelt, the "Pacific Ocean era" is beginning now. And dominion over the Pacific, owing to the Panama Canal, must inevitably belong to the United States.

To begin with, let us see what effect the opening of the canal will have on the struggle of Europe for the Pacific markets. It will to a great degree allay the fears of the European pessimists and dispel the illusions of the American optimists. For under no circumstances can the Panama Canal destroy the importance of the Suez route, which will remain for all Europe the shortest way to the Asiatic and Australian coasts of the Pacific Ocean. The Panama Canal will not facilitate commerce between

Europe and Asia, and from that point of view will be useless to Europe. The route from Liverpool, Havre, Hamburg, and Antwerp to the coasts of the Far East is shorter by thousands of miles by way of the Suez Canal. The following table gives an idea of the advantages of the Suez route (in nautical miles of 6,080 feet):

	Via Suez Canal	Via Panama Canal	Difference in favor of Suez Canal
London-Hong Kong.....	9,700	14,300	4,600
London-Shanghai	10,600	13,700	3,100
London-Yokohama	10,920	12,645	1,725

As for Marseilles, Genoa, Trieste, Naples and other ports lying on the Mediterranean, as well as the Russian ports on the Black Sea, the Suez route to the Asiatic coasts is also better for them. A difference of 1,000 miles of sea route represents, in the case of a 5,000-ton vessel, a saving of 500 tons of coal. On the other hand, the distance between European and Australian ports via Suez is longer than via Panama, as may be seen from the following (nautical miles):

	Suez route	Panama route	Difference in favor of Suez route
London-Melbourne	11,728	12,728	1,000
London-Sydney	12,192	12,377	185
Southampton-Melbourne	10,800	12,400	1,600

As regards New Zealand, the Panama route is somewhat shorter than that of Suez, but the latter being rich in coaling stations and markets for the sale of goods, the advantages will remain on its side for a long time to come. Thus it is clear that the Suez route will remain as formerly the great European commercial route, and along with the development of industry and international relations its role as the greatest world artery will also increase in importance. The economic revival of the Balkan peninsula will also increase the value of the Suez Canal to an extraordinary degree.

Now then, the Panama Canal will in no way shorten the journey from the great European ports to those of Asia. But it will bring about a revolution in commerce between the United States and the Pacific coasts of Asia, Australia and South America, as can be seen from these figures (in nautical miles):

Distance from New York	Via Suez Canal	Via Panama Canal	Difference in favor of Panama route
To Hong Kong.....	11,700	11,000	700
" Shanghai	12,600	10,400	2,200
" Yokohama	13,800	9,300	4,500
" Valparaiso	9,700	5,400	4,300
" Sydney	12,900	9,800	3,100
" San Francisco	14,800	4,700	10,100

Thus the Panama Canal will shorten by thousands of miles the distance between New York and the most important commercial ports of the Pacific. Though offering little to Europe, this route will give much to the United States and will tip the scales in favor of the latter. Many markets of China, Japan, British India, Australia, and South America, heretofore lying nearer to Europe, will in 1914 find themselves much nearer to New York and other great American cities, as will be seen from the following table (nautical miles):

	From the Channel via Suez	From New York via Panama	Difference in favor of Panama
To Shanghai	10,600	10,400	200
" Yokohama	11,000	9,300	1,700
" Valparaiso	8,400	5,400	3,000
" Sydney	13,100	9,800	3,300
" San Francisco.....	8,000	4,700	3,300

With the opening of the Panama Canal the United States will at once be able to compete victoriously with Europe in all the markets of Japan and in the principal markets of China and Australia. England's commercial supremacy heretofore unquestioned, is therefore seriously threatened. Soon all the talk about the "German menace" will be forgotten and the new cry of an "American menace" will resound over all England.

But the opening of the new route will be of the greatest moment to the Pacific coast of South America. It will mark a new era in the development of Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, those countries so rich in useful minerals and yet so remote from the world's centres of culture and industry. Henceforth there will be no need of doubling the entire coast of South America to get to Lima or Valparaiso from New York. Until now, North Americans have preferred to go to South America by way of Europe, mostly via Paris and thence to the Suez Canal. Thus in order to get to Valparaiso from New York, many used to make a voyage around the world. Around South America, through the rocky and stormy Straits of Magellan so dangerous for navigation, steam ships are sent by only one great English company, the Pacific Steam Navigation Co. Its vessels run from Europe directly to Callao, the port of Peru's capital, Lima.

It is manifest what a revolution in the economic destinies of South American countries will be brought about by the opening of the Panama Canal. First of all hundreds of sailing vessels, which have hitherto held sway over the entire Pacific coast of South America, will disappear, making room for giant European

and North American steamers. At the same time the opening of the new route will tell favorably on the development of commerce between those countries and the United States. In the foreign commerce of those regions, as in other parts of the world, the principal role is played by Great Britain, about the imaginary decline of whose international commercial influence so much has been written of late. England still holds first place in the foreign commerce of Chile and Peru, as is evident from the following figures. In 1909, the exports of Great Britain to Peru amounted to £1,567,907, and of the United States to Peru, £846,127, while the imports of Great Britain from Peru were £2,672,540, and the imports of the United States from Peru, £1,495,623. Similarly the exports of Great Britain to Chile, in 1910, amounted to 94,084,000 pesos (peso equals 36 cents), and of the United States to Chile, 36,629,000 pesos, while the imports of Great Britain from Chile were 127,087,000 pesos, and of the United States, 67,619,000 pesos.

As to Ecuador, she receives annually imports from Great Britain to the value of 512,000 pounds sterling, and from the United States only 482,895 pounds sterling.

The Panama Canal will open up to the United States the markets of South America and make possible the realization of the cry, "America for the Americans." New York will be 2,837 miles, New Orleans 3,550 miles nearer than London to the Pacific coast of South America. It must not be forgotten that, thanks to its natural resources, the Pacific coast of South America will develop from the economic point of view with extraordinary rapidity. John Barrett, director of the statistical bureau of American republics, has calculated that the foreign commerce of the South American coast, now amounting to \$300,000,000, will soon reach the billion dollar mark. A whole series of facts shows that the capitalists of the United States are aiming at monopolizing this market and have been taking measures to drive their competitors out of these regions.

A Timely Warning

By "REVIEWER."

Mr. Woodrow Wilson has warned the "social workers" that they must not attempt to do certain things if they want to remain in his good graces. One of the things he warns them against is any attempt to deal with the evil of child-labor, one of the greatest blots on our national life, through the national government. This, says Mr. Wilson, must be left to the States, for any attempt to deal with the curse of child-labor nationally would be against the political principles of Mr. Wilson and the party by whose grace he is to occupy the exalted office of President of the United States. It would be an invasion of "States' Rights," a political principle held sacred by Mr. Wilson and the Democratic party.

The same old Wilson. The same old Democratic party. Like Bourbons, they learn nothing and forget nothing.

The warning contained nothing that was new. And yet it was quite necessary, and, therefore, timely. For it seems that some people were beginning to forget the true character of the man and his party. It seems that some circumstances attending Mr. Wilson's nomination by the Democratic party have so obscured the vision of some political innocents that they really imagined that the leopards have changed their spots.

We recall particularly the eloquent exhortations of Mr. Louis D. Brandeis on behalf of Mr. Wilson, addressed to organized labor. Mr. Brandeis is an exceptionally clear-visioned man for a social worker. He therefore saw clearly the snares and delusions of the Roosevelt program of "Social Justice," and exposed them with unsurpassed ability. But the critical insight which helped Mr. Brandeis to take true measure of Roosevelt's reform program, was evidently never used on Mr. Wilson's party and platform.

Mr. Wilson's antecedents were well-known. By birth and breeding a "Southern gentleman of the old school." By occupation a disseminator of "safe and sane" doctrines in politics, history and political economy. By preference a "conservative statesman," with aristocratic and nativistic trimmings. Not a hopeful combination, by any means. And his party was even worse: In the distant past, the party of extreme "States Rights" and Negro slavery. In the middle course, the party of Cleveland. In the present, the party of the Solid South, with its dis-

franchised Negroes, its peonage, its lawless and ruthless suppression of every feeble attempt of the working class to organize in defense of its rights, and, last but not least, its infamous Child Slavery.

Why should any honest democrat, any social worker, and above all any honest democrat and social worker like Mr. Brandeis enthuse over such a man and such a party?

The answer is to be found in the sorry plight of the middle class of this country, as it is reflected in its political spokesmen, men like Bryan, La Follette and Brandeis. For Mr. Brandeis is simply Mr. Bryan awakened to the fact that there is a working class, and, therefore, turned social worker. For a while the hopes of this element hung upon the "insurgent" wing of the Republican party. The organization of the Roosevelt party shattered these hopes. The defeat of the Bryan forces in 1896 dethroned the middle class of this country from its position of ruling political power. The organization of the Progressive party meant its bankruptcy as an independent, political and moral factor. The Progressive platform officially announced the bankruptcy of the economic principle of competition, which is the very life-blood of the old middle class, and completely surrendered the economic leadership to its greatest foe, the trust magnate, who builds on the principle of co-operation. From now on the "small man," erstwhile "the hope of his country," was to be a mere parasite, living by the grace of his master, the trust magnate, and relying on a paternal government for his protection, in so "supervising" and "regulating" the conduct of his master as to insure to him a sort of "minimum subsistence," like the minimum wage to be provided for the wage worker.

The ordinary social workers, the enlightened "efficiency experts" of the latest phase of our capitalistic development, to whom the question naturally presents itself from the point of view of "husbanding our economic resources," that is to say, properly housing, feeding and caring for the human live stock of the industrial process, naturally pounced with avidity on the great reform program of the Progressive party. This offering could not be, however, to the taste of such true representatives of the middle class as La Follette and Brandeis. Mr. La Follette saw in it the surrender of his class to the trust magnates. Mr. Brandeis, in addition thereto, saw in it the slavery of the working class.

In this extremity an accident, or rather a combination of ac-

cidents, seemed to point the way out. By a historic accident the Democratic party was the party of Mr. Bryan, the "peerless leader" of the middle class pure and simple. And by another accident Mr. Bryan was able to dictate to his party the nomination of Mr. Wilson. It is true that Mr. Wilson was not a Bryanite. Only a few short years ago Mr. Wilson was trying to "find a decent way of knocking Mr. Bryan into a cocked hat." But Mr. Bryan gave it as his opinion that Mr. Wilson had been converted over night. Besides, beggars are not choosers. And so they turned to Mr. Wilson.

Of course Mr. Wilson's "conversion," like most conversions, was largely, if not altogether, mythical. To Mr. Wilson's credit be it said that he did not actively participate in the creation of the myth. He simply permitted the good people who were anxious to create the myth in order to soothe their own consciences to go ahead and do so. Their occupation seemed to give them a pleasure. It certainly brought him advantage. So why should he interfere? American politics have not yet reached that stage when candidates for high political honors are required to actively dispel false illusions concerning their principles.

Of course those who really wanted to know were not deceived. In fact any one who had his eyes open could see the truth. It was sufficient to read "independent" metropolitan dailies to see just where Mr. Wilson stood. The publishers of these "organs of public opinion" usually know what they are about. That they didn't believe the conversion story was quite evident. The *New York Times* and its confreres who foam at the mouth at the mere mention of Mr. Bryan's name, supported Mr. Wilson with an enthusiasm that should have opened the eyes of any one who had not taken a vow not to see. And Mr. Wilson did not feel that he was under obligation forcibly to open the eyes of those who did not want to see. At least not during the campaign.

But it is different after the campaign, when the myth of the "conversion," if permitted to go unchallenged, might lead to unpleasant consequences. Particularly Mr. Brandeis' version of the myth, which evidently included a "conversion" not to Bryanism merely, but to Bryanism awakened to the existence of a working class, to Bryanism plus "social work." That the Brandeis version of the myth might become a positive inconvenience could be seen from the fact that the social workers invited Mr. Wilson to a social function, at which he was made to listen to a lot of speeches about social welfare, among them

one on Child Labor, an institution so dear to Mr. Wilson's home-folk down South. It was, therefore, high time to puncture the bubble. And he did. He told them bluntly that they were mistaken in assuming that he was going to help them interfere with child-labor down South. He might permit them to gather information, if they needed any. But as to interference with the institution itself, that was not to be thought of, for it was against his and the Democratic party's sacred principles of "State Rights."

But it is not only Mr. Brandeis that Mr. Wilson repudiated, although the remarks were so pointedly directed at him. The repudiation included also Mr. Bryan, for as far back as 1907, Mr. Bryan declared that the federal government had a right to take a hand in the question of child-labor and do something to stamp out the evil, specifically denying that such action would be in violation of the sacred principles of "States' Rights." In an article published in the *Reader Magazine* for April, 1907, in reply to an article by Senator Beveridge, in which the latter stated that the manufacturers who wanted the exploitation of child-labor used the doctrine of "States' Rights" as a shield and that the Democrats were helping them, Mr. Bryan said:

"Senator Beveridge refers to the child-labor law, for which he stands sponsor. While it is true that the manufacturing interests which oppose the law are hiding behind the 'reserved rights of the States,' and while it is true that many Democrats are opposing the Senator's bill, some of them because of the influence of manufacturers employing child labor, and some on theoretical grounds, I think I can speak for a considerable element of the Democratic party when I say that the Senator's bill does not in the least trespass upon States' rights."

At the time Mr. Bryan wrote this declaration we all knew that Mr. Wilson was not included in the "considerable element of the Democratic party" for whom Mr. Bryan assumed to speak. In fact it included very few real Democrats, for Mr. Bryan, being a mere accident, was never a real Democrat. That accounts for his heresy concerning the child-labor problem and "States' Rights." Mr. Wilson, being then a well-known real Democrat, was not suspected by anybody of any such heresies. But some social workers, and particularly Mr. Brandeis, evidently imagined that Mr. Wilson ceased to be a real Democrat since his alleged conversion. They now know better. Mr. Wilson is still the same old Wilson, the real Democrat that he was before his alleged conversion, the kind of Democrat that would not permit such a bagatelle as the finding of an effective remedy for the crying evil of child-labor to infringe upon so sacred a Democratic principle as "States' Rights."

Whether Mr. Wilson's course is due to "the influence of manufacturers employing child labor" or to sheer Bourbonism, is immaterial. But the fact of his opposition to effective national child-labor legislation because of his adherence to the doctrine of "States' Rights," with all that that attitude implies, that is all important. And that has now been made so clear that there can be no mistake about it.

It must have been a rude awakening to Mr. Brandeis. Let us hope that it will prove a valuable lesson to him as well as to others of his kind who supported Mr. Wilson in the last campaign in the fond belief that the age of miracles wasn't past and that a real Democrat as president of Princeton might become a progressive statesman as President of the United States.

The Labor Bills In New York

By PAUL KENNADAY.

Every few years some unforeseen, foreseeable catastrophe awakens the American public, startles it into a sudden horror. For a few days the press is filled and men's hearts are heavy with the wanton shooting down of Homestead strikers, with the burning of a Slocum excursion boat, carrying the wives and children of working men, with the breaking of a cheap dam, or the burning of a "fireproof" Asch Building. Then little by little the public forgets, as murders, divorces, the profitable "bustings" of trusts, and the promises and performances of politicians monopolize the headlines.

But usually, whether the attention paid to the catastrophe is momentary or lasts a little longer, there returns the indifference to the rights of others, the inefficient enforcement of even such protective law as exists, and that deep-seated abiding injustice which is responsible in the last analysis for every one of these so-called accidents to which the workers of this nation are exposed in their daily work.

The Triangle Waist Company fire in the Asch Building, two years ago next month, might have been foreseen, the killing of those 146 young girls and men might have been prevented, had the laws been enforced, had merely reasonable safeguards been

placed about and kept about those who labor to keep the wheels of our industry going faster and ever faster. If those girls working nine stories above the ground among heaped-up inflammable material had been the daughters of trust magnates, or even of mere little business men, we all know that doors leading to safety would not have been locked, that overseers would have been provided in plenty to put out flame and prevent panic and to lead in fire drills, that fire escapes would not have been so utterly inadequate that in the twinkling of an eye no alternative would have been presented but burning to death or jumping to death.

But that those 146 young people were merely of the working class, that they differed from many of us in language, in race, in ancestry and in money, that they had found no solid united working class with which to join on the industrial and political field, made their horrible unnecessary death a matter of only passing questioning by the respectable, indifferent money-engrossed public.

Yet, this much of permanent value those deaths did accomplish—they caused the appointment of the Wagner-Smith Factory Investigating Commission. And this Commission, after the taking of much testimony and the investigating of many factories, is proposing such reform in the labor law of New York and is recommending such improved methods of labor law enforcement, that for us of to-day there is the opportunity of coming one step nearer the goal of justice which so long many of us have seen upon the far horizon.

Some thirty-two bills in all are to be recommended to the legislature at Albany by the Commission. Of the more important of these, one relates to canneries and proposes to make the cannery shed in law what it is in fact, part of the cannery factory; and being a part of a factory, the cannery shed henceforth will be subject to general labor law prohibition of employment of children under fourteen years of age. We shall, after this year, see no more of children ten years old and younger exploited in cannery sheds, working till their tired little bodies ache all over, dragged from their beds at early morning and kept at work till late at night, their happy childhood stunted merely that peas may not rot and that profits may not perhaps be a little less.

The public servants whom we tax ourselves to seat in an atmosphere of fine and expensive seclusion, having decided that we may not in any wise struggle free of that millstone fashioned

for this industrial age by property owners defending property rights in the days of the stage coach, the tallow dip and the home spun, it is to-day unconstitutional to prevent women from being worked as many hours as they in their destitution must to meet the demands of pitiless, money-mad employers. True, we have now a 54-hour law for women, but how may women be limited to nine hours of work per day if the time of starting and stopping is left to the decision of the boss? Years and years ago they found in England, as we have found in this state, that a legal limitation of hours without specific legal limits as to the hours of commencing and ending work, was a mere dead letter. This year an attempt is to be made to set this matter right, to protect our girls and women against the enfeebling stress and strain of too long hours, by a law which forbids them to work before six o'clock in the morning or after ten o'clock at night. For the particular benefit and enlightenment of those venerable gentlemen thumbing over their Coke and Littleton and Blackstone, this new law expressly states in its title that it is "to protect the health and morals of females employed in factories by providing an adequate period of rest." Thus in an entirely circumspect manner do we give notice that two plus two is four, and thus do we permit the Court of Appeals at once to reverse itself and to save its face in the best Chinese fashion.

The Commission's fire bills, in brief, provide what it is thought are adequate fire exits in case of fire. Fire walls, smoke towers, lateral fire escapes to neighboring buildings are called for, fire alarm signals and fire drills and, best of all, a stated and safe relation between fire exits and occupancy. An unwise provision, to my way of thinking, has been proposed that in factories over seven stories in height, automatic sprinkler systems must be installed and that when installed, and whether or not they will work when needed, fifty per cent. more workers may be added to each floor than, according to the Commission's own standard, could safely be accommodated by the fire exits if there were no sprinklers.

And the last of the more important bills pending or soon to be introduced are two reorganizing, in effect, the Labor Department and setting up within the Department an Industrial Board. What a farce it is and what a commentary upon loud and general professions, especially before Election Day, of genuine interest in labor's welfare that here in this state we have but ninety-five inspectors to inspect 45,000 factories, thousands of mercantile establishments, department stores, new buildings

under construction, bakeries, mines, tunnels and caissons. No wonder we have 60,000 *reported* industrial accidents each year and industrial disease cases whose great number we cannot even guess.

The new law proposes a big step in the right direction—better salaries, more men, better men. A bureau of Industrial Hygiene is to be formed with expert staff designed to study and report upon industrial conditions, to help the willing employer with suggestions, and to bring down upon the unwilling the trained, compelling official hand.

The Industrial Board is a new feature, patterned after the plan which has given such signal success in Wisconsin of late, and for years past in England and Germany. This Board will consider industry by industry, or types of problems one after the other. After independent study through its experts and after hearing all parties in interest—manufacturers, employees and the public—the Industrial Board will establish rules and regulations having the full force of law. In other words, intricate matters, calling for special knowledge, will be decided by those having or able to attain such knowledge.

Jobs, these salary increases and these new positions will be called by the doubting, and jobs they certainly will become at the hands of Tammany or any other like party in spite of the Factory Investigating Commission, if the public, and particularly the labor unions of this state, permit. But that will be our fault, not the Commission's. We, you and I, and particularly the labor unions, must see to it that the Labor Department shall soon have many more inspectors than the 125 minimum now proposed, that factory inspection shall be done by those qualified to do it, that factory inspection shall be made an honorable public career, that men shall not be favored because they belong to this or that political party or to this or that association or secret society. In fine, the Wagner-Smith Commission are about to hand over to us a fine instrument with which to clear the way leading to efficient factory inspection and protection. It is "up to" us whether we shall hold on to that instrument to use it effectively, or whether we shall turn it over to unskillful hands knowing not how to wield it and caring not. Most assuredly is it for all of us to perceive that these measures of reform, short as they are of doing full justice, yet are so far ahead of what is now written down in the statute books, that they will not go through the Senate and Assembly without vigorous, loud and secret, opposition.

The Storm

By LOUISE W. KNEELAND.

I hear you call,
Oh wind that drives the rain,
Mad with pain
At losing all!
I hear you call,
Oh, wildly call,
As I, too, call,
In vain! In vain!

I hear you fall
Fast through the dripping trees,
On dead leaves, oh rain!
On all
The dead you fall,
Oh, fast you fall,
As my tears fall,
In vain! In vain!

Women of Want

By HERMAN MONTAGUE DONNER.

See the women benumbed of our creed,
Of our Modern, Industrial Creed:
How in thousands they stream from their tenement dwelling,
To hark to and work in the Gospel of Selling:
Mere flotsam and jetsam of Greed!

O at week-end what solace to jaunt,
A machinery-free, human jaunt;
To forget the dull, iterant drudging that ages,
And dream for an hour they've a soul from dog's wages—
Pale flotsam and jetsam of Want!

But if life they must suffer, they must:
And it's shame some will taste, if they must!
So they turn from the loom to the street their enduring,
From bled to the bleeder, from lured to the luring,
Wan flotsam and jetsam of Lust!

And those that fall broken with strife,
Soul-bereft by drear, visionless strife,
Have we gain of their loss and their anguish, we others,
Who grind through Trade's sluices these possible mothers
To flotsam and jetsam of Life?

The Truth About the Irish Players

By ANDRE TRIDON.

Society and the real critics were not in attendance the other night when the so-called realistic Irish players returned to town (There was a big première at the Maxine Elliott theatre.) Neither were the Irish patriots who made the "Playboy" famous. I heartily regretted the Irish patriots' absence, for it was distinctly jarring to hear all the literary youngsters and their sub-fashionable mates crooning with joy whenever some bundle of brogue that could be interpreted as humor issued from the lips of those amateurs.

The audience as a whole appeared to have a gorgeous time. The plays were atrociously dull, drama was melodrama, comedy was of the slapstick variety, the scenery was unpardonable, the characterization farcical, and yet the literary youngsters and their sub-fashionable mates felt "so refreshed," whatever that may have meant; at least they said so while on their way to seek more substantial refreshments.

Whatever the Irish players may do from now until doomsday, they will be refreshing and delightful. People pronounced them to be so long before the curtain had risen and reiterated their pronouncement during the interminable waits between the acts. No dissenting voice was heard. I shall probably remain the only dissenter.

To be perfectly fair I confess that after the John-Drew-like strutters of the Broadway stage, the leg-shows à la Ziegfeld, and the Belasco platitudes, wherein some handsome creature standing in the midst of fascinating scenery, speaks perfectly trivial lines, the rawness of these unintelligible persons was in a certain measure refreshing. Also a little tough realism does the playgoer good after the mock Chesterfieldianism of our theatrical floorwalkers, male and female. The question is, What do we mean by Realism? and is every kind of realism artistic or even worth while?

In the first play, which was "Hindle Wakes" boiled down to one act size, a villain comes back to his native heath to marry the girl he "wronged" ten years before and she turns him down.

The villainous villain, who looks like a buccaneer of the Spanish Main with his black clothes, black tie, black hair, black hat, black eyes, and black moustache running fiercely down the corners of his mouth, wishes to convince us that his villainous-

ness is of the pseudo-religious variety. For thirty-five minutes or so he quotes one preacher-like formula until we actually feel ashamed of him, and the ending of the play becomes embarrassingly obvious. The young woman who refuses to become "respectable" by marrying this converted Captain Kidd, dissects his primitive psychology with a refinement that would have delighted dear old Henry James. And she never once hesitated in her choice of expression while apprising the buccaneer of her heartfelt scorn for his casuistry. The sketch was called the "Magnanimous Lover" and the guilty author was one Ervine, a Fabian wit, I believe.

The second play, "Birthright," was the story of two farm boys. One is mother's favorite, who shirks all work and devotes himself to sports, and the other is supposed to help a lot around the farm. As a matter of fact the overworked one mostly sits around in a respectable black suit, while his overworked father, who is tilling the arid soil with the sweat of his brow, sits near the fire in an almost fitting cutaway. The old mare breaks her leg and has to be shot. They all talk, talk, talk about the bad boy and the bad land and the bad luck and the poor old mare. In the second act the good brother jumps on the bad one, fells him in front of the fireplace a la Belasco, and kills him 'realistically' by shaking his shoulders gently a couple of times. The mother, who wears patent leather shoes with high heels, comes in and howls appropriately: My boy! My boy!

The "Jackdaw," by Lady Gregory, which topped this awful evening, defies analysis. It gave the impression of being the first rough draft of a sketch for some Bowery imitator of Weber and Fields. The humor of it consisted mainly in the audience's efforts to discover something humorous in the lines and the situations. For Lady Gregory, trying to look like Queen Victoria, was keeping a sharp eye on her audience from a proscenium box, and the audience was on its good behavior.

Is this realism? Refreshing realism? People talked by the hour on irrelevant matters. Artistic realism does not consist in reproducing faithfully every detail of a conversation, but in selecting a few typical details rich in suggestive power. Whoever has spent a morning in the police court knows how incapable the usual plaintiff or defendant is to state his own case. He rambles pitifully, never once coming to the point, unless the magistrate takes him in hand and compels him to answer definite questions. Will anyone claim that the story of the case as told

by the untutored rambler would be more realistic than the few pregnant facts drawn out by the judge?

Furthermore, in their attempt to depict simple folks, the players presented a distressing conglomeration of half-witted individuals. I except, of course, the Henry Jamesian heroine of the first play. Some were cheerful idiots, some sinister idiots, but half-witted they all were, with that one exception. Driveling idiocy is not synonymous with realistic simplicity.

In another way yet did the Players' attempted realism strike amiss. Praise is due to them, I concede, for their scorn of "nice stage pictures" and of the "speech to the audience," for their freedom from the "elocutionary" tradition according to which a whole cast adopts one and the same unnatural pitch with no allowance for personal idiosyncrasies. This part of their technique is enjoyable, provided you sit in row A. B or C. Those in T or U, however, miss one-third of the lines and are constantly straining their ears to catch the other two-thirds. Either the Players should perform in a Futurist theatre before an audience of one hundred or so, or they should return to the conventional stage delivery, which carries the lines to the last row of our ridiculously large show houses.

I am beginning to feel more lenient towards the Irish patriots whom I criticised rather severely for their attitude at the time of the Playboy riots.

The Grill of the Winter Wood

By J. WM. LLOYD.

Like a wheel of gold the sun rolled down,
 Back of the grill of the winter wood,
 While a lonesome wind, like a homeless houn',
 Whining, came snuffling to where I stood
 In the wide, white field, by the pond-hole's cup,
 Where the rabbit had hiding good:
 And the silvern wheel of the moon rolled up,
 Back of the black of the winter wood.

LIGHT

From the Russian. Translated by Sasha Best.

It so happened long ago that I was obliged, on a dark November night, to travel on a great river. Suddenly, at a bend of the river, under the great dark mountains, I saw a light.

It was bright, intense in its glow, and seemed near, very near. Thank God! I cried joyously. A village is near, a lodging for the night!

The oarsman turned around and gazed over his shoulder at the light. Then with his accustomed apathy he resumed his rowing, merely saying: "We still have very far to go."

I did not believe him, for was not the light there, right before me? It shone distinctly out of the nebulous darkness and I saw it so near to me.

But the man was right, we really had very far to go, endlessly far. Thus did light seem to triumph over darkness, and to come nearer and nearer, to shimmer, to promise, and to lure. But two or three more strokes of the oar, and you think to arrive, and yet you are so far, so far.

And far into the night we rowed on the inky black river. Gorges and mountains came near, and swam away, disappeared in the distance, and vanished into apparent endlessness. But the light was always there, glimmering, luring on, so near and so far—

How often have I this picture before my soul, the dark river under the shadow of the great overhanging rocks, and this living light!

I am not the only one, alas! who is lured on by these lights, these lights that seem so near—while life still flows on between the gloomy shores—and are so far, so far.

And again and again we have to take to the oars.

 BOOKS RECEIVED

Isaac A. Hourwich, Ph.D., *Immigration and Labor The Economic Aspects of European Immigration to the United States*; 544 pp. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

J. Hampden Dougherty, *Power of Federal Judiciary Over Legislation*; 125 pp. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

William J. Ransom, *Majority Rule and the Judiciary*; 183 pp. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

Simon N. Patten, Ph.D., *The Reconstruction of Economic Theory*; 99 pp. The American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia.

Heinrich Cunow, *Die Parteien der grossen französischen Revolution und ihre Presse*; 394 pp. Buchhandlung Vorwärts, Berlin.

Theodore Schroeder, *Free Speech for Radicals*; 81 pp. Free Speech League, New York, 25 cents.

Andrew C. McLaughlin, *The Courts, the Constitution and Parties*, 299 pp. University of Chicago Press, \$1.50.