

The New Review

Copyrighted by New Review Publishing Association, 1913. Permission to reprint provided credit is given.

Vol. I

JANUARY 4, 1913

No. 1

THE NEW REVIEW

In laying the first number of the NEW REVIEW before the public, a brief statement of the general aim and scope of the new publication is in order.

The primary purpose of The NEW REVIEW is to enable the Socialists of America to attain to a better knowledge and clearer understanding of the theories and principles, history and methods of the International Socialist Movement. The NEW REVIEW will be devoted to education, rather than agitation.

We use the word education in no narrow pedagogical sense. Socialist education cannot be confined to the study of certain books or theories or modes of action. Our movement has long ago passed the stage of utopian construction, esoteric sectarianism, or secret conspiracy. It has broken through the bounds of local and national isolation. It has now become synonymous with the world-wide struggles of the workers against the monopolists of the means of work and of life. It is as many-sided as are these struggles. Local and partial strikes, "general" strikes extending over entire localities or industries, participation in local and national elections, efforts for the introduction and extension of political democracy and economic reform, public demonstrations and strikes *en masse* for the attainment of political objects, unions and co-operatives and Basel congresses—all these forms of working class activity and struggle are now regarded by friend and foe as a part of the general Socialist movement, the ultimate aim of which is the complete overthrow of the existing social order.

A movement so comprehensive, so universal, so Protean is not to be educated or taught or trained in accordance with the rules of the schoolroom, workshop, or barrack. An educational organ of this movement must not presume to impose upon the movement its own superior theories, irrefutable principles, and infallible

dogmas. All it can do, all it can hope to do is to impart correct information, to subject the multiform manifestations of the movement, and of society in general, to a searching and fearless analysis, and to develop in its readers a spirit of free inquiry and criticism.

But this does not imply that *The New Review* has no definite standpoint. Students of scientific method are well aware that a working hypothesis is essential to progress in the search for truth, and that even a false hypothesis is in the long run more helpful than aimless experimenting. Even if Socialists had no theory they would have to invent one. But we do have a coherent body of theory that has withstood triumphantly all the assaults of the intellectual champions of capitalism, one that has stood the test of the most searching criticism—the criticism of actual fact, one the essential truths of which have been confirmed by the salient facts of social evolution during the past half century, one to which even its critics are paying ever increasing homage. The intellectual achievements of Marx and his successors have become the guiding star of the awakened, self-conscious proletariat on the toilsome road that leads to its emancipation. And it will be one of the principal tasks of *The New Review* to make known these achievements to the Socialists of America, so that we may attain to that fundamental unity of thought without which unity of action is impossible.

In attempting to fulfill this self-imposed task we shall have to reach out far beyond the questions and conflicts of the immediate present. The world-wide emancipation movement of the working class is not merely political, nor merely industrial; it is also a great cultural movement, the greatest cultural movement in all history. Wherever the Socialist movement is well organized and successful, so that it has come to embrace a large part of the working class, there we also find that a veritable moral and intellectual regeneration of the masses has taken place. In order to fulfill its great destiny, the working class must become superior to the ruling classes not only in physical power, economic efficiency, and political capacity, but also in intellectual insight and moral integrity. An educational organ of Socialism must, therefore, devote attention to science and philosophy, literature and art, to the history of the past as well as to speculations, more or less valid, concerning the near or remote future.

The New Review will honestly strive to carry out this program in so far as the means at its disposal will permit. It will strive always to be in the van of the Socialist movement of America. And it appeals to all Socialists for their moral and material support, so that it may perform its functions in an adequate manner and be of the utmost service to the movement of which it is a part.

* * *

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 have promised to contribute 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 will be 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.

1913

To the toiling masses, employed and unemployed, the year 1912 ends exactly as it began. Their situation has in no way sensibly improved. Our Agricultural Department has trumpeted forth endless arithmetical paeans over the year's exceptionally bountiful crops, but the impossibly high cost of living has not, therefore, been appreciably reduced. The basic industries, particularly those of iron, steel and copper, have been working at high tension and almost to full capacity, but we have yet to hear of any improvement in the inhuman working conditions that have prevailed in the steel mills—the twelve-hour working day and the seven-day working week—conditions that even Mr. Gary feels obliged to deplore in his public utterances, though he professes himself unable to remedy them. The figures of imports and exports have risen to the highest totals ever recorded, but we have yet to learn that either the workers of America or those of other parts of the world have received a larger portion of the bare necessities of existence. Gaunt hunger and ragged misery stalk the streets now as they did a year ago, a prey to carking care and modern, "scientific," commercialized charity. The bread lines have not been shortened by one single man, woman or child, the harshness of the police to the tramps and outcasts of society, as well as to striking workers, has lost none of its brutality, and our courts of justice continue to dole out workhouse and jail sentences to the hapless victims of class rule and class tyranny. The lot of the world's workers remains the same, and the pillars of capitalism stand unshaken.

And yet the past year did not stand still nor was it altogether wanting in deeds of high emprise. In Europe and America, and even in Asia and Africa, there have been heard mutterings and rumblings that presage a gathering storm. To be sure, meat riots of exasperated working women in the streets of New York and Berlin, hunger riots in Vienna, attempts on the life of rulers in India and Japan, are nothing more than the ordinary crop of

oppression and misrule. Similarly, Tripolitan and Moroccan expeditions, Balkan wars, and the menace of world-wide war because of strangled little Serbia's hankering after an outlet on the Adriatic, merely testify once more to the long-established incapacity of European diplomacy to deal intelligently even with the narrow interests that are entrusted to its keeping, the business interests of dynasties and high finance. But these exploits of the ruling classes, like the entirely natural, although unintelligent and aimless, reactions against their misrule, are very far from being the most salient features of the past year's history.

It is a striking fact that the beginning of the year as well as its end witnessed two formidable demonstrations of the growing power of the working class. It was in January that the German Social Democracy achieved its magnificent electoral victory, and it was in the last days of November that an extraordinary International Socialist Congress was convoked at Basel. One may rate successes at the polls as low as he chooses; we are by no means of those who think that Socialism will be peacefully inaugurated by a majority of votes in the ballot box. But peacefully or not, Socialism surely cannot be established unless a majority of the people are determined to establish it, and the 4,250,000 votes of the German Socialists in the January elections are a long step towards obtaining that majority. The effects of this unprecedented victory have been felt far beyond the confines of the German Empire. Likewise, one may readily admit that International Socialist Congresses do not yet possess the material force requisite for the maintenance of peace in spite of criminal governments, bloodthirsty militarists, and greedy capitalists. But it appears to us undeniable that the protest of the Basel Congress against the unscrupulous machinations of governments playing with the fire of universal war, and its proclamation on behalf of the proletariat of the leading countries of Europe that it is determined to resist the outbreak of such a war with all the means at its disposal, have been potent factors in the preservation of peace, even such precarious peace as now exists in Europe. The International of the workers has not yet risen to the rank of the world's ruling power, but the rulers of the world can no longer omit it from their calculations.

These mature and well-organized expressions of the growing power of the workers were accompanied by other expressions of a more rudimentary and spontaneous nature, which, however, are no less significant. The great English strikes may not have attained the objects for which they were initiated. They certainly did not succeed in completely paralyzing British industry and commerce, and they called forth a power of resistance on the part of capitalist society that must have been a surprise to the ardent advocates of the general strike as the universally applicable and exclusively effective method of proletarian warfare. But

these strikes also manifested a widespread and marvelous solidarity of the workers, a hitherto unsuspected ability on the part of hundreds of thousands to stand together through storm and stress and utmost privation for a common end. Success may have been partial or lacking, but the grandiose effort was impressive. It is bound to exert a restraining influence upon the arrogance of the ruling classes. They have felt something of the growing power of the proletariat.

Our own Lawrence strike bore a resemblance to the British transport workers' strike, rather than to that of the British miners. The Lawrence strike of 1912, like the McKeys Rocks strike of 1909, was a revolt of the most oppressed section of the American proletariat—unskilled, poorly paid, unorganized, immigrant laborers driven and exploited by a powerful corporation in control of all the agencies of local government and having at its beck and call also those of the State. And like the McKeys Rocks strike, the Lawrence strike evinced the wonderful possibilities of these workers—their powers of endurance and resistance, their indomitable spirit and solidarity. It recalls once more to American Socialists the imperative need and duty of giving a helping hand to these downtrodden workers in their ever renewed efforts at organization and in securing political rights. Police arbitrariness and brutality shone in all their native American glory at Lawrence, just as they did at McKeys Rocks, Little Falls, and a hundred other industrial bastilles; but the exploiters were taught once more the salutary lesson that there are impassable limits to human patience.

But perhaps the most significant event of the year, the most significant from the standpoint not only of American Socialists, was the American Presidential campaign. Certainly the great increase in the vote for Debs—it more than doubled that of the last election—was a most notable achievement of the party, particularly in view of all the peculiar circumstances of the campaign. No amount of vain pre-election boasting and no amount of vain post-election carping can take away one atom from the solid weight of the registered increase in Socialist sentiment, thought, and conviction in almost every part of the country. But, however important this advance of Socialism in America, it is cast in the shade by an event of still greater moment. We refer, of course, to the breaking up of the Republican party and the definite constitution of the Progressive party.

Whatever the birth of the Republican party may have meant to its fathers, its triumph signaled the definitive victory on American soil of capitalist production, and the political and economic ideas corresponding to it, over the older forms of production and the political and economic ideas that correspond to them. Similarly, the dissolution of the Republican party and the advent of the Progressive party signalize the development of the

contradictions and antagonisms inherent in capitalist production to such a degree as to make its doom inevitable. The Republican regime denoted industrial development through capitalism. The coming of the Progressives denotes that progress and popular welfare are no longer to be attained except through a radical departure from the traditional doctrines of capitalist economy and the frank acceptance of a quasi-collectivist program. Capitalism is to be saved by changing and renewing its foundations, by replacing individualism and *laissez faire* with State Socialism. The Republican *regime* denoted a stable social order. The passing of Republicanism denotes that the social equilibrium which served the propertied classes so admirably is a thing of the past, and that the Conservative republic—the envy of the bourgeois idealists of Europe—is about to give way to the Radical republic, which can only serve as a transition to the Socialist republic.

This does not signify that to-morrow a miracle will happen. Old and decrepit societies have an exasperating way of resisting the change that is inevitable. But all history teaches that the most thoroughgoing revolutions have been those that had to overcome the greatest resistance. The workers must not expect to come into their own without encountering the most stubborn opposition on the part of the propertied classes. But, to use the language of the Basel Manifesto: "If governments suppress the possibility of evolution and force the proletariat to desperate measures, the responsibility for the consequences will rest on the governments," those of America as well as those of Europe.

H. S.

THE LAST ELECTION TO THE GERMAN REICHSTAG

BY KARL KAUTSKY

I must begin my statements with an apology. The request that I write this article reached me while I was on a vacation trip. I am, therefore, obliged to write it without having statistical and other material at hand, and will have to confine myself to some general remarks.

The reply to the question, what we have attained in the Reichstag elections of last January, must depend very largely upon the expectations which were connected with those elections. Whoever had extravagant expectations must have been very much disappointed. For, apparently, the election of 110 Social-Democratic deputies has altered nothing. The government and the majority of the Reichstag are just as reactionary as before, social reform lags as it formerly did, and the rivalry in armaments goes merrily forward.

But those who expected that the elections could and would

make any change in these respects were pinning their faith to unrealizable illusions. No bourgeois majority, no matter what its composition may be, will ever conduct an energetic struggle against the government in behalf of a genuine parliamentary regime, against militarism and the increase of the naval forces, and for radical social reforms. Such a struggle can today be expected of a Social-Democratic majority only. And it was obvious in advance that the majority of 1912 would not be Social-Democratic.

The advantage for which we are fighting in an electoral campaign is above all a moral one. Our most important duty does not consist merely in enlightening and organizing the proletariat, but also in inspiring it with the consciousness of its own power. If there are still many workers who assume a hesitating, apathetic, or even hostile attitude toward Socialism, this is not because they disapprove of our aim, but because they doubt our power to realize it. To prove that we are a mighty force becomes even more important than to prove that we are in the right.

We succeeded in doing this most brilliantly in the last Reichstag elections. Over 4,250,000 votes and 110 seats in the Reichstag; a third of all the votes cast, and more than a fourth of all the Reichstag seats, Social-Democratic—that speaks so clearly and plainly for itself that even the most apathetic understands it and even the most timid is encouraged. It plainly means that the German Social-Democracy has ceased to be a mere propaganda party, that it has entered upon the practical struggle for power.

And so the last Reichstag elections proved to be a mighty factor in the winning of power for Socialism, not only in Germany but throughout the world.

But in addition to this general significance, which all parliamentary elections, no matter where they take place, have for us when they show an increase in our votes, every individual election has its special characteristic feature, its special purpose. And even in regard to this special purpose we can be satisfied with the election of January, 1912.

It assumed the character of a struggle against the so-called black-blue bloc, that majority of Conservatives and Centrists, which finally came to control the Reichstag elected in 1907, after the bourgeois parties represented in it had been jumbled together in a peculiar fashion.

In order to make this plain, it will be necessary to characterize briefly the various political parties. There are four of them. First, the Conservatives, the representatives of the great Protestant land-owners, the governing class, which holds all the high and lucrative offices in the State, rules it, and shapes the legislation and administration according to its own will and to its own advantage.

Next to these until recently stood the National Liberals, the representatives of large capital. And opposed to these two parties

were, on the one hand, the petty bourgeois democrats, organized into the Radical People's party, which resembles the French Radical party, though it is more weak-kneed, and, on the other hand, the Centre, a party of a peculiar sort. It was formed in 1866 when Austria was forced out of Germany, and the Catholics thus became a minority in the German Empire. Bismarck at once made them feel their position and thereby forced them into the most decided opposition. With the exception of the Rhineland, the Catholic regions are, as a rule, economically the most backward in Germany, and those in which agriculture predominates. The majority of the supporters of the Centre are, consequently, economically reactionary and agrarian: To that extent they would naturally belong to the Conservatives. But the latter are the Protestant masters of the State, those who monopolize its advantages, while the Centre is dominated by the Catholic Church. Hence, it felt the necessity of embracing a policy of democratic opposition. It often showed an anti-capitalistic tendency, and thus it succeeded in attracting to itself great numbers of the Catholic workers—the only bourgeois party in Germany that was able to accomplish this.

For several decades the Radicals and the Centre were opposed to the strengthening of the power of the government, were against high taxes, and hence against the increase in the military burdens and against the policy of colonial expansion.

All this has been changed since the beginning of the present century. Imperialism has taken possession of all bourgeois social strata in Germany. Radicals and followers of the Centre have begun to dream of colonial expansion and naval power, just like the National Liberals and the Conservatives.

At the same time the advance of the Social-Democracy and of the labor unions has embittered the petty bourgeoisie more and more against the workers; not only among the Radicals, but also in the Centre, enmity toward the working class grew ever greater. Thus it appeared as if all the bourgeois parties were tending to become one solid, reactionary mass. Indeed, the Reichstag of 1907-1912 witnessed the strange spectacle of a coalition of Conservatives, National Liberals and Radicals, which was succeeded by the formation of a "bloc" of the Protestant Conservatives with the Catholic Centre. All differences between the parties in question seemed to have disappeared. But the same development that thus threw them into each other's arms proved to be also the wedge that drove them asunder: the high cost of living. It was during the life of the last Reichstag, 1907-1912, that universal dearness began to be felt more severely and to rest more heavily upon the population and to render it increasingly discontented—not only the industrial wage workers but also the petty bourgeoisie, professional and salaried employees. Ever louder were their cries for relief—and ever more heavily were they oppressed by the policy

of the Reichstag. For new armaments cost money, money, and ever again money—hence more taxes.

In the conflict over the new taxes the "reactionary mass" fell apart. They were all willing to grant new taxes, but each bourgeois layer did its utmost to keep free of them itself and to throw them upon the shoulders of the others. In this attempt the most shameless of all were the Conservatives, who have long been accustomed to look to the state for material advantages and who considered it nothing less than robbery for them to be required to contribute to the cost of the state. In their endeavors to avoid the burden of the new taxes they found an ally in the agrarian Centre, and on the contrary, an opponent in their former ally, the National Liberal Party. The struggle over the taxes split the reactionary mass into an agrarian wing and an urban wing—the "black-blue bloc" and the Liberals.

In addition to the antagonism of all the bourgeois parties to the Social-Democracy, there was antagonism between the two bourgeois "blocs" which dominated the campaign in the last Reichstag elections. While the Social-Democratic Party gained one million votes and the Radical People's Party three hundred thousand, the National Liberals gained no votes at all. The "black-blue bloc" lost three hundred thousand votes.

But the election districting favored the agrarian wing and procured for it more seats than the number of its votes warranted. It depended upon the attitude of the Social-Democracy in the secondary elections whether or not the agrarian wing was again to win for itself a majority in the Reichstag.

In fact, we succeeded in depriving them of this majority—unfortunately not to the degree of which we had been hopeful and which would have been possible if, in the secondary elections, a portion of the Liberals had not supported the Conservatives. At all events, Conservatives and Centre combined do not form a majority this time.

Naturally, it would have been a delusion to believe that a majority of combined Liberals and Social-Democrats would usher in an era of democracy and social reform. The Liberals not only lack the necessary strength and courage, but above all the desire for it. They are just as hostile to Labor as the "black-blue bloc."

That the latter did not gain a majority signifies a negative, not a positive advantage.

This "black-blue bloc" forms a united mass. If it had the majority it would be able to impart to the government a uniform and decisive trend, and that in the direction of an arbitrary policy of force, both at home and abroad, at the expense of the urban population and in favor of the great land-owners.

That has now become impossible. It was to be expected that the great electoral victory of the Social-Democracy would introduce an era of violence against that party. The Prussian Landtag

shows how the "black-blue bloc" proceeds against us in those places where it predominates. The imperial government now lacks the sure support necessary for such acts of violence. The compulsory laws against the proletariat, which were demanded by the Conservatives, were either not introduced or were voted down. That is the first great success of our electoral policy.

In order to obtain a majority, the government must now seek to bring about a combination of the National Liberals with the "black-blue bloc." To be sure, this was not necessary in the first session of the new Reichstag. For there the government introduced proposals only in regard to the army and navy—and on these questions all the bourgeois parties, without exception, are at one. However, that does not end the matter. The new armaments require new taxes. This question will arise in the next session. And there again terminates the beautiful bourgeois unity.

It is, indeed, to be expected that the government will succeed in bringing the National Liberals and the "black-blue bloc" into one camp. But it can hardly accomplish that without creating rebellion among a considerable portion of the supporters of the National Liberals as well as of the Centre.

A great portion of the National Liberal voters are intellectuals who hate the Centre like sin. They hate the Catholic Church as a sort of competitor, just as the small dealer hates the consumers' co-operatives. Formerly they attached themselves to the National Liberal party chiefly because it waged an energetic battle against the Centre. If now the National Liberal party walks hand in hand with the Centre, that will drive away many of its voters, independent intellectuals and salaried employees. The majority of the former will prefer to give their support to the Radicals, while the latter will be added to the ranks of the Social-Democracy.

On the other hand, the Centre has up to this time been successful in binding to itself great masses of workers, and this by means of its struggle against the government and the National Liberals. In fighting against National-Liberalism the Catholic worker was fighting against capitalism.

Now if the Centre, after having become a government party, also becomes the ally of the National Liberal party, then the eyes of the Catholic workers, who already are wavering and deeply mistrustful, will be fully opened. They will then come over to us *en masse*.

Thus, we have accomplished everything which, in the present situation, it was possible to accomplish by parliamentary means.

Nowadays it is impossible to make up a Reichstag, or any parliament, in such a way as to make it capable of effecting great social and democratic reforms in the absence of violent pressure from without, unless the majority is composed of Socialists. The proletariat can no longer expect anything from any bourgeois

party. A parliament today can of itself create anything great only if it has a Social-Democratic majority.

So long as this is not attainable, we are obliged to limit ourselves to preventing the government from obtaining a safe majority, to depriving it of the power necessary for violent measures against the working class, and we must strive to place the bourgeois parties in the situations in which they found themselves before the election, either to serve the purpose of the proletariat or to lose their proletarian following, in situations in which we are superior to the bourgeois parties.

It was from this standpoint that the last Reichstag electoral campaign was conducted. This Reichstag is powerless to accomplish anything great, as is every parliament with a bourgeois majority in a country with developed capitalistic production. But we have robbed it of the power to commit great acts of violence. And the bourgeois parties are thrown into situations in which they must either desert the government on important questions or else compromise themselves with their own constituents.

In short, the last Reichstag election was a great success, not merely in respect of propaganda, but also practically, and this success was won by means and in circumstances which promise us far greater successes in the future.

The high cost of living continues to rise. Class antagonisms are becoming ever more acute, the mass of the population is becoming more and more embittered against existing conditions. And we are making gigantic strides toward the time when we shall have half of the votes cast, and shortly after that half of the seats in the Reichstag.

But, it is true, the nearer we approach this condition of affairs, so much the nearer do we come to the last, the hardest and most violent struggles, for just so much the more bitter will be the resistance of our opponents.

THE NEW REVIEW

By Bertha W. Howe.

Soul of the working class,
Which is the life of me—
Strength of the toiling mass,
Which speeds the heart of me—
Stamp thy evolving will,
Which is the law of me,
Firm on these pages till
Earth breathes, "Equality!"

THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND THE FARMERS

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING.

Is the American Socialist party introducing an element of populism, or agrarianism, into its program? Has the effort to "capture" the farmer vote led to the abandonment of basic Socialist principles? This question is peculiarly important now that Mr. Roosevelt has provided us with a small capitalist and democratic party, which has adopted a "State Socialist" program even more radical than that of Lloyd George or the Australian Labour party, and is also ready to do anything to capture this same vote.

After studying the subject for four years, the American Socialist party has just adopted a new agrarian program—a program that makes greater concessions to small capitalist agriculturists than any other program that has ever been put forward by a Socialist party. It is at the same time so nearly identical with that of the Progressive party that either one of two results may be expected: Either the Socialist party will be forced to resume the Socialist attitude towards agriculture, which it has just abandoned, or the two parties will ultimately unite in agricultural States.

There are two main questions with regard to agriculture with which Socialists are concerned: (1) What is to be the attitude of the Socialist party toward the farmer as an *owner of land*? (2) What is to be its attitude towards the farmer *in so far as he is an employer*?

Some ultra-revolutionary Socialists and Labor Unionists are disposed to waive the whole question aside by saying simply that the working people have to expropriate all small capitalists, including even farm tenants, because of their ownership of a few thousand or even a few hundred dollars in machinery, cattle, etc.

But this was not the position of Marx, nor is it the position of the majority of the revolutionary Socialists of to-day. It is generally agreed that the mere fact that a farmer owns the tools of his business, including even the farm itself, does not necessarily classify him with the capitalists—provided he is not an employer of labor, or only employs a small amount of labor in emergencies.

Revolutionists have adopted two methods of dealing with this type of agriculturist, who may be called the self-employing farmer. One policy deals with him as an owner, or as a tenant with some of the rights of an owner, which practically amounts to the same thing. Another policy subordinates the question of ownership entirely to the question of how far the farmer is an employer. It was in accord with the first policy that Marx and

Engels included a proposal for land nationalization in the Communist Manifesto in 1847. Among the *transitional measures* there proposed, they demanded "the abolition of property in land, and the application of all land rents to public purposes." The last part of this proposed policy is practically that adopted later by Henry George, as Marx afterwards recognized himself, in a letter written in 1881 to Sorge, of New York. But though Marx favored the single tax idea, he described it, *when administered by capitalists*, as "a Socialistically fringed attempt to save the rule of capitalism, and to establish it in fact on a still larger foundation than at present." In other words, land nationalization, or the "application of all rents to public purposes," is, as long as these public purposes are purely capitalistic, an element of State Socialism or State capitalism, essential in the progress of capitalism, but in no way Socialistic. This measure would not necessarily disturb the farmer's *possession* of his land, but would reduce all agriculturists to the position of tenants of the State—a position undoubtedly easier for the farmer, and, under a far-sighted capitalistic government, more favorable also to the free development of capitalism, and therefore better suited to prepare the ground for Socialism. It would leave the question of agricultural labor, however, practically where it was before.

The second Socialist policy, not necessarily in contradiction to the first, attempted, in the application of the unearned increment (land rent) to public purposes, to discriminate in levying the tax, between the farmer as a worker and the farmer as an employer, in such a way as to make easier the continued *possession* of his farm by the farmer who does all his own labor. This has been the tendency of the French revolutionists, i. e., the "Guesdists," and also of the American party.

A few years ago the American party adopted by referendum the following declaration:

"The Socialist party strives to prevent land from being used *for the purpose of exploitation and speculation*. It demands the collective possession, control or management of land to whatever extent may be necessary to attain that end. It is not opposed to the occupation and possession of land by those using it in a useful, *bona fide* manner, *without exploitation*."

This declaration does not say *how* land is to be prevented from being used for the purpose of exploitation. But there is little doubt that it refers to the traditional Socialist policy of extending national ownership of land wherever possible, together with the encouragement of co-operation among the government's tenants or of direct operation by local and national governments, and where nationalization is not feasible, the taxing away of the full rental value, and the use of the money so obtained either for the promotion of agricultural co-operation, science and education, etc., or for other social reform purposes. In other

words, this new policy fits in very well with the older revolutionary attitude.

The proposal just made by Vaillant, in France, is along the lines of this approved Socialist policy. The government is to acquire all lands that are for sale. Some of these lands are to be exploited by associations of laborers. Small properties are to remain in the possession of the present possessors, who are to pay to the State a rent, which is not to exceed the differential rent due to fertility or situation. If the *maximum* rent here mentioned is charged, then the small farmer is neither subsidized by the State nor is he exploited by exceptional rents due to exceptional local scarcity of, or exceptional local demand for land.

But now, since the adoption of the new program at Indianapolis, this very carefully considered Socialist land policy is almost completely abandoned. In the first place, a group of mere State Socialist reforms, excellent in themselves, are offered as instalments of Socialism. A. M. Simons, who is the chief exponent and sponsor of the new policy, disagrees completely with Marx. Marx says that the capitalists in their agrarian measures, as well as other reforms, are proposing "a Socialistically fringed attempt to save the rule of capitalism, and to establish it in fact on a still larger foundation than at present," and he expects the capitalists to have a very great, if temporary, success in this direction. Simons, on the contrary, states that "the capitalist parties do nothing whatever for the farmer." At the Indianapolis convention Simons said: "We must go to the farmer, and show him that he cannot be relieved while he is being ridden by the capitalist class, and that we alone come to him with the gospel of freedom, of liberty, of emancipation," etc.

Yet Mr. Roosevelt's party has since appeared, as was to be expected, and offers the farmers the larger part of the new Socialist agrarian program—with the prospect moreover of winning the control of the government in 1916, whereas the Socialist party has no such prospect. Why, indeed, should not the small capitalist parties advance the interests of the small capitalist farmers, who compose a majority of their supporters?

Simons, moreover, makes no very sharp distinction between the many classes of farmers. None of his propositions—and none of the propositions of the Socialist platform or of the "resolution" on the farmer adopted at the Convention—makes any distinction whatever, as the above quoted declaration did, between a farmer who is an employer and a farmer who is not an employer. The platform demands, where collective ownership is "impracticable," "the appropriation by taxation of the annual rental value of all land held for speculation or exploitation." In order that the party's former position should be maintained, it should have demanded "the appropriation by taxation of the annual rental of all land held for speculation and exploitation, i. e., operated through

the employment of wage labor, except in emergencies, such as the harvest season." For the phrase "exploitation" is ambiguous to the non-Socialist public to which it is now addressed. Not one farmer out of a hundred will realize that it means to Socialists the exploitation of wage labor, though the discussion at the convention of 1910 showed this to have been the original meaning. Farmer employers may thus be led to vote the Socialist ticket because of our small capitalist and agrarian platform of State Socialist reforms, and on the supposition that the expropriation of "land held for speculation and exploitation" is only a stronger way of saying "the expropriation of land held for speculation." For to the average agriculturist the only "exploitation" in modern society is that of the large landholder. In a word, we are making a bid for the votes of those very agriculturists we intend to expropriate, namely, the employers.

Not only is the farm employer more highly favored than the farm laborer, to whom practically nothing is immediately offered, but the Socialist party of America has taken a reactionary step. The application of *all* land rent to public purposes is no longer demanded. Exception is made not only for the farmer who does all his own labor, but also for the large agricultural employer, provided only he happens to reside on his farm, or estate, and exploits the workers directly as laborers, instead of exploiting them indirectly as tenants. The exploiter of tenants is to be abolished, the exploiter of labor is to be favored by allowing him, as well as the small farmer who does all his own labor, to retain the land rent.

The third perversion of Socialist principle is seen in the resolution referred to, as presented by A. M. Simons. In this resolution we find the ownership and operation of farms by the national, state and local governing bodies referred to as "socially operated farms." On the contrary, until the Socialists control the government, all such governmental, state, municipal or community farms would be not *socially* operated, but *governmentally* operated by a capitalistic administration. In a word, this is pure state capitalism, a policy which, as Marx says, will be undertaken by the capitalists themselves. The same is true, of course, of the government ownership and operation of railroads, as already practised in all great capitalistic countries, except Great Britain and the United States, and also of all the other government ownership measures mentioned in the Indianapolis resolution on farming, and in the platform.

The resolution says further that the "elimination of farm tenantry and the development of socially owned and operated agriculture will open new opportunities to the agricultural wage worker, and free him from the tyranny of the private employer." Undoubtedly "socially owned and operated agriculture" would have this effect, but agricultural enterprises owned and operated

by capitalistic governments may even have the opposite effect. The laborer may be saved from the tyranny of the private employer only to fall into a more servile, if more humane, tyranny on the part of the employing capitalistic state, county or municipality.

This resolution, moreover, demands the progressive taxation only of rented lands and lands held for speculation, dropping the platform phrase "exploitation" entirely. And finally it demands that public lands shall be rented to landless farmers at the customary rental, but that the entire land shall be free of rent as soon as the total payments equal its value. In a word, this resolution, which is called a special farmer's program, provides for a form of possession which is almost equivalent to private ownership, at least for life—and it says nothing against the right of inheritance of this tenant right. The party moreover permits its state organizations to go still further. Oklahoma demands that the payment of rent up to the full value of the land shall give the right of occupancy free of rent not only to the tenant but also to his children, while Texas entirely rejects the national platform at one point and demands that that state "rent land to landless farmers at a nominal rent."

Simons, indeed, spoke the truth when he wrote just before the Indianapolis convention that in America "whatever Socialism does with agriculture, it will do in co-operation with and in obedience to the wishes of the farmer." Indeed, it was insisted that the committee which drew up the resolution above mentioned should be composed exclusively of farmers. Just who *the* farmer is may be seen from the government statistics, which show that the labor wage bill of *the average farmer* in the various sections of the North varies from \$225 to \$600 a year. The farmer, in other words, is not only a small property owner, but he is also, as a rule, a small capitalist employer, and it is certainly true that the Socialist party has now gone as far as any party could possibly go to bid for the support of this small capitalist element.

If we follow closely the language of the platform we can see this populist element still more clearly. Every time the party platform refers to the capitalist class as being "few in number," it suggests to the reader that only the trusts and large capitalist elements are referred to. Moreover, the word "plutocracy" is frequently used instead of the words "class rule," and a "plutocracy" is precisely the term applied by Bryan and Roosevelt to the large capitalists. Not only this, but it is suggested that he present "regulative" measures against the plutocracy are as far as the reformers may be expected to go, while government ownership must be left to the Socialists, ignoring the measures towards government ownership now taken by capitalist governments in every country of the world except the United States, and even begun here in Alaska and Panama. The platform refers

to "the present day revolution" through which we are passing as a transition from economic individualism to Socialism, and suppresses the obvious fact that in America, as well as all over the world, it is a period also of capitalistic government ownership or State Socialism. And finally, it mentions as the immediate cause of high prices only the trusts, and does not mention the fact, referred to even in the Roosevelt platform, that the value of farm lands rose thirteen billion dollars from 1900 to 1910, which was reflected in the doubling of agricultural prices, and was a far more important element in these high prices than all the trusts put together.

Of course an unambiguous attack on land rent in general would have displeased all the farmer landowners, down to the smallest, including even those tenants who expect to become landowners (whether by the aid of the capitalists or of the present Socialist party), and would have deprived us of many votes. There is no doubt, as the platform states, that the farmers, like all the rest of the population, are plundered by the great capitalists. But the plunder that a very large part of the farmers secure from the consumers of agricultural products through these high prices is very much greater. The platform even goes so far as to say that it is "the farmers" who are plundered by "extortionate rent." This is true of two million tenants. There would be equal truth in the proposition that "the farmers"—a million or two, at least—are plundering the workers, and are being made comparatively rich by "extortionate rent." But this fact is not even mentioned.

A very strong side-light on this populist movement is thrown by our Vice-Presidential candidate, as well as many other prominent Socialists. In his speech of acceptance of his nomination, Seidel identified capitalism with "corporate wealth," and said that this was the same thing against which Governor Altgeld, Mayor Tom Johnson, and the populists had been fighting. In other words, Seidel reduces capitalism to the large capitalists, and thus makes the strongest possible bid for small capitalist support.

Before concluding, it might be well to glance at the chief argument by which Simons supports the new populist policy. He says that it is about time to quit talking about maintaining the small farmer in the ownership of his farm, and that capitalism is abolishing that condition in agriculture as it has already abolished it in industry. That is to say, because certain groups of small farmers tend economically to disappear, Simons concludes that there is no way by which capitalism can or will save them, and that the Socialists will offer them their only salvation. He says with perfect truth that a more and more expensive equipment is required on farms, that their value has doubled, and that this erects an impassable barrier between the landless farmer and the instruments essential to his existence. It is perfectly true that

this barrier is impassable *except through government aid*. But the history of France, Austria, Russia, Ireland, Denmark, Australia, New Zealand and many other countries, shows that this aid is forthcoming from capitalistic governments, and that by artificial encouragement, such as the measures now proposed by the Socialist party in this country, capitalistic governments will save a very large part of the small farmers from bankruptcy, and attach them permanently to the capitalist political parties.

Simons argues that the only types of farm which are showing a very rapid tendency to increase are the very large, which can supply themselves with the very best machinery, and the very small, the latter being of the market gardening variety, or in cases where the land is rented to tenants who are practically in the position of laborers (as we see in our South). Let us, therefore, look at the figures.

In this country the majority of the farms in the chief agricultural sections originally had 160 acres, and were worked without any steadily employed labor. Only the census groups of farms from 175 to 500 acres are therefore considered large, and only those of more than 500 acres as very large, i. e., as liberating the owner from manual labor. As many farms in the richer sections have been divided into two or three parts by inheritance, 80 acre and 50 acre farms are now very common, and usually employ all the labor of the family, even when far from market and used for extensive farming (the production of grain, or the fattening of cattle). The census then shows the following result:

Size of Farms.	Per Cent. of Total Number of Farms in Each Group.	
	1900	1910
Very small farms (49 acres or less)	33.6	35.4
Small farms (50 to 174 acres)	48.6	46.5
Moderately large farms (175 to 499 acres)	15.1	15.4
Very large farms (over 500 acres)	2.6	2.8

These facts are of the utmost significance. If only the "very small" and "very large" farms were growing rapidly, then undoubtedly Simons would be right, and we would soon have the farmers lining up clearly on one or the other side in the class struggle, either as large employers, or as proletarians owning their own tools. But the fact that the moderately large farmer, i. e., the farmer who has the double advantage of being able to use a large part of the best machinery on the one hand, and on the other hand the economic advantage of his personal labor and that of his family, and of rigid supervision of his labor, is also increasing in numbers, makes a possible ground of safety to which small farmers may and usually do hope to attain.

Moreover, while the "small" farms (50 to 175 acres) form a

smaller and smaller proportion of the total, they are increasing absolutely. In 1900 there were 2,788,300 such farms, in 1910 they had increased to 2,948,978. It would take twenty-five years at the present rate before the "very small" farmers equalled the "small" farmers in number. In the meanwhile the value of land is rising rapidly, as well as the value of cattle, while the amount of machinery, fertilizer, and number and grade of cattle used are increasing with equal rapidity. The "small farms" are decreasing slowly in average size, but not in capital employed. Even the "small" farmers are prospering enormously from the rapid rise in farm values, though they are gaining less than the "very small" and the "moderately large" and "very large."

This "small farm" group (if we measured by capital, instead of measuring by land) is probably decreasing neither absolutely nor relatively. In the meanwhile it represents nearly three million voters, and may secure many forms of aid from a state capitalist government of the Progressive type, which may even increase its relative importance compared to the other groups. Moreover, it will be seen that the farmer of this class has every reason to hope to rise into the farming class above him and become a prosperous employer.

Simons' prediction at the Convention has, indeed, come true, that whatever Socialism did with agriculture, it would do "in co-operation with and in obedience to the wishes of the farmer." And we cannot be surprised if European Socialists regard our present policy as an absolute surrender to the small agricultural capitalists. As the report of the Indianapolis convention in the Berlin "Vorwaerts" pointed out, its attitude on the land question is a most surprising one.

Twenty years ago, when the Populist party was at its height, there might have been more excuse for such a surrender. For it seemed at that time that a majority of our agricultural population, including all but the largest farmers, were being driven rapidly towards Socialism. But conditions have not only changed since that time; they have been *completely reversed*. The year 1892 was the end of a period of two decades of falling agricultural prices. The year 1912 succeeded two decades of rising agricultural prices. It seems that this tendency will continue henceforth without serious interruption. Up till 1892 large sections of new land were being opened to cultivation, not only in America but all over the world. Since that time this process has become very much slower, and the growth of manufacturing all over the world has now become far more rapid than the opening up of new lands. Therefore the demand for agricultural products has risen far more rapidly than the supply. The result is that, whereas new capital is going into agriculture more rapidly than ever, it goes into a higher price for the old land, into machinery, into the hire of labor,

and into improvements of land and cattle—and not, as previously, into the opening up of new land.

Not only the small farm owner, but also the owner of farm animals, has profited enormously during the last twenty years. This process is likely to continue, and if it shows any sign of abatement the reforms of state capitalism will, no doubt, reinvigorate it. For the Socialist party at this time to take up the position of the Populists of 1892 is, then, a perfectly useless and futile proceeding.

The populism of today, moreover, is no longer a purely agrarian movement. The movement for government control of monopolies is about to swallow it up, and the Roosevelts and La Follettes will be able amply to satisfy the overwhelming majority of farm owners (as well as a large part of the farm tenants) without sacrificing the other business interests they represent, namely, all elements of the capitalist class, with the sole exception of the trusts, the large bankers and the railroads.

As the Roosevelt and La Follette movement is almost certain to sweep everything before it in this country within a few years, there is, fortunately, little danger that the American Socialist party will be able to continue long in its present un-Socialist and impracticable agrarian policy in competition with these outright small capitalist parties. Already there are signs in the Socialist party press (for example, the New York Volkszeitung) that the advent of a third, or radical, party in this country may be welcomed by Socialists of all shades, except the most opportunistic, as compelling us all to re-unite on a purely revolutionary and proletarian program.



THE ROCHESTER CONVENTION OF THE A. F. OF L.

BY MAX S. HAYES.

The last convention of the American Federation of Labor, held at Rochester, N. Y., in November, was unquestionably the largest and most interesting gathering ever held by that body.

The proceedings were noteworthy in two essential features, viz.: The unusually small number of jurisdictional disputes that were brought upon the floor, and the aggressive debates that were precipitated by those delegates who are Socialists, against the political policies advocated by President Gompers and his friends, as well as upon the subjects of industrial unionism, the Hatters' case, the referendum election of officers, and several other questions.

In fact, political action and industrial unionism cropped out in nearly every discussion from the beginning to the end of the convention, and "a certain party" received more attention and free and ungrudging advertising from Republicans, Democrats, Bull Moosers and Mugwumps than all other parties combined.

The absence of jurisdictional squabbles can best be explained by the fact that a number of the international unions have amalgamated or were allied in departments, while several have been thrown out because they refused to merge with kindred organizations.

It has become quite the fashion for certain wiseacres and soothsayers who think they know all about organization on the industrial field to inform the rest of humanity that the A. F. of L., whose laws and history they never bother about reading, is uncompromisingly committed to craft unionism and opposed to the industrial form of organization.

However, such is not the case. It is true that the Federation when originally formed, and up to within recent years, adhered strongly to craft autonomy. The reason was perhaps logical enough when it is explained that the United States was, until the centralization of capital began in earnest less than a score of years ago, a new and typically individualistic country; that the tools of production were distributed in thousands of independent companies and cheap land still afforded a means of escape for mechanics who began to feel the oncoming machinery glacier.

The crude industrialism of the Knights of Labor, with their autocratic power, naturally created a period of reaction when dissolution set in, and for a time it was a case of everybody for himself and the devil take the hindmost. International unions by the dozens sprang into existence, applied for admission, and were admitted to the Federation, and their officers became ambitious to build up large memberships and shine as great leaders, even if it was necessary to encroach upon their neighbors' preserves in the matter of securing recruits and jobs for their members.

But at no time has the A. F. of L. prohibited international unions in a given industry from combining their forces. Indeed, the Federation has upon numerous occasions encouraged kindred organizations to unite, and has even gone to the extreme of expelling international unions for refusing to merge into larger organizations. Thus the engineers in the mines were unseated

because they declined to merge into the United Mine Workers, the car workers were expelled last year for refusing to join the larger body in that trade, and the Amalgamated Carpenters were ousted because they would not join the Brotherhood. This year the steamfitters had their charter revoked on account of their refusal to merge into the international union of plumbers, steamfitters, gasfitters, etc., who have been given complete jurisdiction over the pipefitting industry.

On the other hand there was but one industrial organization ousted for resisting the encroachments of craft unions, and that was the United Brewery Workers, who were re-admitted at the succeeding convention, and the delegates virtually admitted their error in that instance by adopting a law that in future no organization can be expelled except by a two-thirds vote. The unions now classified as industrialist have fully that number of votes and can block any further attack upon their principles by a resort to such drastic methods.

The fact of the matter is that the tendency is now stronger toward industrial unionism than at any time in the Federation's history. The point of division comes, as it did at Rochester, regarding the methods that should be used to gain the end. Eleven years ago, at the Scranton convention, the Federation recommended that the affiliated unions, wherever possible, combine or establish trade councils to secure unity of action. At Rochester it was proposed that the pressure of compulsion be substituted for the voluntary plan, and the craft unionists rallied their followers by condemning the use of force to achieve industrial unionism.

Many of us are inclined to become impatient at the apparently slow progress that is made to organize and combine the workers along industrial lines, but after all it is wholly a matter of education and a clear understanding of their material interests on the part of the toilers.

And it is as certain as the sun shines that the invention and perfection of machinery and the concentration of capital (the forces from without) will hasten the amalgamation of labor, and if the present leaders do not rise to the occasion and encourage the movement, but rather retard it, they will be retired to make room for broader and more progressive men who grasp the truths of evolution. A number of conservative officials have already been supplemented by radicals and other changes are impending.

Throughout the political discussions the lines were quite closely drawn between the delegates who are Socialists on the one side, and all other partisans on the other. The latter, in supporting the administration's policy of "rewarding our friends and punishing our enemies," were very careful to mask their methods with the cry of being "partisan to trade union principles." In not a single instance did the Republicans, Democrats or Bull Moosers undertake to defend the parties with which they affiliate, and it was truly amusing to note the manner in which they met the attacks of the radicals by seeking to make themselves believe that the Socialists are not good trade unionists and really a bad lot of disturbers and wholly unpractical.

Nevertheless the Socialists represented fully one-fourth of the vote in the convention and also had quite a respectable number of sympathizers, who for trade and other reasons deemed it the best policy to support the administration for a while longer.

This fact was brought strongly to my attention, having been nominated as a candidate against President Gompers by delegates who desired to register their protest against the policies that he typefies. In numerous instances I was assured that were it not for the fact that they were "tied up" or felt

under obligations to the administration, they would volunteer their support, and in every such case the delegates were assured that their judgment would be respected.

To sum up, while no startling innovation resulted from the Rochester meeting, every observing delegate agreed that there was a strong and favorable undercurrent running toward more progressive industrial and political action. And judging from the general sentiment that exists in every avenue of life today, this tendency is bound to continue in the labor movement for some years to come.

A. D. 1913

BY LOUISE W. KNEELAND.

"We work so long!
We work so long!"
Down through the years
The children cry.
Theirs is no song.
A bitter cry,
A weary sigh.
"We work so long!"
Theirs is no song.

The night is dark!
The night is dark!
Along the streets
Lean misery
Now skulks and creeps.
And soon, oh hark!
A shuddering moan,
A stifled shriek,
Oh hear, oh hark,
One goes alone
Into the dark.

Oh hearts that break,
Oh hearts that break,
'Tis death in life
That you forsake.
A bitter cry,
A weary sigh.
Theirs is no song.
The children cry:
"We work so long!"
And the years go by.

WOODROW WILSON IN THE WHITE HOUSE

BY J. WILLIAM LLOYD.

I like to think of Woodrow Wilson in the White House—this amateur reformer, this carpet-knight of politics, this academic professor of economics, who is to sink his little stone of tariff revision into the forehead of Giant Privilege, this new Joshua who will bid the sun of business evolution stand still.

This good man with his strong Yankee face, his touch of the Puritan, his bourgeois Americanism, so sure of his country, his people; that things have only gone a little wrong and can easily be tinkered into shape again by a well-educated, respectable man.

What surprises wait for him.

Confidently and honestly he will begin, sure of the loyal support of all these brainy men, these sound and incorruptible Americans who worked with such zeal and devotion to bring him to the Presidential chair.

And then the cobwebs will descend upon him. A gossamer net will entangle—O fine as spider's silk—so easy to brush aside, yet someway never removed; so fragile, it breaks with a touch, yet always clinging, clinging, always invisibly restored. There are strange mists upon the landscape, and little midgets to dance before his eyes that he is troubled to see clearly. It is not that he cannot see, but things do not look the same. It is not so simple as it was.

He essays the political machinery. It seems to be well-oiled, it appears to obey, to move easily, yet, someway, it does not yield the expected results. There are unlooked for obstacles there. There is strange lack of coordination. The wheel to which he gives personal attention, the lever in his hand, may work right, but somewhere else the cogs slip, the wheels stop or else turn unaccountably in the wrong direction. He begins to be afraid of this powerful thing that is so little under his control. He thought he understood it, but he does not.

He loses confidence. He turns to his advisers, but they, too, have experienced a subtle change. Their very faces do not look the same. There seems to be a creeping lethargy. These men who were such dashing champions in the campaign, who worked with such eloquence, courage and marvelous efficiency to elect him, have now become sleepy and weak, or else mysteriously different. If he tries to waken them and urge them on, they show unexpected inertness, caution or timidity. They begin to warn him of dangers and catastrophies if he moves too fast. He will upset business, paralyze industry, throw men out of work, impoverish his friends, create widespread disaster, they tell him, and he sees it is true. A cautious and conservative man himself, these warnings lessen his initiative and energy more than he would have thought. He has the right outlook, his is the true remedy undoubtedly, but even this remedy, discreet as he had thought it, must be applied very gradually or conditions will be worse than before.

And so the machinery works, but the product is suspiciously like what it was before, only the name has been changed. The men work (and draw their salaries—O they draw their salaries!) but nothing new gets done. He himself begins to feel like a man on a

treadmill, or a race horse on a stage—he is certainly moving, working hard, going on, but after all it is in the same place.

Slowly he begins to realize that those he depends upon to help him but are not to be trusted. A secret satotage prevails, which does his work, but does it against him. A veiled treachery is everywhere, and if he pushes too hard, it may not be so veiled either. So long as he only seems to be doing things, so long as masquerades can be maintained and a sort of moving-picture show twirled before the public, leaving the real business world behind unchanged, just so long these fellow workers are cordially his servants and admirers. They are willing to work with all their powers for forms and appearances—a Maya of illusion—but when real effective work seems doing they feel the frigid pedal, grow indifferent, perhaps, in the last resort hostile. They have all sorts of good reasons—personal idiosyncrasies, legal technicalities, preferences for other methods, conscientious scruples and questions of principle, qualms of sympathy—the reasons are all good and urged by sensitive and honorable men, but in the end they all amount to the same thing, and that thing—*laissez faire*.

Bread pills, sugar pills, colored water, all these are popular and will be heartily praised and earnestly administered, placebos are acclaimed, but the moment a radical remedy is suggested or a surgeon's knife reached for, then doctors and nurses alike do nothing or do all wrong. The cynical truth may at last be come out with that the patient is profitable and a cure inexpedient.

Is this picture somewhat overdrawn? Perhaps it is. Things may not always be so bad as this. Some good men and true will rally round Woodrow Wilson with a faith and sincerity equal to his own, who will honestly work with him in all good faith. He will get some of his remedies applied exactly as he wants them. Let us hope so—the more the better. But then will come the worst discouragement of all. For then will this Knight of Restored Competition and the Revised Tariff find that his best lances, though delivered on the very breastplate of the foe, are but rotten punk and unhorse nobody.

We Socialists have no reason to regret his election. For years the Republican party has tried, or professed to try, to regulate trusts and hold down the cost of living. Its failure has been before all men's eyes. The Democrats have clamored for opportunity to try their remedies. And the people, always naturally conservative, were bound to give them that chance. It was the next and an inevitable step. For it seems so simple and self-evident to the average man that if the tariff were taken off beef, free beef from South America's pampas would lower the price of meat. And it would for a moment, in fact, until the Beef Trust could buy up all the cattle in South America and all the steamships that brought beef—and what then?

The Democrats had to have their chance. And when they have had it, and have also failed, the issue will be more clear. Swiftly and soon now the time is coming when the lines will be drawn, with the Socialists standing for Human Benefits first and above all things, on one side; and the Anti-Socialists, standing without disguise for the rule of Private Profit and the servitude of the working masses, on the other.

Speed the day!

POETS TO THE FORE

BY ANDRE TRIDON.

Two hundred friends of art have pledged themselves to subscribe fifty dollars a year for five years for the purpose of financing a magazine called the "Poetry Magazine," which is published in Chicago. In Boston, William Stanley Braithwaite is editing another newly-born little magazine known as the "Poetry Journal." In New York, Mitchell Kennerley has put forth the "Lyric Year," which contains one hundred poems by as many American bards. I feel confident that the year 1913 will see more Maecenas' drawing checks for poetical purposes and more Kennerleys following the example set twenty years ago by dear old Lemerre.

Modern inventions and novel art formulas usually begin by eliciting sneers from America. Then, all of a sudden, they are adopted, be they wireless telegraphy or grand opera, on a scale undreamed of by plodding Europe. If the day of Poetry has dawned, let us rejoice.

It is too early to pass judgment upon the two young publications that are to open their columns from top to bottom to many a poem which magazines rejected because it would run over a page, and to display in the proper place many a gem which the daily press would have appended as a filler to financial reports or cookery recipes.

They will in the regular course of their existence modify their shape, their type, their policy. In a year from now, we shall be better able to place a valuation upon their accomplishments or their endeavors. With all due respect to a publisher who fearlessly breaks away from the beaten path, we must confess to finding the Lyric Year distinctly depressing. We confidently hope that this impression is caused by the editor's unwise selection of the one hundred poems making up the book, and not by the poet's actual barrenness. Be it said right here that Ferdinand Earle was not guilty of the indiscretion committed by John Corbin who, when literary advisor to the New Theatre, rejected one thousand plays and accepted only one by John Corbin. No poem of Earle's has been smuggled into this collection, and this is a matter for regret, for few of Earle's poems are as commonplace as the majority of the pieces included in the Lyric Year. Most of them are lacking in human interest, in universal appeal. International localism should be the test of good poetry, as it is of all other arts. When a human trait is especially emphasized in one section of the world, whoever fails to grasp it and visualize it for the rest of mankind, lacks the gift of artistic perception. Whoever sees it only in its local narrowness as some professional Irish do, who distress typesetters by their use of the Gaelic vocabulary for tenderness and geography, is but a village rhymster. In the "Poetry Journal," for instance, a certain Seosamh MacCathmhaoil asks us to grow excited over Clíodhna's curachs. Personally, I never cared for curachs and I wonder how many people would like them even prepared in the Clíodhna way.

On the other hand, it is inexpressibly cloying to see men and women of the year 1912 turning everlastingly to time-worn subjects. Thus we read tortured preciousness addressed to a thrush that "tinges the presaged dole with sweet," to quote Augustine Daly, who further favors us with "teen-touched

joy" and "chrysmal music." Why should springtime still spur the platitudinous to marshal forth catalogued stereotypes:

April calling, April calling, April calling me!
I hear the voice of April there in each old apple tree;
Bee-boom and wild perfume, and wood-brook melody—
O hark, my heart, and hear, my heart, the April ecstasy!

and this is signed Madison Cawein.

Why so many odes to Browning indited in the most involved Sordello-like stylistic whorls? Why so many descriptions, more or less hypocritically edited, of "what I saw in a dream," the action of the dream being generally set in the red plush upholstery which to many simple souls is typical of heaven's decoration. And yet the value of localism has been demonstrated forcefully by Whitman, expressive of the surge of a new race; by Sinclair, notwithstanding his outbreaks of immaturity, who put before us the two sides of the epic of meat; by Jack London, primitive psychologist, who gave us the thrill of the Northwest; by Norris, the epic bard of wheat, of the plainman's wheat, of the gambler's wheat; by Robert Herrick, who analyzed the artificial fetters that weight down modern American mates; by Edith Wharton, who in some of her short stories and in *Ethan Frome* revealed the heartaches hidden under sham regional self-control.

Why doesn't some of that localism trickle into contemporaneous poetry? "We are in the market," a celebrated vulgarian of the editorial world wrote to a poet, "for the poem which will appeal to the wife of a Middle-Western barber." Was Ferdinand Earle moved by such considerations when he gathered together the one hundred poems of the Lyric Year, or were the poets who sent in their contributions moved by thoughts of success attained through such channels, or is the Lyric Year a doleful monument to the impotency of American poetry? For ninety-five out of these hundred writers do not even possess power. They sing of fauns, of flutes and bowers and only succeed in evoking libidinous clerks disporting themselves in the shadows of Central Park while a brass band is playing. The men's love is a rehash of the sonnets to the dark lady; the women's love is merely vociferous and hysterical.

The contributions from women to the Lyric Year, some forty poems, can be disregarded on the whole. Almost all are poems of artificial, insincere passion, wherein a fountain pen waxes promiscuous. This is what Gautier called "*épater le bourgeois*." These ill-advised females whom we suspect of being hideously decorous in their amatory activities, imagine themselves the spirit daughters of Swinburne, while they are only country cousins of Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

There is genius, however, in the Lyric Year, though it is not to be found among the prize-calves. Three judges enthused over something vague and rambling called "Second Avenue," which could equally well be entitled *The Flatiron Corner*, Ellis Island, Hoboken or Harlem; over a long, insistent discourse on nothing, called "A Ritual for a Funeral"; over "Renascence," another pseudo-mythical dream affair; over a Browning ode, and over Mr. Daly's contribution on what is a thrush and why.

In no more than five poems does the note of individuality and power sound unmistakably. Percy Adams Hutchinson, taking the old subject of Custer's fight (not as old, though, as the subject of spring) carved in bronze and marble a thrilling group of red men and white men; every syllable of his short twelve lines rings like the flight of bullets or the clatter of hoofs.

Montagu Donner's "Jetsam," written in memory of the Titanic horror, suffers a little from formalism and verbal search, but is powerful and modern in every sense of the word. The passage describing the scenes of disorder on the decks of the sinking steamer is little short of classic. Ludwig Lewi-sohn's "Saturnalia" is a passionate word triptych, painted with the healthy brutality of Bellows or Glackens.

James Oppenheim's "Pittsburg" and Louis Untermeyer's "Caliban in the Coal Mines" are the most interesting examples of international localism it has been our joy to observe in recent poetry. Untermeyer's poem is perhaps the most striking of all the one hundred. Was the fact that it has only ten lines held against it when the judges came to awarding prizes? The prize-winning pieces are all long-winded affairs. Do Earle, Braithwaite, and Wheeler judge poetry as editorial accountants pay for it?

Here is Untermeyer's masterpiece:

God, we don't like to complain,
We know that the mines are no lark,
But—there's the pools from the rain,
But—there's the cold and the dark.

God, you don't know what it is;
You, in Your well-lighted sky,
Watching a meteor whizz—
Warm, with the sun always by.

God, if You had but the moon
Stuck in Your cap for a lamp,
Even You'd tire of it soon
Down in the dark and the damp

Nothing but blackness above,
And nothing that moves but the cars—
God, in return for our love,
Fling us a handful of stars!

For giving to this short poem a fitting and dignified frame, Mr. Kennerley deserves many thanks. For the sake of "Caliban," and of the four other poems mentioned, the Lyric Year will probably escape damnation.

THE FAREWELL

BY CHARLES VILDRAC.

(Translated by Sasha Best.)

When the great ship gorged with water had sunk to the bottom of the sea, when its huge body was still sucking down with it all the debris and rubbish lying round about; when at all four corners of the night the little boats had perished, each unperceived by the others; each under a huge mountainous wave that stifled its last ories; when the fierce roaring sea had effaced on

itself all marks of the disaster,—lo, there was still on the waters one living man who was swimming.

He knew that the shore was very far, and that before, with a cry of joy, he would feel under his stretched toes the land that welcomes the shipwrecked, he would be spent and exhausted, and he knew that he must eat and sleep.

He knew his fate but too well. But he believed himself strong, and wished to spend calmly his last hours, his last strength, wished to spend to slow and pious profit the last warmth of his body, the last light of his soul; and so he let himself be borne along on the deep and frantic waters, that now lifted him high up on the crest of its waves, now dashed him down, blind and dizzy, to the foot of the high and moving walls.

Like a charge of rams came the huge waves, and made his body bound and rebound on the horns of their lowered fronts. Dams burst before him, mountains crashed over him, and showers of hail burst over him and played around his head; the frantic water engulfed him and tried to dissolve him, and for one moment of eternity this enormous liquid uproar became part of him.

Then for an instant around him was a sudden lull. The sea, having given itself a respite, became as calm as the air, and he heard but the rustling of little shreds of foam. The lone swimmer recovered his senses and drank in the air like a new world.

This lasted until dawn. To last longer and to save his failing strength, he no longer swam, but allowed the waters to carry him along. Then at last the cold benumbed him, and then only did he lose the last blind hope of his flesh, then only did he lose that superb courage that comes to men from the habit of their victories, and from the docility of conquered worlds, then only was he invaded by great and solemn truth.

Deep down in the soul of this man was a being unknown to him, a being simple still, and rich, with a child's confidingness; a being to whom it seemed incredible that nature could at times become, even to her preferred guest, even to her most dearly loved child, a fierce, dark stranger, despotic and without mercy. And suddenly in the depth of this man's soul appeared another being, an exile overcome with astonishment, a stranger filled with grief, and the sea with its noise, its movement, its stretch and its volume, filled him with horror.

He drove from his senses the noise of the water, and closing his eyes, allowed his mind to wander away.

And he saw a city bathed in sunshine. Beautiful new shoes were creaking with quick steps on bright, clean pavements. All along the shops behind the blinds, he heard the clocks tick, sounding mid-day.

By the light of a night-lamp he saw a closed room in which a family was peacefully sleeping. He heard the noise of the breathing, intermingled in regular rhythm. Leaning over the

beds he saw two children sleeping together, heavy with damp slumber, their bodies uncovered and tucked closely together into the hollow of the bed, like two young kittens.

Then he saw a garden, where a young girl was watering the flowers, with one hand holding up her dress, with the other carefully balancing the heavy watering can, thus distributing a refreshing shower over the flowers, and very careful not to wet the ends of her shoes. The small clusters of foliage seemed to rustle in contented response, and their damp fragrance was wafted to him; there also came to him the noise of steps crackling on the gravel of the garden path.

Then also he saw streets on which were thronged idlers, who, seated on chairs, drinking and smoking, were watching the passing crowd. And he saw soldiers playing and wrestling with each other in the courtyard of the barracks.

Hollow roads he saw, and fields of wheat, and broad thoroughfares, where one bids God-speed to those who pass.

And then, in a last vision, he saw the beautiful kingdom where human thoughts are exchanged; where all is closely intermingled and joined together on earth in one great union, and where all continues itself in one single embrace.

And then it was that he burned to speak words in adoration of this great universal kingdom. He burned to say them out aloud, to hear them with his own ears, once again to know the genius of words, once again to hear the sound of a voice.

And he spoke as one who prays, and he uttered in the midst of the sea, the words that serve to love and to praise. He sought them all, and said them over and over, as he who is dying sucks a fruit; and when his reeling brain no longer found them, he began to sing, because sing he must to quench his great thirst of song and words—he began to sing his great farewell, farewell without words.

And sing he must, and so he sang. And it was the most beautiful song of sorrow, of love, of sadness ever sung by man; it was man's most poignant song!

He had subdued in his mind the tenacious voices of the sea; and in his soul there reigned supreme this song, greater than the grandest organ—but he was alone to hear it! And it melted in the wind like the snowflake on the water.

With chattering teeth he continued to sing, and hot drops of water burned his eyelids. But it was not the water of the sea!

SOCIALISM AS IT IS

A Survey of the World-Wide Revolutionary Movement by
WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

WHAT SOCIALISTS SAY:

J. G. Phelps Stokes: "The most illuminating work that has appeared on the present socialist movement."

The New York Call: "Impartial. . . Exceedingly useful and informative, particularly to active Socialists."

Professor Jacques Loeb: "The best and most scholarly presentation of the subject that has yet fallen into my hands."

The International Socialist Review: "The most important contribution to the history of present-day Socialism that has appeared for years."

James O'Neal in The Chicago Evening World: "One of the most original and suggestive studies of Socialism and the Socialist movement published in recent years. . . . In his criticism of the reformers and revisionists in the Socialist parties he is generously fair, and there is no trace of invective. Most of it we consider sound and in thorough accord with Socialist principles and policies."

The New Age (London): "Readers will find in his work the best account yet written of the actual working of the Socialist movement in Europe, America and Australia; an account, moreover, as luminous, as detailed and exact, and as lucid and subordinate to the main purpose of the work as fair-minded. For the sections devoted to the exposition of what Socialism is, indeed, no praise can be too high."

WHAT NON-SOCIALISTS SAY:

The Montreal Star: "So far as we are aware, the best exposition of this great movement that has appeared in the English language."

Rev. Lyman Abbott: "With the clearness characteristic of a radical, who has no favors to ask and no fears to perplex him, you have made the issue perfectly plain."

The Boston Advertiser: "The latest of several expositions of Socialism by Americans affiliated with the Socialist party impresses us as the best, being most vigorous and thoughtful."

The Indianapolis Star: "Probably contains more solid information about Socialism and its progress throughout the world than any volume that has ever been prepared on the subject."

The Washington Star: "Comprehensive, contemporaneous, direct in exposition, consistent in interpretation, this study stands as one of the first rank to the student of Socialism in its present stage."

The Review of Reviews: "He shows, in a temperate, comprehensive way, that Socialism is a living, growing, and ever changing force. His discussion of the relation of the Socialist movement to the Progressive movement on the one hand, and to syndicalism on the other, is stimulating and helpful."

Cloth, 12mo., \$2.00 net; postpaid, \$2.12.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 Fifth Avenue,

New York

EXCEPTIONAL OFFERS IN MAGAZINES

One Year's Subscription to:

Regular Price		Regular Price	
The New Review.....	\$2.00	The New Review.....	\$2.00
and	} My Price,	and	} Price,
International Socialist Review..		1.00	
(Or Coming Nation)	\$3.00		\$3.50
			\$3.00
To each subscriber to this club I will send six beautiful pictures, ready for framing, 10 x14 inches, which are worth at least \$1.50.			
The New Review.....	\$2.00		} My Price,
and	} Price,		
The American or Cosmopolitan.....		1.50	
			\$3.00

Send Check or Money Order. Send for Catalogue.

JOSEPH E. KLEIN

Brooklyn's Leading Magazine Man

1094 MYRTLE AVE.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

You are cordially invited to attend a Concert and Reception to celebrate the appearance of

THE NEW REVIEW

Saturday evening, January 4, 1912, 8 P. M., at Assembly Hall, 109 East 22nd Street, near 4th Avenue. Hans Barth, pianist; L. Harris Washburn, baritone, and other artists.

TICKETS, 25 CENTS

THE TRUTH SEEKER

AN AGNOSTIC WEEKLY.

Founded 1873.

ECONOMIC DEPARTMENT.

Send for free sample, etc.

THE FREE THOUGHT SOCIETY

William Thurston Brown, Speaker.

Meets every Sunday at 11 o'clock in Bryant Hall, 725 Sixth Avenue, New York.

The Emblem of Enlightenment, Beautifully Made as Emblem Pin or Scarf Pin.

Prices:

14-k Solid Gold, \$1.80; 10-k Solid Gold, \$1.25; Sterling Silver, 25c.; Gold Filled, 25c. Mailed upon receipt of price. Wholesale rates for Branches.

SOL. SHAPIRO

55 E. 117th St., New York City

Please mention

THE NEW REVIEW

when answering Advertisements

The publication fund of **The New Review** has been raised from the sale of shares. Preferred shares are \$10 each. You can aid us to establish **The New Review** on a sound foundation by buying one or more shares.

I hereby subscribe to.....shares of preferred stock in the **New Review Publishing Association** for which I enclose.....Dollars.

Name.....

Street.....

City.....