

The New Review

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

REACTIONARIES AT WORK *H. S.*

LITTLE FALLS: A CAPITALIST CITY STRIPPED OF ITS VENERE
Robert A. Bakeman

SOCIALIST GAINS AND LOSSES IN THE RECENT ELECTION
Wm. English Walling

THE PANAMA CANAL: ITS DIPLOMATIC HISTORY.
I. EARLY HISTORY OF THE CANAL. II. PANAMA AND RUSSIA
M. Pavlovitch

STORM-GLASS *J. William Lloyd*

WALT WHITMAN IN FRANCE *Charles Vildrac*
(Translated by Sasha Best.)

THE NEW REVIEW

Published Weekly at 150 Nassau St., New York City, by

NEW REVIEW PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
ALEXANDER FRASER *President* MOSES OPPENHEIMER *Treasurer* JOSEPH MICHAEL *Secretary*

SUBSCRIPTION, \$2.00 PER YEAR \$1.00 SIX MONTHS FOREIGN, \$2.50
SINGLE COPY, 5 CENTS

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second-class Matter.

The following articles are among those that will appear in future issues of the **NEW REVIEW**:

Social Classes in the United States, by Isaac Halevy; Charpentier, Musical Anarch and Labor Agitator, by Andre Tridon; Syndicalism and Mass Action, by Austin Lewis; The Exhalation, A Short Story, by Allan Updegraff; The International Co-operative Alliance, by Albert Sonnichsen; Strike Tactics, by Phillips Russell; Syndicalist Organization in France, by Paul Louis, of Paris; A Precursor of Progressivism, by Robert Rives La Monte.

The **New Review**

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

Vol. I.

FEBRUARY 8, 1913

No. 6

REACTIONARIES AT WORK

Last November the reactionaries in Washington suffered a crushing defeat. The mature judgment of the great majority of the American people was expressed at the polls, clearly, decisively, overwhelmingly. It was not only the man who four years ago had stood forth as the heir to "my policies" that was repudiated, but all his principal lieutenants also went down to defeat with him, and this almost unprecedented disaster was all the more humiliating since it also involved the wreck of the Republican party. But although defeated, the arch-reactionaries have by no means given up hope. The "invisible government" continues to give its orders to the puppets of the visible government, and the reactionaries of all parties in combination are manifesting an industrious and mischievous activity in several directions. In this activity every department of the government—legislative, executive and judicial—is participating.

In April of last year the Senate passed the Dillingham immigration bill, which contemplated many changes in the general immigration law and introduced a literacy test, including writing as well as reading. On December 18 last the House passed the Burnett bill as a substitute for the Senate bill. The House bill contained no provision other than the literacy test, which included only reading. Both the Senate and the House bill aimed at restricting immigration, but the Senate bill was too drastic for the House, and the House bill was too moderate for the Senate. The whole subject then went before a conference committee, which agreed on a conference report recommending a new immigration law much more drastic in many ways than the Senate bill to which

the House had refused to accede. The report was filed late on the night of January 16 and was called up as soon as the House met on the following day. There followed a real or sham filibuster by the opponents of the measure, but by seven o'clock in the evening all the customary means of parliamentary obstruction were overcome and the bill was passed by a two to one majority without even a roll call.

Why this unseemly haste?

It was obviously not due to the literacy provision (including only reading), which has been widely discussed and in regard to which there may be an honest difference of opinion. Illiterate citizens are not a blessing to any country, and every modern, civilized state recognizes the duty of providing at least a rudimentary education for its citizens. But illiteracy is not a crime, nor is it indicative of physical or moral inferiority. It generally indicates no more than this, that the illiterate person was not given the opportunity to acquire a rudimentary education, whether because of individual poverty, or because of the general backwardness of the country in which he was born and reared, or because of exceptional legislation against a whole group or class of citizens, as for example against the Jews in Russia. The illiterate person may be honest and industrious and even intelligent, though not in the bookish sense. Those inclining to a humane view may even feel that the illiterate deserve a special consideration just because they are so heavily handicapped in the struggle for existence. But whatever view one may take as to this much discussed literacy test, it could not possibly have afforded the ground for the unusual and altogether unseemly haste of the House in forcing through the conference report at one sitting.

The real cause soon became known. On examination the conference bill proved to be neither the Dillingham bill nor the Burnett bill, but a new immigration law of thirty-eight sections. The House having originally rejected the Dillingham bill as too drastic, it now hastened to adopt the conference bill, which was infinitely more drastic!

One provision of the conference report called forth a storm of protest as soon as its tenor came to be known. It read: "Citizens or subjects of any country that issues penal certificates or certificates of character who do not produce to the immigration officials such a certificate" shall be excluded from admission into the United States. The Senate bent before the storm. Senator Lodge

put on an air of injured innocence and attempted a lame and stupid defense. Senator Simmons suggested that the provision be made permissive, failure to produce a certificate to be regarded as *prima facie* evidence of undesirability, leaving to the immigrant the right to explain, if he can, the lack of a certificate. But there was no replying to Senator O'Gorman, who urged that the clause would encourage foreign governments to have laws enacted requiring certificates of character in order that their subjects might be prevented from entering the United States, and that it would reverse the American policy of expatriation which this country has defended against the world for a hundred years. And Senator La Follette uncovered the real motive behind this conspiracy when he said that "Russia does not want these people who are seeking freedom admitted to the United States, and I believe that is why some others do not want them admitted. For these people are a menace to plutocracy, and there are certain people in this country who do not favor encouraging a menace to plutocracy." The bill was therefore unanimously ordered back to conference so that the certificate clause might be stricken out.

But the certificate requirement is not the only vicious provision in the conference bill. The same section that contains the certificate requirement also includes the following provision: "Persons who have *committed* a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude" shall be excluded. This is a complete departure from the present law, which excludes those "who have been *convicted* of or *admit* having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude." But if one has neither been convicted of a crime nor admits having committed it, how are the authorities here to know that he has committed it? The answer to this puzzle is found in two new provisions of the conference report. Section 16 of the report confers upon immigration officials the right to secure through United States courts subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books and documents, while no such right is conferred on the accused and detained alien; and Section 19 provides that "in every case where any person is ordered deported from the United States under the provisions of this Act, or of any law or treaty now existing, the decision of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor shall be final."

The conference bill thus confers upon boards of special inquiry and immigration officials the power to try aliens for al-

leged crimes. There are no rules of evidence, there is no right to counsel. The immigration officials have the right to subpoena witnesses, but the alien has not this right. In many European countries defendants are tried and convicted in their absence. Under the present law such a conviction is not sufficient cause for exclusion or deportation, according to the ruling of the courts, but under the proposed law such a conviction would be regarded as proof of the commission of crime and would result in exclusion or deportation.

At present if an alien is ordered excluded or deported, he can appeal to the courts. Under the proposed law the decision of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor is made final. At present if a foreign government wants its citizens or subjects residing in this country delivered into its hands, it must resort to extradition proceedings under existing treaties; the alien can then appeal to the protection of the courts and has the right to remain in this country if he can show that the act he is charged with was of a political nature. Under the proposed law the foreign government will not have to resort to any such legal procedure; it will simply charge the individual with the commission of crime, and the accused will have neither the protection of the courts nor of established rules of evidence, nor the aid of counsel, nor the testimony of favorable witnesses, nor will he be able to plead that his act was of a political nature, for the proposed law makes no exception in favor of political refugees, but simply provides for the exclusion or deportation of persons who have committed an act involving moral turpitude. And what this phrase, "moral turpitude," may be made to include by an executive eager to show complaisance toward a foreign government, we have just had a signal demonstration of in the case of E. F. Mylius.

Mylius had accused the present King of England of having married another woman before he was married to his present wife. He was arrested on a charge of "seditious libel," tried for "criminal libel," found guilty and imprisoned. On arriving here he was detained at Ellis Island and ordered deported, on the ground that he was guilty of a crime involving "moral turpitude." An appeal was made to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, who confirmed the order of deportation for the following reasons:

I cannot assume that a law which excludes anarchists and persons who advocate the overthrow of government, or the assassination of public officials, was intended to admit the publisher of a false charge of bigamy simply because he advances a political purpose or motive for the act, or because the false charge was directed against

a King among others, or because the court in which the trial was held had regarded the political aspect of the case as an aggravation of the offence.

Thus the political aspect of Mylius' act is completely disregarded, or rather the real gravamen of the charge against Mylius is that his act was of a political nature. As the *Evening Post* justly remarks: "The question of moral turpitude resolves itself into a question of motive, and what possible motives there can be for libeling a king other than political, one would find it very hard indeed to say. In fact, it is to be doubted whether any objection would have been made to the admission of Mylius if his crime had been one of ordinary libel against a private citizen." There can be no doubt that the British government has its hand in this affair, just as the Russian government had its hand in the affairs of Pouren, Rudowitz, and others. And our government, now as before, shows itself exceedingly complaisant toward the foreign government, for as Charles Edward Russell said in the *Call*: "For several years there has been carried on in this country a settled, malicious and sinister plan to destroy the ancient right of asylum for political refugees and to bring about a condition in which a foreign government can seize in the United States any person that may have become obnoxious to it." And the new provisions in the conference bill on immigration are, without a shadow of doubt, designed to bring about this condition most speedily and surreptitiously. It is therefore all the more necessary to arouse the whole country to this most serious menace.

When the Washington government, in both its legislative and executive branches, shows itself to be so willing a tool of foreign governments in dealing with the opponents of those governments, is it to be supposed that it would shrink from employing its judicial arm in dealing with malcontents at home? The attack upon the "alien" is only a part of the general attack upon the "seditious," and no "seditious" publication has been such a thorn in the side of the ruling powers as the *Appeal to Reason*. In 1909 its editor, Fred Warren, was arrested because he committed a technical violation of the Post Office regulations such as others had committed a thousand times before without being molested for it. When he was tried and found guilty President Taft pardoned him on the express ground that it was not wise to make a martyr of Warren. Then Warren was indicted for exposing the goings on in the Leavenworth penitentiary, the technical charge being that he sent "obscene" matter through the mails. The fact

is that if the thing was to be exposed, the use of "obscene" language could not possibly be avoided. And now Eugene V. Debs has been arrested and put under bail for suborning a witness. All these prosecutions against the men connected with the *Appeal* have no other motive behind them than to cripple and, if possible, kill the *Appeal*. Thus would a wholesome lesson be administered to all the "seditious" publications throughout the country.

When one contemplates all these various and repeated attacks upon the aliens, the right of asylum, and the opposition press, one is forcibly reminded of an early episode in American history.

It occurred in 1798, in the Presidency of John Adams. The Federalist party—the party of the "well-born," of the great land-owners, merchants and financiers of that day, the party of Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, and finally also of George Washington—was still in control of the federal government, but its power was visibly on the wane, while the Republican party of Thomas Jefferson was gaining power in state after state. The Federalists determined to entrench themselves by passing laws against the "aliens" and the "seditious." The Alien Acts raised the period of residence preliminary to naturalization from five to fourteen years, and authorized the President to deport out of the country any aliens whom he considered dangerous to the peace of the United States, and at his discretion to grant license to any alien to remain in the country for such time and in such place and under such bonds as he might designate, and to revoke such license. The Sedition Act made it a crime for any persons to combine with intent to oppose any law or measure of the government, and the threat of heavy fines and imprisonments was suspended over the heads of those who would venture to criticise any official or act of the government. These Acts were aimed at the Republican politicians and editors, many of whom were foreigners and sympathized with the French Revolution. Two years later the Federalists were defeated in the contest for the Presidency, and in a decade or two they ceased to exist as a party.

History appears to repeat itself now. A political party that was once great and achieved mighty results is now in its expiring gasps, and the "aliens and seditious" are again a general object of attack. But are we quite sure that the party which traces its descent from Thomas Jefferson will be faithful to the Jeffersonian tradition?

H. S.

LITTLE FALLS

A Capitalist City Stripped of its Veneer

BY ROBERT A. BAKEMAN

When one has thrown his whole being into a description of events that really seem to justify the free use of superlatives, he is rather taken aback when he is calmly asked, "Well, what more can you expect of the capitalist system?"

It takes a finished philosopher to hold continually in mind the doctrine that a given institution is but the reflex of the prevailing method of production, when one has such memories to combat as have we who were in the strike at Little Falls.

But the calm man is right and much as we should hate to have everybody cured all at once of that soul-satisfying inconsistency that permits a man to say in one breath that we are all caught in the system and in the next berate the individual capitalist, we must start out with the idea that Little Falls is an industrial city under the capitalist system and that the difference between her and other industrial cities is that she has violated the eleventh commandment and has been "found out." Making slight allowances for the personal equation, it seems perfectly reasonable to think that with a similar strike in any other industrial center of the United States, Little Falls would be practically duplicated.

The great fact that this country faces to-day is that the time is rapidly approaching when the employer of labor will not be able to grant the demands of the two million skilled laborers for shorter hours and more pay and charge the bill to the fifteen million unskilled and unorganized workers. A movement of the workers from the bottom up has started, a movement bigger than any labor organization. It is to her millions of unskilled workers that the nation must look, for the centre of the stage is theirs. No movement of the future can ignore them.

Little Falls is of importance only because it is one more of the signs that the giant who has slept so long is really awaking and because there is revealed the cancerous growth sapping away the vitality not only of Poles and Italians and Slavs but of a whole community—yes, of a nation.

Little Falls is a water-power village that has attracted half a dozen industries to its river-banks. Chief of these are two

large woolen mills that knit sweaters and are apparently competitors. There are about 2,500 men and women employed in the two mills. Up to October the wages were from five to ten dollars a week, with an average of about seven. But always in computing the wages of the workers we must bear in mind that a good many of them do piece-work and that there are times during the year when there is very little work for them to do. The yearly income of a given worker, which is really the only fair basis of reckoning, is almost impossible to get. A feature of the work was brought out before the state investigating committee that had not been noted before, showing up one of the vicious characteristics of "piece-work." It appeared that before Oct. 1 in order to make six or seven dollars a week many of the girls had worked eleven, twelve and thirteen hours a day with only a few moments for lunch. In the little while between the enforcing of the 54-hour law for women and the beginning of the strike, men had been put at night work in the mills, and since there was no law to protect them, they were made to work twelve and thirteen hours a night, with no time off for lunch. It is fair to say here that the American-born or English-speaking girls were paid considerably higher wages than the others. And the whole strike revolves about the foreign-speaking peoples: the Poles, Italians, Austrians and Slavs, of whom there must be from 1,500 to 1,800 in the mills.

The fifty-four hour law was a sop thrown to labor. The politicians thought no more of it. And to the manufacturers it seemed a mere matter of adjustment in the bookkeeping department. Since the legislature took off ten per cent of the hours of labor, was it not the proper thing for the manufacturers to take ten per cent. off the wages? Where a girl had been making \$6 they reduced her pay envelope to \$5.40. The man who had been making \$7 was reduced to \$6.30. That was all there was to it. And if the manager of the mills as he handed over a check for a thousand for some pet philanthropy did think of the effect of that cut upon his employees, he may have very righteously comforted himself with the thought that the Legislature was to blame. For wasn't he perfectly willing that they should work sixty hours or even sixty-five, and get paid for it, too?

But the backs that had always adjusted themselves to receive any burden that was handed down to them, suddenly stiffened

up. The "last straw" had been added. Perfectly spontaneously, as far as I can learn, without the slightest suggestion from outside their own ranks, nearly a hundred refused to go back to their work unless their pay was restored. Whether it was a knowledge through their own people of the Lawrence Strike or whether the workers felt that human nature could bear no more may be a question, but certainly the strike was spontaneous.

A classical pronouncement of the Little Falls strike came from the pen of the Chief of Police: "We have a foreign element on our hands. We have always kept them in subjection and we intend to in the future. We will allow no outsiders to 'butt in'."

I haven't the slightest question that this represented Chief Long's honest conviction and from our subsequent experience with him we feel sure that if it had not been for the coming in of outsiders he would have strangled the strike at its birth. Some time—perhaps Little Falls isn't enough—American municipalities will awaken to the tremendous power lodged in their police authorities. Some time they may realize that there are other questions of importance in regard to a candidate for the police force besides his weight and height.

Here there were 1,500 people of four different nationalities, without a knowledge of the English language, unacquainted with our customs and our tangle of laws, without any organization—these at the mercy of a man trained in the subtleties of our business piracy and whose job depended entirely upon the extent to which he was able to exploit them. And he declared he would allow no outsiders to help them. But the outsiders came just the same. A few of us went first to see if our knowledge of the English language would be a help, and then to urge the workers to get into some organization where their energy would be conserved. We found one man talking in Polish, urging the strikers to join the A. F. of L. Another followed him in Italian pleading the cause of the I. W. W. We picked up five sticks from the gutter and broke one, and then put the five together and showed that they could not be broken. The people seemed to understand and nothing more was said about either organization for more than a week, when the people themselves demanded that an I. W. W. local be formed. I want to repeat that an honest attempt was made to keep the strikers from becoming confused by the injection of the labor union issue until after the strike was won.

With our coming began the process of stripping the veneer from Little Falls. It had the same kind that every city has. From the heights the usual number of church-spires could be seen. I guess there was a Y. M. C. A. there, too, and the Fort-nightly Club was composed of fashionable women who studied civics and hired a nurse to go through the miserable tenement houses owned by some of their husbands. The second day of the strike some of these club women were holding out boxes to the striking mill workers, asking money for the hospital Tag Day.

To be perfectly fair with them we must suggest our conviction that Little Falls didn't really know the extent of its veneer. The women thought they were interested in the tenement house proposition until they were shown that the worst ones belonged to their own families. The minister of a large church in the city really thought that he would be true to his friend Mayor Lunn from Schenectady until he heard that the Socialist pastor-mayor was down in the city jail, arrested for having to do with a strike that affected some of his wealthy parishioners. The woman that refused to let Helen Schloss, the district nurse who joined the strikers, room longer with her because her friends were criticizing her, hadn't realized before that she could ever do a thing like that. The business men who came to us, like Nicodemus, by night and told us we were right but that we must not mention their names, no doubt hated to have to feel they were cowards. The men who saw girls and women beaten and realized that this was fundamentally a strike of mothers and daughters to maintain a wage that would keep them from falling below the level of decency, undoubtedly blushed as they heard the clanking of the chains of social ostracism and economic pressure that held them in bondage. But it would be unfair not to make note of the fact that there were a few, and perhaps more of whom we did not hear, who broke through these chains and showed the red blood of manhood.

To one who has followed at close range the situation at Little Falls from the beginning it has been increasingly evident that the purpose of the authorities was to crush the life out of the strike before it was really born by ridicule and threats. Failing in this, they gave a mild hint of the limits to which they would go if the strike reached full strength; they would beat it to a jelly with brute force. They didn't want to use the last

method unless they had to, but they were prepared to if it were necessary. They didn't care about anything but the strike. They wouldn't have cared if the Mayor of Schenectady had barked his head off in Clinton Park; they wouldn't have objected seriously if a hundred Socialists had addressed audiences every day—about anything but the strike. Those simple-minded men had not the slightest intention of handing body-blows to the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence and the Bible. It wasn't free-speech they were against. The whole trouble came because these venerable institutions were in bad company. A man had been arrested the day before for speaking to the strikers. If others were allowed to speak then the case against him would fall through and encouragement would be given the strike. If the Mayor of Schenectady and the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence and the Bible had stayed at home, they wouldn't have been imprisoned and broken and soiled.

The issue has not been clearly stated to the public. Stripped of its ambiguities it is this—Have the millions of unskilled workers who have borne the ultimate burden of exploitation a right to organize for their protection? Every other issue subordinates itself to this one. The manufacturers have answered that question in the negative and the authorities in Little Falls have handed over the repressive forces to them apparently as completely as though they were employees of the mill corporations.

A brief skeleton of the facts in this connection is of interest. At ten o'clock in the morning of Oct. 14 the Chief of Police gave his unnecessary consent that the writer might speak. At eleven o'clock he withdrew his permission. He said it was contrary to the city charter. When asked to be shown the city charter we were taken before the city attorney, whose first remark was that he didn't like our looks, and then that he didn't like what we were going to say. When pressed to tell us what we were going to say, he said he didn't like what he thought we were going to say! Perhaps it isn't too much authority to place in the hands of the prosecuting officers to allow them to arrest men for what they think they are going to say, but we beg humbly to suggest that such officers be first obliged to pass some sort of examination in clairvoyance. We then sat down with the chief of police and tried to find for him some section of the city charter which would warrant our arrest. None such was found,

but he said he guessed he would "take a chance" on the disorderly section. And so we were arrested and brought into court.

Although Mayor Scholl in a signed statement had said that if Mayor Lunn had spoken anywhere but in Clinton Park it would have been all right, we were arrested and sentenced to jail by Judge Collins for speaking a quarter of a mile from Clinton Park. And then the next day they arrested Mayor Lunn without knowing who he was. The next day five were arrested, and the next four, and the prosecuting attorneys studied the penal code every day after the arrests to find out what it was we had done. One day they came across the riot clause: "where two or three are gathered together," and the sheriff solemnly read that, and then we came before the automatic court, and so on *ad nauseam*. And then came the so-called riot, and after it the arrest of more than thirty with the orders of Chief Long to "get the leaders" literally carried out. Every one was held on charges that called for such high bail that these leaders have already been imprisoned these two months and a half.

President-elect Wilson doesn't believe it is true, but he admits that there is no denying the fact of the people's conviction that our courts are not courts of justice. What have the people seen in Little Falls to uphold the idea that our courts are courts of justice? What have these "foreigners" seen to inspire them with respect for this one of our American institutions? They have seen practically every person who came in to help them arrested. They have seen the courts back up the arrest. They have seen, they believe, a riot started by the police in order to get an excuse to arrest all the "leaders" and by placing them in prison to break the backbone of the strike. They have seen the program begun by the police carried through the lower court without a hitch. They have seen officers maliciously enter their meeting-place and destroy their property. They have seen their fellow-strikers, some of them women and girls, to the number of ninety, beaten with policemen's clubs. They have heard their women, young and old, insulted with vile words. They have seen some of their number promised release from jail if they would plead guilty and thus involve the rest. They have had officers tell them that they would not be punished if they would go back to work. They have seen for the last two months and a half fifteen or twenty of their number, whose only crime is

activity in this strike against starvation wages, behind the prison bars. And the court of justice—they have seen it sit absolutely blind and deaf and dumb while this organized band of official plug-uglies have plied their trade. It will take a good many sermons and much singing of "America" and many readings of the Declaration of Independence to counteract the influence of that long day spent by more than thirty of us in an underground cell in the Little Falls jail. Among us was one man whose hands had been tied behind him in the mill while his mouth was beaten to a jelly; another had been shot in the head and it took us fifteen minutes to bring him to consciousness but he was left without medical attendance for more than six hours; and there were others whose heads were split open by cowardly officials who dared not beat them in public. When a young Italian asks if the police have any right to hit men that way, and before there is a chance to answer another blow is given, what is the thing to say? That man is insensible to feeling who is not conscious of the tragedy that has taken place when man after man says "they wouldn't do this way in the old country." Society is going to learn very soon that those dividends are dearly earned that necessitate the converting of the enthusiasm and patient trust of the foreign-born workers into suspicion and bitterness.

Little Falls stands stripped of her veneer. The flimsy foundations of her boasted philanthropies are perfectly manifest. The churches with their spires pointing to the heavens have followed the earthly course dictated by economic pressure. The line of demarcation between the capitalists with their dependents and the proletariat with their very few middle-class sympathizers is clearly drawn. That hateful word "class" is recognized as a fact based on economic lines. The "good" people of Little Falls know it is false to say "there is no North, there is no South." They know now the extent to which they will go to keep intact their privilege of exploiting Polish and Italian and Slav women and girls. And Little Falls is ashamed—of being found out.

Little Falls is only a skirmish on the battlefield, but following Lawrence and Grabow it furnishes cumulative evidence of the purpose of the capitalists to crush the uprisings of the unskilled workers by the use of the repressive forces. Ettore and Giovannitti

and Emerson are followed by Legere and Bochino and the rest at Little Falls who have been in jail now more than two months. No one, perhaps, knows what will happen to these men, but it is certain that as the contagion of discontent spreads among the unskilled millions the capitalists will have their legislatures pass laws that will make the workers easier victims of the police and militia and courts. We shall not need longer to gasp when constitutional and common law rights are violated, for Little Falls has shown this if nothing else—that there is no limit beyond which the capitalist will not go, no right so sacred as to be inviolable when he fears separation from his fundamental source of exploitation—the unskilled, unorganized worker.

But the lesson of Little Falls is not fully learned by a statement of the attitude of the capitalists. A plain word about labor must be spoken. Nothing chilled the atmosphere at Little Falls so much as the attitude of the American Federation of Labor. It was exploited by the capitalists from start to finish. At first it denied that there was any strike. Then, when the employers settled with the workers, it allowed the mill-owners to say the settlement was made with the Federation. It was constantly giving material to the hostile newspapers. Schenectady members of the Federation came to Little Falls and went to police headquarters to get information to discredit one of the strike-leaders, and the writer himself found one member of the Jack-Spinners Union acting as a special police-officer. The churches who had been fighting the strikers the hardest, came out in praise of the A. F. of L. I hold no brief for the Industrial Workers of the World, but I do insist that every strike of the workers belongs to us all, no matter to what labor organization the strikers give their allegiance. Working class solidarity is of more account than all the names in existence. It is the only thing the capitalist fears. No matter what else is sacrificed, the workers must not be divided.

From the textile mills and garment lofts, from the canneries and coal mines, from the steel mills and the lumber camps comes the cry of the awakening brotherhood of the races—the cry that makes the stagnant blood leap in our veins! On from Little Falls to the skirmish that comes next, and if some be left behind in jail, the spirit that defies the prison walls will escape to cheer you on!

SOCIALIST GAINS AND LOSSES IN THE RECENT ELECTION

BY WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

I.

The election returns are now for the first time practically complete. By comparing the returns from Socialist sources and those given by the *Tribune* and *World*, it may be seen that the differences are comparatively slight.

Lessons of the most momentous importance can be gained by the comparison of these returns with those of 1910. As we Socialists have usually taken the two year period as a basis of comparison and as our Socialist campaign book of 1912 does the same thing, we must now use this same basis (instead of 1908), even though it result unfavorably to us in many instances. We cannot use one measure where it turns out in our favor, and another where it turns out against us. Moreover, the chief purpose of studying the returns at the present time is to see the effect of the new Progressive movement, which arose not between 1908 and 1910, but between 1910 and 1912. Another preliminary remark needed before passing to the returns themselves is to state that we have followed the method adopted by the Socialist campaign book of taking the vote for the head of the ticket instead of the smallest vote cast for any Socialist candidate. As much may be said for the one method as for the other, but after considering this question the campaign book decided to use the vote secured by the head of the ticket, and we have followed the same method.

In studying the returns for the various states, it is impossible to attach the same weight to the vote in one state as in another. Two things must be taken always into consideration: The size of the state and the percentage of the Socialist vote when compared to the whole vote cast. It is obvious that the vote of Delaware can in no way be compared in importance to the vote of New York. It ought to be equally obvious that where the percentage of the vote cast is very small, as in South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia, the returns are of very little significance and I have therefore omitted them entirely. For example, the vote in South Carolina rose from 70 in 1910 to 164 in 1912, an increase of over 100%, but of no significance.

since the latter figure is only three-tenths of one percent of the total vote cast.

On the other hand, some states that are not of the very first importance assume an importance for our purpose on account of the large percentage of the total vote cast which was given to the Socialists. For example, we obtained nearly 10% of the vote cast in Florida, 21% in Nevada, and intermediate figures in several of the Western states with comparatively small populations.

It is of interest, first, to note the order now assumed by the various states as to the percentages of the total vote secured by the Socialists.

Order of States Showing Largest Percentages of Socialist Votes.

No.	State.	Per Cent.	Votes.
1.	Oklahoma	16.6	42,262
2.	Nevada	16.5	3,313
3.	Montana	13.6	10,828
4.	Arizona	13.3	3,163
5.	Washington	12.4	40,445
6.	California	12.0	79,201
7.	Idaho	11.3	11,960
8.	Oregon	9.7	13,343
9.	Florida	9.3	4,826
10.	Ohio	8.7	89,930
11.	Wisconsin	8.4	33,481
12.	Texas	8.3	24,896
13.	Minnesota	8.2	27,505
14.	Utah	8.0	9,023
15.	North Dakota	8.0	6,966
16.	Kansas	7.3	26,807
17.	Illinois	7.1	81,278
18.	Pennsylvania	6.9	83,614
19.	Louisiana	6.6	5,249
20.	Arkansas	6.6	8,153
21.	Wyoming	6.5	2,760
22.	Colorado	6.2	16,418
23.	New Mexico	5.8	2,859
24.	West Virginia	5.7	15,336
25.	Indiana	5.6	36,931
26.	Connecticut	5.3	10,056
27.	Michigan	4.2	23,211
28.	Nebraska	4.1	10,185
29.	Missouri	4.1	28,466
30.	South Dakota	4.0	4,662
31.	New York	4.0	63,381
32.	New Jersey	3.7	15,901
33.	Iowa	3.5	16,967
34.	Mississippi	3.2	2,061
35.	Rhode Island	2.6	2,049
36.	Alabama	2.6	3,019
37.	Massachusetts	2.6	12,650
38.	Kentucky	2.6	11,647
39.	New Hampshire	2.4	1,980
40.	Maine	2.0	2,541
41.	Maryland	1.7	3,996
42.	Vermont	1.5	928
43.	Tennessee	1.4	3,492
44.	Delaware	1.1	556

It will be noticed that the first eight states are in the Far West, except Oklahoma, where our percentage and perhaps our actual vote were increased by the fact that there were no Progressive electors. The ninth state, Florida, is not so significant as appears because there is no real competition with the Democrats, and the full anti-Socialist vote is not cast. And the same is true of the seemingly high percentage in other Southern states.

Most of the states next in order are in the Middle West. The tenth is the important industrial and agricultural state of Ohio, the fourth state in population in the Union. Wisconsin now falls to eleventh place and in the same class with Ohio, Texas, Minnesota, Utah and North Dakota.

Far down on the list come the Eastern states, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Massachusetts, *though they are the most industrial of all and should be near the top.* The only exception, Pennsylvania, is apparent rather than real, for the percentage of the total vote received by Socialists in Pennsylvania west of the Appalachian divide would bring that section near the top of the list, while the percentage received in Eastern Pennsylvania would class it with other Eastern states. Twenty-five or considerably more than half the states did better than Connecticut, while thirty states preceded New York, the birth-place of Socialism in this country. Every Eastern state fell below the average for the United States in regard to the percentage of the total vote received by the Socialists (5.96%).

II.

In considering another phase of the subject, the growth of the Socialist vote, we may as a rule, take into consideration only the percentage of increase of this vote. In those cases however where there seems to be a decrease it will be well also to compare the percentage of the total vote received by the Socialist party in 1910 and 1912 respectively.

We may divide the states into six groups arranged in proportion to the percentage of increase or decrease of their vote in the recent election:—

(1). The first group of states is that in which the Socialist vote has been approximately doubled within the last two years. This includes, beside the mountain states of Montana,

Idaho and Utah, Texas and several central states—Michigan, Indiana, Kentucky and West Virginia.

(2.) The second group consists of those states where the increase of the vote has been slightly above the average increase in the nation. The vote having been 607,000 in 1910 and approximately 907,000 in 1912, the average increase was about 50%. While in three states the vote did not double, it increased at a rate considerably more than 50 per cent. These states were Oklahoma, Illinois and Iowa. But a special fact is to be noted in each case. In Oklahoma, as I have said, there were no Roosevelt electors. In Iowa the vote in 1904 was within a few hundred of the vote in 1912. In Illinois the vote in 1912 is only about 17 per cent greater than it was in 1904—a growth less than that of the population. (Of course, the explanation is that we made the mistake of attracting non-Socialist votes in 1904.)

(3.) A third group of states shows approximately the average rate of increase (50 per cent). We may include in this group all those states where the vote increased from 40 to 60 per cent., namely, Ohio, New Jersey, Kansas, Missouri, Minnesota, Nebraska and perhaps Washington.

(4.) In the fourth group a handsome increase of the vote has been secured since 1910, but not so much as the general increase throughout the country. In this group the chief states are New York and Pennsylvania. In New York the Socialist vote increased 29 per cent. But justice to the locals in the upper part of the State requires it to be noticed that the increase was very largely outside of New York City (where the vote is now 868 less than it was in 1910). In Pennsylvania the increase was 38 per cent, but here again justice to the locals in the Western part of the State requires it to be noted that the increase in that section was as a rule from 50 to 100 per cent. The increase in the Eastern part of the state was, on the contrary, relatively small (with the exception of some rural counties where the total vote received by the Socialists is still so small as to make the increase comparatively insignificant, even where it was several hundred per cent).

(5.) There were several states which showed only a slight increase either in the votes cast or in the percentage of the total vote secured by the Socialists. In Arkansas there was a decrease in votes since 1910, but as the percentage of the total vote cast by Socialists rose from 6 to 6.6 per cent, this means, not that

there was a decrease, but that the vote was practically stagnant in that state. In Colorado there was an increase in the vote to about one-half of one per cent, which indicates a similar condition. It cannot be questioned that these figures are extremely unsatisfactory from our standpoint. No doubt, there was a considerable increase in both states of genuine revolutionary Socialists, but this was apparently offset by desertions of Progressives who had been persuaded into voting for us in previous elections under the mistaken idea that we are a reform party.

(6.) Finally we come to a long list of eleven states where the Socialist vote has decreased in the past two years. Reversing the order we have hitherto followed, we shall name these states beginning with those where losses were greatest, but considering the states in four geographical groups. The greatest loss was in Florida where the vote in 1912 (4,826) was less than one-half of what it was in 1910 (10,204). In Tennessee the vote fell from 2.9 per cent of the total vote in 1910 to 1.4 per cent in 1912. In Virginia it fell from .8 per cent to .6 per cent; in Maryland from 1.8 per cent to 1.7 per cent, and in Delaware, where the vote is exactly what it was two years ago, more votes were cast by other parties in this election, so that the percentage of the total obtained by the Socialists fell from 1.2 per cent to 1.1 per cent.

The next most serious loss, if we keep to our geographical grouping, was in the Middle West, but it was confined to one state—Wisconsin, where the vote fell from 40,053 to 33,481, from approximately 12 per cent of the total to 8.4 per cent.

The third most serious loss was on the Pacific Coast, in the states of Oregon and California. In Oregon the Socialist vote fell from 16.5 per cent of the total to 9.7 per cent. In California the women voted for the first time in 1912, and the Socialist vote, like that of the Progressives and Democrats, rose. But the percentage of the vote received by the Socialist party fell from 12.4 to 12.0 of the total vote cast.

And finally a most regrettable loss occurred in Connecticut, Massachusetts and Vermont. In Connecticut the vote fell from 12,197 in 1910 to 10,056 in 1912, and while the Socialists received 6.5 per cent of the total vote in 1910, they received only 5.3 per cent in 1912. In Massachusetts the vote in 1910 was 13,444, in 1912 it was 12,650. Two years ago we had 3.2 per cent of the total vote, this year 2.6 per cent of the total vote. In Vermont

the vote fell from 1,067 in 1910 to 928 in 1912; that is, from 1.9 per cent of the total vote cast to 1.5 per cent.

It would be useless to give all these figures if no lesson were to be learned from them. But two very broad conclusions are, it seems to me, undeniable.

Firstly, when we study these returns geographically, we see that the chief losses have been in New England and on the Pacific Coast. As these losses were not confined to one state, this shows that there is something in the political situation in each of these sections that militated against us. The courageous attitude of Debs on the Negro question and on Asiatic immigration has doubtless hurt us among the Negro-burners of the South and the anti-Asiatic agitators on the Pacific Coast as we may infer from the attacks on the Negro in one of our leading party papers in the South, and the action of the State Executive of California last year in excluding Debs from the list of party speakers.

The second conclusion that we must draw is not geographical. It cannot be a mere coincidence that the losses occurred in the individual states where they did, for often the above explanation was lacking. If we study the tactics pursued in all the Northern states where the losses took place, do we not find that they were practically identical *in each individual case, where there was a loss*, namely, to present Socialism in such a way as to make a strong appeal to Progressive voters?

The losses were almost *exclusively* in states where the tactics were least militant. *Every one* of the states most often accused of compromise is included among those showing losses.

On the other hand, *every one* of the states and parts of states best known for their militant tactics are among those where the gains were greatest, for example, Ohio, West Virginia, Montana and Western Pennsylvania.

Our "practical" politicians not only compromise our principles, but prove to be impractical. Our vote-getters fail in everything, even in getting votes.

On the face of the returns the only practical advice they can offer is that we can gain votes in the South by deserting the Negro and on the Pacific Coast by imitating the nationalistic, militaristic, race-war policy of the Australian Labor party.

Doubtless there are other and equally important lessons to be gained from the study and discussion of the recent election returns. The chief purpose of this summary is to prove that we

must in this instance and always concentrate attention on our losses as well as our gains, on our weakness as well as our strength. Let us deal with the facts, all the facts, and nothing but the facts.

THE PANAMA CANAL—ITS DIPLOMATIC HISTORY

BY M. PAVLOVITCH (PARIS)

I.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE CANAL

Among Goethe's brilliant anticipations there is, perhaps, none other so interesting as the prophetic opinion uttered by the immortal German poet regarding the Panama Canal. It is interesting to recall that prediction just now, on the eve of the completion of the colossal undertaking that was begun more than thirty years ago by the great though unfortunate French engineer, Ferdinand de Lesseps.

On Wednesday, February 21, 1827—Johann Eckermann, the poet's faithful friend, tells us—Goethe was talking at table enthusiastically of Alexander von Humboldt, who had just published his book on Cuba and Colombia, wherein he touched upon the possibility of cutting through the Isthmus of Panama.

"Undoubtedly," Goethe said, "if we could succeed in digging a canal from the Pacific Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico, it would be of immense consequence to all civilized countries. But I should be surprised if the United States permitted any other country to undertake this enterprise. Considering the development of the United States westward, one can foresee that within the next thirty or forty years that young country will occupy and settle the vast territory lying west of the Rocky mountains. At the same time it is clear that on the Pacific coast, where nature has already created safe harbors, there will grow up great commercial cities, which will act as intermediaries in the exchange of commodities between the United States, on the one hand, and China and India on the other. Under these circumstances it would be not only desirable but also necessary that a more rapid communication should be established between the eastern and western shores of North America, both by merchant ships and men-of-war, than has hitherto been possible with the tedious and

expensive voyage around Cape Horn. I repeat that it is indispensable for the United States to effect a quick passage from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean and I am certain that it will do it. Would that I might live to see it! But I shall not."

Is it not wonderful that nearly a hundred years ago Goethe clearly foresaw the future of the United States? Even then he understood the inevitable development of the Pacific coast line with its great commercial port of San Francisco. Even then he foretold what the English, French and Spanish diplomatists did not see until the very last moment—that, despite all obstacles, the United States would seize the canal, which at that time existed only in the mind of the great poet. Even then he had already comprehended in its entirety the great importance, strategic and commercial, of the canal. Is it not strange that this man, who so well comprehended all the enchanting beauty of antique poetry and art and had so deep an insight into the past, should display at the same time such far-sightedness in grasping the economic destinies of the great American republic?

What strikes us most is his prophecy as to who would ultimately control the canal.* Indeed, as is evident from a careful study of the diplomatic documents dealing with the Panama Canal in 1827, it was exceedingly difficult to foresee how the question of joining the Pacific and Atlantic through Central America would terminate. It was a question that had long agitated many persons interested in the destinies of the New World. Columbus had dreamed of such a canal, and the Spanish king, the morose fanatic Philip II, had attentively read over the report submitted to him by a special commission of investigators who had visited the isthmus and studied the conditions there with reference to the digging of such a canal.

Early in the nineteenth century, after five years of travel in Central and South America (1799-1804), the famous German savant, Alexander von Humboldt, published in the French language a series of masterpieces, setting forth the results of his observations in the regions he had explored. In one of them Humboldt expressed regret as to the lack of information that would make possible the solution of the canal question. With his personal investigations as a basis, Humboldt expressed him-

*In the same conversation with Eckermann, Goethe also expressed the wish that England would possess the Suez canal, which was not built until fifty years later—Ed. N. R.

self in favor of digging the canal by way of Lake Nicaragua. The great authority that Humboldt's name carried in the highest circles of Europe caused the Spanish government to drop its customary inertia. The report on the canal that had been submitted to Philip II was taken from the dusty archives of Simancas. Other documents, too, were dug up. In April, 1814, the Cortes passed a resolution on the necessity of building a canal through the Isthmus for vessels of the highest tonnage and addressed an appeal to financiers to proceed with this vast undertaking. Nevertheless this resolution of the Cortes brought no results. Less than ten years after the adoption of this resolution Spain had lost all influence in Central America, where independent republics were proclaimed.

At the Pan-American Congress in Panama, June 22, 1826, the canal question was raised by the famous liberator of the Spanish-American colonies, Simon Bolivar. The hero of the fifteen years' war against Spain for the liberation of Central and South America now desired to unite those countries which had waged common war in peaceful labor for the realization of this great project. The canal that was to be the result of the joint efforts of all the nations of America was also to be the exclusive property of the states of the New World. It was to serve at the same time as a symbol of the brotherhood of all American peoples, an evidence of their friendly union, and a guarantee of their absolute and undisputed independence from Europe. Such was Bolivar's grand idea.

It is interesting to note that the government of the United States which now claims the Panama canal as its exclusive property, at that time objected to Bolivar's point of view. President John Quincy Adams gave Commissioners Anderson and Sargent instructions diametrically opposed to it. "If the work should ever be executed so as to admit of the passage of sea vessels from ocean to ocean, the benefits of it ought not to be exclusively appropriated to any one nation, but should be extended to all parts of the globe upon the payment of a just compensation or reasonable tolls."†

That was eight months before Goethe predicted that the canal would be built and monopolized by the United States.

After the above-mentioned congress of 1826, that is, after

†International American Conference, Vol IV, Historical Appendix, p. 144.

the United States government had for the first time given an official statement of its point of view in regard to a canal through the Isthmus of Panama, its policy remained for a long time unchanged in its general features. American statesmen energetically maintained as a principle that the canal should not be built in the interests of any one nation, but should benefit all countries equally and should therefore be placed under the protection of all the powers. In a word, no monopoly in the building or administration of the new world-route should be tolerated, lest in the hands of some one power the canal become a tool to oppose the legitimate interests of the rest of the world. International ownership of the canal instead of a possibly dangerous monopoly by one government—this was the basic principle upheld for a long time in the commercial and diplomatic circles of America.

But this point of view in regard to the Panama question was maintained only so long as the United States was comparatively weak, and had to pursue a cautious policy in its relations with European countries, particularly the great powers of France and England. Both of these had designs on the Isthmus of Panama and stubbornly strove for control there.

The failure of the French expedition into Mexico, which ended in the execution in 1868 of the pretender to the Mexican throne, the archduke Maximilian of Austria, marks a new era in the diplomatic history of the Panama Canal. Until the Civil War the United States kept on the defensive in its foreign relations, as its lack of power dictated. But beginning with the year 1866, it assumes an aggressive attitude toward all those adversaries who are trying to prevent the United States from establishing control of the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, especially in the region of the future canal. Having driven the French out of this territory, the American eagle began to press hard the British lion.

The diplomatic history of the Panama Canal is replete with interest. The history of the greatest undertaking of the times is not only the history of the origin, growth and realization of the most difficult engineering feat in the whole history of the world. It is at the same time the history of the rise, growth and expansion of American imperialism, which is destined to play so prominent a role in international politics in general, and in the economic life of the European and Asiatic nations in particular. It is also the history of the rise and decline on the American con-

continent of the European powers, Spain, France and England, at one time leaders of the world in colonization.

As is well known, the question of the Panama Canal first entered the domain of reality when it was taken up by the famous French engineer, Ferdinand de Lesseps.

On May 28, 1878, he was one of a group of enterprising Frenchmen who obtained from the government of Colombia a concession to build the canal. Subscription for shares of the company that was to build the canal was opened in 1880 and met with instant response in France, where the required funds were duplicated several times over. But in the United States de Lesseps' undertaking was viewed with great disfavor. This opposition was not, however, sufficiently active or bitter to change his plans.

The attitude of mere cautious reserve which diplomatic circles in the United States displayed toward the French government was due partly to the fact that the American public were skeptical from the very beginning as to the successful outcome of de Lesseps' project, controlled as it was by a private company and financed by public subscriptions. How de Lesseps' enterprise ended is well known and many still remember the great scandal that broke out in connection with this affair.

What a blot the Panama affair has been on the reputations of a whole array of republican lights in France, such as Rouvier, Clemenceau, etc. Yet at the time those who most disgraced themselves were the adversaries of the republic, nationalists, Bonapartists, "patriots" of all kinds. Instead of endeavoring to retain their country's hold on the great undertaking, already half-finished, and to save it from disaster, the political antagonists of the republican regime secretly schemed to send to ultimate ruin the Panama Canal and the republic of France along with it.

The republic survived, but the great undertaking of which France could have been so proud, was wrested from her control. The seizure of the Suez canal by England and the Panama catastrophe have had a profound influence on the subsequent economic development of France. Since that time her financiers have sedulously avoided all great industrial and engineering enterprises involving risk. They have preferred to make loans to governments, where the investment was secure, even though the rate of interest was small. More terrible and far-reaching a catastrophe even than the defeat of France on the battle-field at

Sedan in 1871, was her surrender of those advantages at Suez and Panama which the genius and daring of Frenchmen had almost secured to her. The attempt at realizing the dream of French control of these two world routes, which would have increased the international importance of France both from a political and economic point of view, was completely frustrated. Properly speaking it was this defeat, and not that of Sedan, which marked the beginning of the fall of France from her position of world leadership in politics and finance.

II.

PANAMA AND RUSSIA.

The history of the Panama Canal includes one curious episode that is but little known in America. When it was finally understood in France that the Panama enterprise was failing and that French control of the situation might possibly be lost, some of the stockholders in de Lesseps' undertaking decided to seek the aid of Russia. It was at this time that Russia was beginning to build the great trans-Siberian railroad, and Emperor Alexander III, as head of the greatest world-power, seemed in the eyes of the anxious Frenchmen a sort of a demigod. That titan could save the situation, they thought, and at the same time advance the interests of Russia. It is a fact that the Panama Canal is just such a crowning of the great trans-Siberian road as the Suez Canal is of the North American transcontinental railroads. A glance at the globe shows that the Panama Canal is the connecting link of a world-route that goes by railroad over Asia and Europe in the east, by water through the Atlantic and Pacific in the west; just as the Suez Canal completes the other world-route, by railroad across North America in the west and by water through the Atlantic and Pacific in the east.

As Russia had just completed the first great world route when her railroad was finished, it seemed likely she would be interested in having the control of the second world route in the hands of a nation friendly to her.

Accordingly in 1894, the well known French engineer Philippe Bunau-Varilla, who had played a prominent part in the history of the Panama Canal, went to St. Petersburg. His mission was to learn of Witte whether in view of the critical situation confronting France, Russia would show her friendliness by giving needed aid.

On March 24, 1894, Bunau-Varilla made a report of his visit to a select audience made up of such prominent Frenchmen as the vice-president of the Senate, Poirier; the ex-ministers, Dupins and Lanaissant; the influential deputies, Crisppi and Mascureau; and others. Witte, he said, had first of all asked him what the attitude of the French government was toward the idea of seeking Russian help. "If France thinks as you do," said Witte, "I can say personally, without making any promise in the Emperor's name, that a solution of the question which will conserve all French interests, will be taken into favorable consideration by his Majesty's government."

On returning to France Bunau-Varilla sought at once an interview with Casimir-Perier, then President of the Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs. He then went to Arcachon for an interview with Minister of Finance Burdeau.

It was after Bunau-Varilla's report that Burdeau, returning to Paris, summoned the unofficial diplomat to the Ministry of Finance.

"Casimir-Perier and I have studied the question together," said Burdeau. "In a few days he will send for you to tell you that the French government is in favor of acting in common with Russia in the Panama enterprise. This is, therefore, a basis for reorganization. I am speaking personally to-day, but the official communication from the minister will reach you soon."

But before Casimir-Perier gave government sanction to the plan, the ministry fell (May 22, 1894). A month later, following President Carnot's assassination, Casimir-Perier was elected President of the republic. But his resignation soon followed amid circumstances that deprived him of all future influence in affairs of state. About the same time occurred the death of Emperor Alexander III, while Burdeau and several others deeply interested in Panama lost their prestige and found themselves powerless.

At this day there are in existence no printed documents to indicate what the plans were in the carrying out of which the Russians and French expected to join hands. Nor is there anything to indicate what share Russia would have had in the partnership. According to one oral version, Russia was to declare that she considered the building of the Panama canal a great cultural undertaking, which would not only serve the economic interests of France and Russia, but also in the highest

degree advance commerce among all countries and thereby further international peace. The Russian government was also to point out that so great an undertaking could not be successfully carried on by a private company and that reorganization must be done with government aid. So Russia would propose to France that they jointly complete the building of the Panama canal. It was plain that the means required for the quickest carrying out of this plan could be obtained in the same place as the millions for building the Trans-Siberian road, that is, in France, and doubtless the French stockholders, who had refused to give money to Ferdinand de Lesseps, would gladly advance it to the Tsar of Russia.

At present it is hard to say how far this version as to the manner in which Russia and France were to co-operate corresponds with reality. Bunau-Varilla did not deem it advisable to put down in black and white a statement that would have made plain Russia's role in the affair. We shall have to await the memoirs of Witte, or some other statesman, French or Russian, who had part in it. At all events it is beyond doubt that negotiations were entered into.

(To be concluded.)

STORM-GLASS

BY J. WILLIAM LLOYD

Twigs of ice against the gray,
The grandeur and gloom of a stormy sky;
A beating rain and a following wind
And sodden clouds that fly and fly;
The icicles hanging everywhere,
The weeds of the field spun all of glass,
Only a wet crow in the air,
And the feet of the human afraid to pass.

WALT WHITMAN IN FRANCE

BY CHARLES VILDRAC

Translated by Sasha Best

Two years have elapsed since Leon Bazalgette gave us first the life, then the excellent translation of the entire poetic work of the great American, Walt Whitman. True fame, carrying with it profound and lasting influences, establishes itself but slowly, and does not depend upon public favor. It would be rash to assert that Whitman is to-day popular with the French public. It is, however, easy to predict what a large and glorious place will be given him among us in the future; it is easy to see what a horizon he is opening up for French poets, and what a vivifying light he throws upon our sterile and repulsive morals.

In taking up Whitman, it is impossible to consider the author of "Leaves of Grass" without at the same time considering the man. The life and the work are a single poetic masterpiece, and we can withhold our admiration neither from the one nor from the other. An exceptional harmony, at which we marvel at first, for it is only too true that rarely has it been given to us to find in the daily life of a great poet the hero that appears in his book. The habit of factitious and bookish emotions in literary art has constrained us to admit that a writer's daily life may be an absolute contradiction of his work; and if we approve the men who loudly extol some moral attitude of philosophy, we do not withhold our applause upon learning that far from putting themselves forth as an example, they merely resign themselves to a continual compromise.

"Do you know," says André Gide, "what it is that makes the poetry, and, even more, the philosophy of to-day, but things of dead letters? It is that they are separated from life. Greek art idealised life to such an extent that the life of an artist was in itself a poetic realization, the life of a philosopher a 'mise en action' of philosophy. To-day beauty no longer acts, action no longer troubles itself about being beautiful, and wisdom goes its own way."

The living realization of the idea, that is what haunts the noblest and most enlightened modern minds. Let us remember the peasant Tolstoy, or let us re-read Ibsen's "Solness." "Is it possible," says Hilda, "that my builder cannot mount as high as he builds?"

But there is Whitman who simply and clearly solves the problem that appears so complicated by the conditions of actual, everyday life; he gives us the highest lesson that we can receive, that which we need the most: a lesson of beauty in action. And this

mighty and free builder always could mount as high as he built, lightly living his poems, giving to all, speaking to all as he wrote:

Whoever you are, to you endless announcements!

He does not live apart, he has none of the qualities of the man of letters, nor does he correspond to the type—deplored and consecrated—of poet, this inaccessible being, detached from the world, this species of demigod, who poses and invites the crowds to contemplate him.

He is first a man, and that is his most beautiful title. Bard of mankind, he embraces all humanity, includes it in himself:

I reject no one; none can be interdicted;
None but are accepted, none but shall be dear to me;
All tend inward to me and I tend outward to them,
And of these one and all I weave the song of myself.

His domain is the present and the future. Poetry with him is no longer in tow of the epoch, lagging behind in its effort to take in things of the past. Taking its place in the forward march, it is prophetic, as omnipresent as the newest manifestation of human genius, though with something of Biblical immutability. It is an essential poetry, disengaged from dilettantism and literary contingencies; it is robust and without art, like new cities; lavish as nature and sane as the sea-air. It is a religion of life, an exalted consciousness of the universe.

They who open a book of poems with the intention of finding there a rare and superfluous nourishment, a luxury of the intellect, will discover with the great Whitman that poetry may become a pure and daily need, that it is mingled in every moment, that there is a poetic life every one can attain, which gives value to and lights up the simplest words and acts, and which, causing us to regard a re-discovered world with ever-renewed wonder, enriches us and gives new life. His warm and prophetic voice will tell them:

But each man and each woman of you, I lead upon a knoll,
My left hand hooking you round the waist,
My right hand pointing to landscapes of continents and the public road,
Not I, not any one can travel that road for you.
You must travel it for yourself.
It is not far, it is within reach.
Perhaps you have been on it since you were born, and did not know.
Perhaps it is everywhere on water and on land.
Long enough have you dreamed contemptible dreams.
Now I wash the gum from your eyes,
You must habit yourself to the dazzle of the light and of every moment
of life.

Do we not find the eternal and most synthetic definition of the poet in these lines:

There was a child went forth every day,
And the first object he looked upon, that he became,
And that object became part of him for the day, or a certain part of
the day,
Or for many years or stretching cycles of years.

The early lilacs became part of this child, etc., etc. The lines end thus:

These became part of that child who went forth every day, and who now goes, and will always go forth every day.

This active participation in the universe, this attentiveness and fervor, this gift of expressing life in its entirety—not alone in its exterior aspects, but so to say in its profundity, with the same penetration and the same sureness with which one would express oneself—all this is dominant and voluntary in Whitman. But it is no longer special to him; it seems to characterize the newest and richest works of our time.

We have been witnesses of curious coincidences, which attest the presence of certain currents of ideas and new emotions in the same epoch, without regard to the division of peoples and languages. For instance, writers who, from a certain point of view, appear very distant from one another, such as Dostoyevsky, Kipling, Gorky, or Verhaeren, who have never, or but very lately, known Whitman, yet affirm with him, each by means of his own genius, that all must center in the universal, must be related to the world as a whole, to its compact and living truth.

They are men of the same race, these prodigals, who have not received their riches at second or third hand, who have not seen with the eyes of the dead, who do not seek the thread of the history of the past in libraries or in fashions, but are absorbed in the spectacle of the present living world.

The analogies with Whitman that present themselves are manifold.

For instance, when one thinks of Charles Louis Philippe, of the intensely human quality of his work, of his gift for expressing rather than describing, of the cordial, warm kindness of the man shining through all his works. When one compares the form of verse used by Whitman in his "Leaves of Grass" with the form adopted by Claudel in his dramas; when one considers the manner in which they illustrate, one as well as the other, the divine law of indirect expression; when one finally compares, not without

surprise, these two voices, both of which have the quality of rousing what is dormant by means of the ever-ready word.

Finally, in these different genres, and with these different personalities, the most recent writers display, as does Whitman, a generous tendency to renew and to revive the relations of man to man, and of man to nature; a wish to grow and to enrich themselves from and by everything, and to yield to everything and to everyone the riches that are theirs.

Know you solely to drop in the earth the germs of a greater religion.
The following chants, each for its kind, I sing.

With these same religious aspirations, religious in the largest sense of the word, poets after him are going to sing. No moment in the history of literature could be more favorable than this to our discovery of Whitman.

Here and there in the newer reviews, in the more recent volumes of poetry, can be found the sane and vivifying influence of Whitman's ideas and attitude.

Nor could it be otherwise. The work of the bard of Manhattan is implanting itself in our country like a great tree from the New World. The bark is rough, the branches innumerable and vagabond, the foliage hairy; but what a salutary odor of nature, what a joyous love, what grandeur and what a revival! All is there to conquer us—gaiety, kindness, heroism, independence, and the robust optimism, which forms so necessary a part of our moral sanity.

It is the happy destiny of the French people to love and to assimilate such qualities, to exalt in such riches, and to re-create them with their own genius.

And no doubt, in France, more than anywhere else, will be justified the stirring prophecy of old Walt, to the poets to come:

Poets to come! orators, singers, musicians to come!
Not today is to justify me and answer what I am for,
But you, a new brood, native, athletic, continental, greater than before
known,
Arouse, for you must justify me.
I myself but write one or two indicative words for the future,
I but advance a moment only to wheel and hurry back in the darkness.
I am a man who, sauntering along without fully stopping, turns a
casual look upon you and then averts his face,
Leaving it to you to prove and define it,
Expecting the main things from you.
