

MAY 1913

Ten Cents

The **New Review**

A-MONTHLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

Tariff-Revision And After	The Seventeenth Amendment	<i>H. S.</i>
Factory Reforms		<i>Abram I. Elkus</i>
The White Man's Burden		<i>W. E. Hardenburg</i>
Haywood		<i>Andre Tridon</i>
State Socialism and the Individual		<i>Wm. English Walling</i>
France and Proportional Representation		<i>Paul Louis</i>
Concerning Historical Materialism (<i>Concluded</i>)		
IV. The Natural and the Artificial Environment		<i>Paul Lafargue</i>
Industrial Unionism and Syndicalism		<i>Robert Rives La Monte</i>
The White Birch Grove		<i>Eliot White</i>
As Its Scent to the Heart of the Rose		<i>Louise W. Kneeland</i>
The Novels of Albert Edwards		<i>Andre Tridon</i>
Justice		<i>Robert Carlton Brown</i>
Brothers		<i>Louise W. Kneeland</i>
Book Notice		
Shall We Recall the Recall?		<i>Ernest D. Hull</i>

150 Nassau Street

New York

HALF A MAN

A Study of the Negro in New York

BY

MARY W. OVINGTON

Foreword by Prof. FRANZ BOAS

This book deals chiefly with the Negro's economic status in New York. It shows his shifting position, at one time, a man; at another a despised servant. The last chapters discuss the race problem as a whole.

* * *

Miss Ovington's monograph on the Negro in New York is marked by frankness and thorough knowledge. The picture is the drama of a worthy race struggling upward under most difficult conditions.—*The Nation*.

Cloth bound, \$1.00 net.

LONGMANS GREEN & CO.,
443 Fourth ave., New York

MAISEL'S BOOK STORE

A worthy collection of thousands of good books brought together by a good deal of zeal and knowledge. Many real bargains. Here is one:

The International Science Library

New, 16 vols., cloth bound, published from Appleton plates, at \$24.00. Each volume contains from 400 to 500 pages.

The set consists of the following works:

- Darwin, Descent of Man.
 - " Origin of Species. 2 vols.
 - Haeckel, Evolution of Man. 2 vols.
 - Huxley, Education and Science.
 - " Man's Place in Nature.
 - Nicolson, Ancient Life History of the Earth.
 - Proctor, Other Worlds Than Ours.
 - Spencer, Education.
 - " First Principles.
 - Tyndal, The Forms of Water.
 - " Sound.
 - Wright, Man and the Glacial Period.
 - Young, The Sun.
 - Youmans and others, Culture Demanded by Modern Life.
- These 16 vols. make a very good foundation for every private or organization library. My price is \$8.00 for the set, expressage extra.
- 424 Grand Street, New York

Two of These \$1.00 Magazines for \$1.50

The NEW REVIEW The MASSES The PUBLIC
--: INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW :--

AN ATTRACTIVE COMBINATION

The NEW REVIEW	Regular price	\$1.00	} MY PRICE
The METROPOLITAN	"	\$1.50	
SOCIALISM SUMMED UP: By Morris Hillquit	"	\$1.00	
		\$3.50	

Joseph E. Klein, 1094 MYRTLE AVENUE
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

*NEWSDEALERS in New York and other cities have the
NEW REVIEW on sale or will order it for you.*

NEW REVIEWS IN BUNDLES

are sold at the rate of six cents each; non-returnable.

LIBERAL COMMISSIONS TO SUBSCRIPTION SOLICITORS

The New Review

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

Vol. I.

MAY, 1913

No. 16

Tariff Revision and After

The Underwood Tariff bill is being criticized in all sorts of ways. Protectionists condemn it because it lowers their sacred protective duties. Free traders find fault with it because it does not do away once and for all with all protective duties. Each particular industry and each particular interest raises the cry that it is being unjustly discriminated against and that it is going to be ruined by the lowering of duties on its own products, while the duties on the products of related or rival industries have not been made low enough. Those who resent the imposition of a direct tax on the incomes of the rich and well-to-do find an additional cause of complaint, for the income tax provision is an integral part of the Underwood bill. But notwithstanding all these contradictory criticisms from the various capitalist camps, or even because of them, we Socialists may well admit that the Underwood bill denotes a forward step in the evolution of American capitalism, and as such we may welcome it.

The Socialist attitude toward the question of Protection and Free Trade has always been different from that of either the capitalist protectionists or the capitalist free traders. However protectionists and free traders may differ from each other, they both agree in this, that each side regards its own creed as eternally true, eternally good, and applicable at all times in all parts of the world. As against this theological attitude, which regards its dogmas and "eternal ideas" as independent of time and space, the great Socialist theorists set up the historical conception that at one stage of capitalist development each particular country is compelled to raise a protective barrier against the industrial products of the more advanced countries in order to establish its own independent industries, to "manufacture manufacturers" as Engels put it, but that at a later and higher

stage of capitalist development the protective system becomes a barrier, not so much against the foreign manufacturers, as against industrial development at home.

This later stage was reached in the United States a couple of decades ago, and tariff revision is long overdue. Even the Republican leaders repeatedly admitted the need of revision but they pleaded that the tariff should be "revised by its friends." The Republican platform of 1908 held out a promise of downward revision, and the Payne-Aldrich law was one of the cardinal blunders of the Taft Administration. The "infant industries" of four and five decades ago have grown into mighty giants and like the giants of fable they are both voracious and slothful. They oppress the helpless domestic consumer with extortionate prices, they gather in vast profits through the creation of monopolistic rings, combines and trusts, while the technical state of various industries is often permitted to fall behind that of other countries. Instead of acting as a spur to the conquest of the home market, protection has become a barrier to the extension of the foreign market. Practically all capitalist interests are agreed that such is now the general situation, although each special interest contends that its own case forms an exception. The Underwood bill, with its reduction of duties in some directions and extension of the free list in others, is a necessary and belated outcome of this situation.

Judging from the course of the bill in the Democratic caucus, it will be adopted by the House substantially as introduced. Its fate in the Senate is more doubtful, owing to the narrow and unreliable Democratic majority. But assuming that it will be adopted without radical alteration, for President Wilson is not likely to permit a bill that has been radically altered to become a law, how will the new tariff affect the wage-workers of the land?

Other things being equal, the numerous reductions of duty and extensions of the free list are sooner or later bound to result in lower prices for the necessaries of life. These again would, other things being equal, lead in the long run to a reduction of money wages, so that there would be no real gain to the workers from the reduced cost of living. But other things need not necessarily remain equal. On the one hand, the workers may resist the reduction of money wages directly by means of strikes and improved organization, and indirectly by extorting favorable legislation from the state and national governments. On the other hand the capitalists are almost certain to attempt to

throw the whole burden of the economic readjustment upon the shoulders of labor. In this connection a recent editorial of the *New York Times* is highly significant, for in this whole matter of tariff revision the *Times* has been the most consistent exponent of ultra-capitalist ideas and interests.

The *Times* calls upon "American manufacturers, producers and wage earners" to prepare to adjust themselves speedily to the new conditions arising out of the Underwood tariff. The enactment of the new rates means that the "government will no longer assure profits by excluding competition." Hence, if the present high rate of American profits is to be maintained "factory methods must be re-examined to the end that waste of effort and material may be cut off, that the best modern methods may be applied." But the profit of the manufacturer must be maintained not only by means of extra care and exertion on his own part, but also on the part of the laborer: "Labor, too, must adopt the rule of higher efficiency. . . . Where a manufacturer finds it difficult or impossible to meet the new competition, he will be forced to demand of his workmen either a higher rate of production or, inevitably, longer hours or a lower wage."

There cannot be the slightest doubt that the employers will follow the course outlined by their faithful mouthpiece. The Underwood bill will usher in a new era of labor struggles more intense, protracted and violent than any that have preceded. This will perhaps be the most important outcome of the bill, and one that its authors have by no means contemplated. The success or failure of either side in this great conflict will depend primarily upon the extent and perfection of its own organization as compared with that of its antagonist, and secondarily upon the attitude of the local state, and national governments. That the capitalists are fully alive to the situation, the *Times* has informed us. That the workers are not in an equal state of preparedness, every careful observer of the labor movement knows. Does it therefore follow that the workers will evade the conflict or that they are doomed to defeat? Neither the one nor the other. Tame submission would be far more disastrous than defeat. The workers will be forced to accept the gage of battle that will be hurled at their feet, and the war that is inevitable will itself teach them how to wage war.

The Seventeenth Amendment

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislatures.

When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies, provided that the Legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

There is no denying the fact. We are making these days rapid progress in small things. The tariff is being revised, and not by its "friends." There is going to be an income tax. And now we shall also vote directly for United States Senators. For more than sixty years the proposal has been advocated to make Senators directly elective by the people, but it was not until June 24, 1911, that the Senate gave its consent to the change. By the action of the Connecticut legislature on April 8, the proposal has now become a part of the national Constitution.

It will be noticed that the amendment as adopted says nothing as to the time when Senators shall be elected. Does the old constitutional provision for the election of one-third of the Senators every two years therefore remain in force, or is it abrogated by implication, so that Congress has now the power to order a simultaneous election throughout the country as soon as the terms of the present Senators shall have expired? We confess complete ignorance on this point. But as regards the free and effective expression of the popular will the matter is not without importance.

The direct election of Senators will do away with many hoary abuses, not the least of which was the disproportionate influence of the country as compared with the cities. In New York, for example, the present state constitution in effect provides that the city of New York, with a majority of the state's population, shall not elect a majority of the state legislature, so that United States Senators have hitherto been elected by the representatives of a minority of the state's population. In Connecticut the disproportion was even more glaring, for there the little town of Union, with a population numbering 322 and a voting list of 87, sends two representatives to the state legislature, as does also the city of New Haven, with over 133,000

inhabitants, and nearly 26,000 voters. Yet we boast of our democracy!

The direct election of Senators will do away with many minor abuses, but it will not do away with one of the worst abuses, the most undemocratic political institution next to the United States Supreme Court—the United States Senate itself, to which New York, Pennsylvania and Illinois send two representatives each, just like Delaware, Rhode Island, and Nevada. Constitutional lawyers tell us that the Senate can never be constitutionally abolished, for it cannot be abolished without its own consent. But "never" is a big word, and history tells us that on a certain famous night the nobility of France proposed the abolition of its own feudal rights and prerogatives. And yet the night of August 4, 1789, was a mere episode in a great political and social revolution.

The General Strike in Belgium

This is not the first time that the workers of Belgium have struck for the conquest of political rights. In 1893 they wrested from the ruling classes the present manhood suffrage, universal but unequal, so that they can always be outvoted by the prosperous and educated. In 1902 they struck again for universal and equal suffrage, but were defeated. On both occasions the workers not only suffered and starved, but many of them also fell dead and wounded in clashes with the military forces. And now for the third time they are pitting their bare arms and empty stomachs against the armed forces of the state and the money bags of the capitalists in order to win the essential basis of democracy, universal and equal manhood suffrage.

Several of the best known and widely trusted parliamentary leaders of the Belgian workers advised against the present strike, but the demand of the masses to be led once more to battle became irresistible. The strike was decided upon in a national congress, but the parliamentarians hesitated, negotiated, procrastinated. Finally another national congress was held, the strike was irrevocably ordered, and the timid leaders were roundly told that the workers were determined not to return to work until they themselves, in congress assembled, should have decided to do so. The workers took their fate in their own hands, whereupon the weak-

kneed leaders pleaded to be permitted to continue in the leadership.

The strike has been thoroughly organized and prepared for. For months local strike committees have been at work, agitating, raising funds at home and abroad, storing food, providing for the care of children by friendly families in and out of the country. One-half of the salaries of the representatives in Parliament and of all officials of the Socialist party, the unions, co-operatives, and other labor organizations, is to go to the strike fund. The co-operatives have arranged to grant long term credits. The strikers have also received assurance of aid from bourgeois circles. Thus a Freemasons' lodge in Liege has volunteered to take care of fifty children, the Liberal paper *Petit Bleu* has undertaken to raise \$20,000 weekly during the strike, and the cable has reported various large donations by capitalist employers. For the yoke of the Clericals weighs heavy upon the Liberal bourgeoisie as well as upon the proletariat.

Thorough preparation has its great advantages, but the government also has had time to prepare and organize its forces. The Belgian workers have had experience in the organization of general strikes, but the Belgian government also has learned from experience how to cope with them. It was otherwise in 1893, when the government found itself confronted with a novel situation the potentialities of which were unknown and therefore dreaded. The success of the great Russian general strike of October, 1905, was also due to the fact that the disorganized government was taken by surprise. In the present strike the workers have no such advantage, and it is no doubt due to a recognition of the strength of the government, as well as to the desire not to lose the sympathies of the Liberal bourgeois, that the leaders have decided upon making the strike a peaceful one at any price.

But the strike of 1902 was also to be peaceful at any price, yet there were clashes with the military and workers were massacred in several towns. What should we think of a government that mobilized its army, placed it on the frontier, yet gave a solemn pledge to the opposing government that under no circumstances would it assume the aggressive? Yet that is what our Belgian comrades have done now, after the experience of 1902. It was with that experience in mind that Gustav Eckstein wrote in 1903, in the *Neue Zeit*, that "the general strike is the final, the most serious menace of the proletariat before the general assault; it has no greater force than that, but also no less.

When, for example, the Belgian comrades solemnly promised before entering on the general strike that in no case would they leave the ground of legality, they gave away the chance of success beforehand. A menace accompanied by a promise that it would not be carried into effect, has never yet produced a great effect. . . . All previous political struggles have had this in common, that in the end physical force was decisive. And whether it can be altogether excluded from the political struggles of the working class appears to me more than doubtful."

But in the actual struggle men are not free to choose their weapons or methods of warfare or the time for attack. Our Belgian comrades, we may be sure, are doing all that is possible in the existing circumstances. They deserve and they are assured of the sympathy and active aid of the class-conscious workers everywhere. And whether they win or lose, the fight they will have fought and the lessons they will have learned will become a part of the history and the experience of the international proletariat.

H. S.

Factory Reforms

By ABRAM I. ELKUS,

Counsel for the New York State Factory Investigating Commission

Created in response to a popular demand for an investigation of the Triangle fire in March, 1911, the New York State Factory Investigating Commission devotes a considerable section of its Report to the questions of "fire-prevention" and "fire-protection." The investigation of the fire problem, however, opened up a wide field of inquiry into other ways in which the lives of industrial workers are endangered and their health and vigor destroyed. Industrial accidents, poisoning and disease in what are called "dangerous trades," unsanitary conditions under which work is done, the lack of proper ventilation and illumination, the question of child labor, especially in the canneries and tenement houses, and of overtime work for women—all of these questions and others were covered by the Commission's year and a half of investigation and they are all represented in the thirty-two bills recommended by the Commission and now before the State Legislature.

Of these bills the most important are the three which pro-

vide for a thorough-going reorganization of the Labor Department. The Bureau of Inspection is enlarged and includes a division of Industrial Hygiene. The Bureau of Statistics, which has already done excellent work, is provided with more efficient machinery for collecting, codifying, and diffusing information of value to employer and employe alike. Most significant of all is the creation of an Industrial Board of which the Commissioner of Labor is chairman, assisted by four associate members—a woman, a representative of labor, a representative of the employers and a scientist.

The Industrial Board is, first of all, a legislative body with power, under broad, general statutes, of making rules and regulations which shall meet the ever-changing conditions of industry—a thing no legislative statute could effect. It can, further, make rules which shall apply to particular industries; and all these rules or changes in existing rules shall have the force of law. The Board is also a permanent investigating body and, as such, possesses all the powers of a legislative committee. Each member, likewise, has the right to inspect all factories, mercantile establishments and premises affected by the labor law.

In a word, the new Labor Department, and especially the Industrial Board, forms the crystalization of the Commission's work. Its separate recommendations, though excellent, are incomplete by themselves. The Industrial Board supplies the machinery for carrying them into effect.

In its investigation of the Fire Problem, the Commission lays great stress, and rightly so, on congestion. Workers are crowded together as closely as the floor-space will permit. In the Triangle fire, for instance, the sewing machines were fastened to long tables, one of them 75 feet in length and with but two narrow passages left at the two ends. After the fire twenty bodies were found back of this table, showing that these workers did not have time even to reach the passages. The Commission therefore recommends that the number of occupants in factories be limited to the capacity of the stairways and exits.

It has a number of important suggestions to make in regard to the construction of factory buildings, as for instance, that the stairways be enclosed by fire-proof partitions, and that doors open outward. Fire alarms also are suggested, and fire drills, as well as automatic sprinklers, signs marking exits, unobstructed passage ways and exits, and above all cleanliness. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." If work-rooms are kept clean instead of being cluttered with all sorts

of inflammable materials, fires would be fewer and less disastrous. Safe construction, avoidance of congestion, cleanliness, these are the three C's on which stress must be laid, if New York is to cut down its property losses by fire and its still more appalling losses in human life.

The question of Child Labor in the cannery sheds scattered through the rural sections of the State, as well as in tenement houses and in factories, is fully considered.

In its investigations of the cannery sheds last summer, the Commission found 1,259 children under sixteen years of age. Of these 942 were between 10 and 14 years, 141 under 10 years, while the ages of 55 ranged from 4 to 7 and there was one baby of 3 years.

No record is kept in the canneries of the number of hours spent by the children at work. The canner keeps the shed open and supplies the beans to be snipped or the corn to be husked, and the parents see that the children are there to work. This is due more to the grind of poverty than to hard-heartedness on the part of the parents—foreigners for the most part. When the average weekly wage of the women is \$4.53 and of the men about \$9.00, it is scarcely to be wondered at that even babies are drafted into the work.

The work of snipping beans is simple. It consists in removing the two ends of the bean which are not edible. At the beginning of the season the children enter into the work of "helping mother snip beans" in the spirit of play, but after they have spent days and weeks in the sheds, sometimes from four or five o'clock in the morning until late at night, they become like little machines and sit on their high boxes, snipping, snipping with their sore fingers tied up in rags.

In sheds where American children are employed work seldom begins before seven in the morning, but, as we have said, many of the canners bring out foreigners for the work, whom they camp near the factory in tenements scarcely more habitable than the cannery sheds themselves.

"Boss says the work begins at four to-morrow," one of the "working inspectors" was told by a little Italian boy.

She left the shed at 9.30 that night. About a dozen children were still there and part of the floor was covered a foot deep with beans which were held overnight. Another Italian boy snipped beans from 4 o'clock in the morning till 11 at night and yet the inspector found him snipping the next morning at 5.30,

wrapped up in a shawl and with his black eyes fairly sagging out of his head.

It must not be thought, however, that all the canners are engaged in this shameful exploitation of children. Many of them are opposed to child labor in the canneries, and about half of them do not resort to it to-day. The rest must be made to see the light. The State of New York cannot afford to have the health of its children impaired, their education neglected and their lives blighted through ignorance, indifference and greed.

Another phase of the Child Labor question has to do with homework in tenement houses. Here, too, the factory law is evaded. Children from 4 to 14 are employed in crocheting lace, extracting the meat from nuts, basting cloths and taking out the basting stitches, willowing plumes, running ribbons in underwear, and the like. They work early in the morning before going to school, after school until late at night and on Sundays. One little girl said she never played in the daylight because she had to work then, but that sometimes she was allowed to go out at night "to save the gas."

It is not easy to fix the responsibility for tenement house work, because the work seldom bears the manufacturer's name. Further, the number of inspectors allowed at present is quite insufficient even to secure sanitary conditions. The Commission therefore recommends that the number of inspectors in charge of this work be increased for the protection both of the public health and of the children. Moreover, a list is to be published of all manufacturers who send out work to be done or finished in the tenement homes of the workers. The Commission hopes to make the work unpopular through the powerful agency of publicity.

There are at present nearly 14,000 children, between the ages of 14 and 16, employed in the factories of the State. The state requires a certificate to be filed in all such cases, covering the child's age, his physical condition and his education. Then the state washes its hands of all responsibility with regard to him. He may be put to work lifting and carrying heavy boxes, or kept at his task all day sitting on a high stool or in a dimly lighted room or one filled with dust and poisonous gases. Often the child is just over the health line when he is examined and a few months of work put him hopelessly below it. But his certificate has been filed. The state's conscience is clear.

The Report suggests a simple remedy for this evil; namely, that the children be examined from time to time and their working certificates cancelled if they are found to be physically unfit for factory work. It also recommends a minimum educational requirement, "continuation schools," and special inspection of the working places where minors are employed.

Closely allied to the question of Child Labor is that of the women workers in canneries, factories and shops.

The decision of the United States Supreme Court in the celebrated Oregon case, as well as the whole current of public opinion to-day, is opposed to the excessive toil of women. This opposition is based on considerations both of health and morality. No woman can work from 16 to 21½ hours a day for weeks, in some cases even months, on end, without permanent injury to her health. Yet women are doing just this thing in the up-state canneries, in binderies and other factories, and in the shops during the six-week Christmas rush. Of the night workers in a twine factory one of the Commission's inspectors writes:

"The women as a whole were a disheartening group, in their oily, dust-laden clothes, with drawn, white faces and stooping gait."

Most of the women on the night shift in this factory are married. During the day-time they do the cooking and washing, take care of their children and get sometimes as much as four hours of sleep. Their life of unceasing toil not only injures their own health, but is a heritage of weakness and disease to their children.

The Commission devoted especial attention to the work of women in canneries, both because of the exemption of these places from the factory laws and because of the large number of women employed. A "working investigator" writes of packing the cans after they had been capped:

Ten hours in the warehouse to-day. All the women complained of being very tired before our work was over. They kept us more steadily at the packing of boxes, the pauses being less frequent and of shorter duration—about two minutes pause every half hour or so. We work very fast and stoop constantly to get the cans out of the crates. I have aches and pains all over, and the other women complain of pains in their arms. The foreman told us that if the superintendent came and saw us resting, even for a minute, he would send some of the women away to the factory and make it so much harder for the rest.

In the large canneries, too, the work keeps up pretty regularly during a season of four or five months. A week of 85, 94, in one case 119¾ working hours is not followed by a week

of comparative rest, but by another almost as bad. *And the pay averages ten cents an hour!*

To be sure, many of the cannery women have fathers, husbands, or brothers able to help them. But some of them are alone and no woman could live decently on \$4.53 a week (the average wage of the women), even if she worked the year round. Another "working investigator," a young woman, speaks of the "freshness" of several of the factory bosses, especially of the time-keeper who was the superintendent's cousin. She adds:

"Only up here night work makes the situation even more dangerous."

A few days later she writes:

"I find that the time-keeper who was objectionable to me the other day has been insulting several girls. He said to me, 'You can't make enough to pay you, but I will give you a chance to make 2 or 3 dollars on the side any time. If you come up here to work at night, we can go for a stroll.'"

This is the invariable result of night work. The only remedy is a legal opening and closing hour before and after which work is prohibited. Such a law has existed in England since 1844 and in many other countries of Europe as well.

If the recommendations of the Commission become law, the canneries will be included under the definition of "factories" and so made subject to the law forbidding work for women between 10 P. M. and 6 A. M. Considering the perishable nature of the crops, however, the Commission believes that a maximum of 12 hours a day and 66 hours a week in the rush season might be allowed in the canneries without endangering the safety of the women workers.

Of dangerous trades the Commission has made a most thorough investigation, with some very striking results. Already (in 1911) its recommendations concerning lead poisoning from industrial sources had become law. In 1912, 359 separate chemical factories employing 11,087 workers were covered. Especial attention was paid to danger in the use of commercial acids and wood alcohol, also a study was made of the diseases of the ear and "breath tract" among workers in the ostrich feather, fur, and cordage industries.

In the chemical industries the workers come into close contact with the most deadly poisons. Irritating dusts and noxious gases are often generated in the processes of manufacture. The temperature is often intolerably high and the sanitary conditions bad. Moreover, the men are sometimes ignorant of their danger

and reckless beyond belief. A striking example of this was seen by the Commission in a factory where caustic potash was manufactured. The liquid caustic was sent through several sections of an iron trough, supported at the junctions by wooden blocks. The workmen frequently passed under the trough without any thought, apparently, that the displacement of one of the blocks would mean instant death. When the foreman was asked why he permitted this:

"They know it is dangerous," he said, with a shrug, and so made no effort to stop it.

In foundries also the death rate is very high, particularly from tuberculosis. It is an encouraging fact, however, that the founders are generally in sympathy with the Commission. At the public hearing in Albany a very conservative foundry owner said:

"We believe the most efficiency is obtained by men who are surrounded by good conditions and who are in well heated rooms free from gas, dust, and smoke, and furnished with water, good washing and bathing facilities."

This founder has practically summarized the Commission's recommendations: that the men shall not be exposed to cold draughts when they are dripping with perspiration; that the room shall be properly ventilated and heated; and that toilet places shall be in the same building where the men work so that they need not be exposed to the outside air in cold weather.

But if conditions in the foundries are encouraging, those in the bakeries are discouraging to a degree. Many of the bakeries, especially in New York City, are in cellars. They are hot, dimly lighted and some of them fearfully and awfully unclean. The bakers have no separate clothing for their work, but bake in their underclothes, with bare feet, and often they are not only dirty, but diseased. These men handle the bread twice, before it is baked and afterward. It is popularly believed that the heat of the oven is sufficient to kill germs. This is not so. On the contrary, two eminent London physicians have given it as their opinion that many septic invasions of the human body may eventually be traced to the agency of infected bread. Not only is "a dirty bakery a menace to the entire trade," it is a menace to the public as well.

The Commission has, therefore, in the interests of the public health, a number of recommendations to make in regard to bakers and bakeries, of which the most important are the prohibition of all new cellar-bakeries, the medical examination of bakers and rigid supervision of all bakeries.

A survey of the general sanitary conditions of factories throughout the state shows that one-half of these are fairly beyond criticism, their defects being such as may be easily remedied. Some are all that could be desired. The other half are in need of a thorough reform, especially in the matter of clean workrooms, light and ventilation, washing facilities, dressing-rooms for women and sanitary toilet places. With regard to these latter a good deal must be done in the interests of cleanliness and also of decency where men and women are employed together.

In the section of the Report devoted to accident prevention, the Commission makes a number of excellent recommendations, recognizing the fact that rules for the prevention of accidents must be derived from statutes sufficiently elastic to meet changing conditions. It suggests those protective measures that would at once occur to a careful reader of the whole report—measures, it may be added, which have been approved both by the employers and the representatives of labor appearing before the Commission. Frank praise must be given to those manufacturers who have already and without compulsion adopted the proposed changes in their factories. They needed only to have the evil pointed out to them and they readily agreed to remove it.

"We must educate our masters," said a great English statesman after the suffrage had been extended under Gladstone. Education in the matter of protecting life and health is the keynote of the Commission's Report. An appeal to the intelligence will do much to lessen danger. Bulletins shall be issued from time to time by the Department of Labor with drawings and demonstrations. The experts, too, of the Department shall give lectures on safety devices, and shall make practical suggestions to both workers and employers.

This "campaign of education," which is to be State-wide and permanent, the Commission has entrusted to the reorganized Labor Department and especially to the Industrial Board. The primary object of the Board is to conserve the lives, the health and the strength of factory workers. This object, however, cannot be attained without increasing their industrial efficiency and, as a result, advancing the interests of their employer. This is conservation in its highest sense—conservation not only of the material resources of the State, but also of that far more precious asset, the lives and health and happiness and hope of its people.

The White Man's Burden

By W. E. HARDENBURG.

[The author of this article has obtained first-hand knowledge of the way the "white man" (i. e. capitalist) carries his "burden". As author of "The Putumayo: The Devil's Paradise," published in 1909 by T. Fisher Unwin in London, he was the first European to expose the atrocities perpetrated upon the natives of the South American rubber districts by the cruel greed of European and South American capitalists. It was as a result of his revelations that the British government dispatched Consul Casement to the Putumayo, and the Consul's report confirmed Comrade Hardenburg's charges. Lately Comrade Hardenburg was testifying before the Parliamentary Putumayo Investigating Commission. We have arranged with him for the publication in the near future of a series of articles in the NEW REVIEW on the Putumayo Atrocities, of which the present article may be regarded as a general introduction.]

Among the most tragic of the many horrors that have cursed the human race under the baneful rule of Capital, nothing else can for a moment compare with the cruelty, lust and greed that have everywhere accompanied the contact of Europeans with the natives of the Tropics.

It seems that under the goad of capitalist ambition, men who have had the advantage of modern education and the "moral benefits" of our Christian civilization, will readily throw off their humanity and yield to this insidious and demoralizing influence, which transforms them into veritable devouring beasts. And once the teeth of these human hyenas penetrate into the quivering flesh of their victims, it is almost impossible to make them loose their hold.

I.

Take the case of the now notorious Putumayo atrocities. This series of monstrous crimes, "far worse than anything reported from the Congo," according to the Chairman of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, was first exposed in Peru in 1907 by Benjamin Saldana Rocca, a Peruvian Socialist, in the following words:

"They force the pacific Indians of the Putumayo to work day and night at the extraction of rubber, without the slightest remuneration. . . . They rob them of their crops, their women

and their children to satisfy the voracity, lasciviousness and avarice of themselves and their employes. . . . They flog them inhumanly until their bones are laid bare; they give them no medical treatment, but let them die, eaten up by maggots or to serve as food for their dogs; they castrate them, cut off their ears, fingers, arms, legs; they torture them by fire, water, and by tying them up, crucified, head downwards. . . . They cut them to pieces with machetes, they grasp children by the feet and dash their heads against walls and trees, until their brains fly out; they have the old people killed when they can work no longer, and, finally, to amuse themselves, practice shooting or, to celebrate the *sabado de gloria* (Easter Saturday), they discharge their weapons at men, women and children, or, in preference to this, they souse them with kerosene and set fire to them to enjoy their desperate agony."

Yet such was the power and influence of the criminal beneficiaries of this system that in less than a year Saldana Rocca was bankrupt and forced to return to Lima in order to earn a living. And although he continued, insofar as was possible his noble labors there, it was absolutely without result, for the ruling class was deaf and blind to anything that threatened their possession of the disputed territory of the Putumayo or the curtailment of the blood-stained revenues derived therefrom.

In 1908, 1909 and 1910, it was the privilege of the present writer to take up and amplify Saldana Rocca's work; and after great difficulties, he succeeded in arousing public opinion in England to such an extent as to cause the British Foreign Office to despatch Sir Roger Casement to the Putumayo, to investigate as to the truth of the allegations.

In June, 1911, it was known that Consul Casement's report fully corroborated all the above charges, and in July, 1912, his report was published in full. It not only confirmed the charges here mentioned, but even augmented them. In the meantime, an independent investigation, reluctantly undertaken by the Peruvian Government, returned with over 3,000 pages of testimony.

And now, after five years of constant agitation by various individuals and societies in England and Peru, what do we find? Not one criminal convicted, not one Indian freed! On the contrary, Sir Edward Grey states that the amount of rubber exported from the Putumayo for the first four months of 1912 equalled three-quarters of the total output for 1911, figures which can only have been rendered possible by a continuance of the

abominable system of forced labor. And the London *Star* of Dec. 11, 1912, says:

"We published extracts from the Colombian Consul's dispatches in our later editions yesterday. The lurid eloquence which he employs in describing the abominations of the rubber traffic would inspire scepticism, were it not that his statements have received general confirmation from independent sources. Indians are still being kidnapped and 'sold in the city like donkeys.' Indian women are bandied about as 'gifts' from one white blackguard to another. The same murderous ruffians remain in the company's employ—a guarantee that wretched Indians are still being soaked in oil and burned alive, hacked to death with hatchets and shot down by organized parties of bandits. . . . It is a satire on our civilization."

II.

While as to the Belgian Congo it may fairly be assumed that the atrocities are over, it appears from an article by Mr. E. D. Morel in the "Contemporary Review" of December, 1911, that these horrors are beginning to make their appearance in the French Congo.

By 1900 nearly the whole territory, consisting of over 500,000 square miles of forest, was divided among forty-four French and Belgian companies, and the native was deprived of the right to collect the produce of the country and sell it. The whole region belonged now to a group of merciless parasites in Paris. The results were the same as in the Belgian Congo—armed raids by the employes of the companies, punitive expeditions, the employment of many former Congo State criminals, and the general introduction of the methods formerly in vogue there.

In 1905 crimes and atrocities were reported as being of every-day occurrence—the same sickening tale of floggings, burnings, rapes, mutilations, tortures and starvations. DeBrazza, who had been High Commissioner of the French Congo before the introduction of these methods, wrote: "Ruin and terror have been imported into this unfortunate colony. In the Ubanghi-Shari district, I have found a continuous destruction of the population." And in the French Chamber of Deputies it was stated that concessionaire agents were systematically raiding the country and torturing natives to death, "accompanied by acts of such atrocious bestiality as to be unprintable."

In the lower French Congo the system seems to have ceased, having accomplished its evil results. But in the middle and upper Congo, it is believed to be still continuing, the French government having granted in 1910 "to companies convicted of long-sustained and atrocious crime, exclusive exploitation of rubber for ten years." And more significant still, in the same year, the French government suppressed the inspectors, through whom reports were coming out!

Referring to the Belgian Congo, Rev. John H. Harris says in his recent book, "Dawn in Darkest Africa," in regard to the present shortage of labor and of rubber, owing to the brutal extermination of both people and plants:

"It is a haunting thought that since the '85 scramble for Africa, the civilized powers who arranged the map of the African continent, ostensibly in the interests and for the well-being of the natives, have passively allowed the premature destruction of not less than ten millions of people."

III.

The same gross exploitation of innocent and inoffensive aborigines, but apparently not characterized by such hellish atrocities as in the Putumayo and the Congo, is to be found in the Portuguese islands of S. Thomé and Príncipe and in the vast Portuguese territory along the west coast of Africa, known as Angola.

These islands are situated in the Gulf of Guinea and fairly close to the mainland of Angola. The chief products are cocoa, coffee and cotton, which are raised on large plantations owned by a few whites. In order to obtain the necessary labor, it is the custom to cross over to Angola and there make raids upon the Negroes of the interior.

To-day, out of a population of about 50,000 on the two islands, there are about 2,000 whites—plantation owners, government officials and merchants. The remainder are practically all *servicaes*, as they are termed—victims who have been hunted and captured in Angola and brought here to enrich the plantation owners.

It was about seven years ago that this slave system reached its zenith, and it became such a scandal that certain British cocoa merchants were compelled to withdraw their trade from these islands. During the last few years this export trade in slaves

from Angola has been somewhat checked, but that it is still going on to a certain extent seems indisputable.

Thus Archdeacon Potter in a pamphlet entitled "The Christian Powers and Weaker Races," published in December, 1912, says:

"These people are certainly not free; and they have not been enlisted in the planters' service by their own free will. The death-rate is very high, the birth-rate is very low, and the people are not repatriated in any number, but continue in their slave condition to the end of their lives. . . . And still the evil continues, and the slaves are not made free."

The Rev. John Harris, in his recent book quoted above, agrees with Potter, Burt, Nevinson and other travellers that both the mainland and the islands are still rotten with slavery and estimates that during the last twenty-five years no less than 200,000 men and women have been kidnapped from Angola.

IV.

"Britons never will be slaves," runs the song. Considering the wretched and deplorable position of over thirteen millions of the inhabitants of the British Isles, the truth of this refrain seems rather dubious, to say the least about it. But when we review the conditions of the working class in some of the British dependencies, we see clearly that this idle cry of the master-class is on a par with that other hateful and hypocritical farrago of cant about the White Man's Burden.

I refer to the question of indentured labor, which the Hon Mr. Gokhale, in a motion in the Indian Legislative Council, proposes to abolish *in toto*. His motion was defeated, in spite of the fact that all the elected members voted for it. In his speech on this occasion (March, 1912), Mr. Gokhale said:

"Under this system those who are recruited bind themselves to go to a distant and unknown land to work for any employer to whom they may be allotted, whom they do not know, and who does not know them, to live on his estate, and to go nowhere without a special permit; to do any tasks assigned to them, however irksome. The binding is usually for five years, during which they cannot withdraw from the contract, or escape its hardships, however intolerable; they bind themselves to work for a fixed wage, invariably lower, sometimes much lower, than that of free labor around them; they are placed under a special law, never explained to them before they leave their country,

which is in a language they do not understand, which imposes upon them a criminal liability for the most trivial breaches of the contract, instead of the usual civil liability attaching to such breaches. They are liable to imprisonment with hard labor for two or three months, not only for fraud, deception or negligence, but even for an impertinent word or gesture to the manager or overseer. Add to this that the victims of this system—simple, ignorant, illiterate, poor—are induced to enter on these agreements by wily professional recruiters, who are paid so much per head for the labor they supply, and no fair-minded man will deny that the system is a monstrous imposition in itself, based on fraud and maintained by force—a grave blot on the civilization of the country that tolerates it. The system came into existence to take the place of slavery after its abolition—a fact admitted by Lord Sanderson's Committee. It is a system under which the emancipated Negro scorns to come. It has been repeatedly suspended for abuses, reluctantly resumed under pressure from planters. It was denounced in 1837 in strong terms by Lord Brougham, Mr. Buxton and others. A Committee of four sat in Calcutta to report. Three out of the four condemned the system altogether. Parliament adopted in a thin House the minority report. From then till 1906 there was a constant succession of resumptions and suspensions."

In the March, 1912, number of the "Indian Review" appear these statements: "The majority of British capitalists seem to swallow and even conceal the evils of sending thousands of men, with a complement of thirty-three women for every hundred men, to distant lands, where it is considered justice to send people to gaol for absence from work, non-completion of hard tasks, refusals to be treated at the hospitals, insubordinate language. For these crimes the prisons of Mauritius treat 40 per cent. of their inmates to free board, etc."

Mr. Bateman, an ex-magistrate of Mauritius, says: "The position of indentured coolies when charged in the courts is hopeless. Justice they get only by accident. They are deterred from giving evidence themselves, and unable to procure evidence. I was a machine for sending men to prison for the convenience of the employers."

V.

Another illuminating phase of the heartless rapacity of the international capitalist class in its "altruistic shouldering of the

White Man's Burden"—that is, in its feverish search for, and unscrupulous absorption of new fields of exploitation, is revealed in Mr. Morgan Shuster's book on "The Strangling of Persia." Mr. Shuster says:

"Only the pen of a Macaulay could adequately portray the rapidly shifting scenes attending the downfall of this ancient nation—scenes in which two powerful and presumably enlightened Christian countries (England and Russia) played fast and loose with truth, honor, decency and law, one at least hesitating not even at the most barbarous cruelties to accomplish its political designs, and put Persia beyond hope of self-regeneration.

"The Persians are doomed to political annihilation and economic servitude. The world cannot hear their moral appeal Morocco, Tripoli and Persia, three Moslem States, have been destroyed in one year by their enlightened Christian neighbors."

* * *

The instances enumerated above are not meant as a complete survey of this ghastly subject. They are but a few of the more notorious and best authenticated manifestations of the greed of the modern dividend-seeker, which brooks no opposition, feels no sympathy, knows no justice, which is forever menacing native peace and progress, forever seeking new victims to despoil. The whole question is very well put by Mr. C. Reginald Enock in his introduction to my book, "The Putumayo: The Devil's Paradise":

"The occurrences in the Amazon Valley which, under the name of the Putumayo Rubber Atrocities of Peru, have startled the public mind and aroused widespread horror and indignation—atrocities worse than those of the Congo—cannot be regarded merely as an isolated phenomenon. Such incidents are the extreme manifestation of a condition which expresses itself in different forms all over the world—the condition of acute and selfish commercialism or industrialism whose exponents, in enriching themselves, deny a just proportion of the fruits of the earth and of their toil to the laborers who produce the wealth. The principle can be seen at work in almost any country, in almost every industry, and although its methods elsewhere are lacking in savage lust and barbarity, they still work untold suffering upon mankind."

HAYWOOD

By ANDRE TRIDON

Many a time I set out to observe some social fermentation in which Big Bill played the part of a leavening ingredient; I was going to devote my attention to strike crowds, strike tactics; at the end of the day I found that I had observed closely and studied exclusively . . . Haywood. Magnetism? Magnetism is an absurd word which explains as little Haywood's lure as metaphysics explains the beginning of the world.

Let us dissect Haywood and catalogue whatever we find or do not find. First of all, Haywood is Haywood. Remember Peer Gynt's definition of the Sphynx: "The Sphynx is itself." Rcsny's "Red Wave," Hauptmann's "Weavers," Mirbeau's "Bad Shepherds," Galsworthy's "Strife" have acquainted bourgeois readers with labor agitators who agitate mostly themselves. Mysterious, mystical, dramatic, abnormal, stubborn, brutal; the labor leaders of fiction are one or several of these things; not one of them resembles Haywood nor helps to explain him.

Intensely positive as he is, I find it easier to describe him by pointing out what he is not, does not say, or does not do.

He is not dramatic. The platform from which he speaks never becomes a stage, and when he speaks from a stage, that stage becomes a platform. I have seen Haywood miss splendid opportunities for trashy melodrama. A child was hurt in Paterson when the police cleared a street; the boy's mother was laid low by a billy's blow; another blow put out of commission a man who was helping her to her feet. Haywood, the next day, recited the facts, bare, unembellished, without comment, without tremolo.

"What's the policeman's name?" a voice queried.

"His name," Haywood answered, "is said to be Edward Duffy. His number 72."

If Duffy had been present, this simple statement made in a slow, cold, earnest tone would have chilled him. Edward Duffy, No. 72, had been sentenced to the implacable hatred of 2,000 human beings.

Eloquence Haywood spurns. Resounding words, soap box platitudes, the brotherhood of man, the Socialist commonwealth

rising upon the ruins of the capitalist system, death to the exploiters, will not fire sluggards with a desire to fight for their rights. Workers want simple, homely facts concerning their trade. When a strike is well launched, it is altogether too easy to fire a crowd with the desire to do stupid things, it is too easy to catch round after round of applause.

Haywood is simple. His speech and manner are simple. So are his clothes and his get up. Some of the youngsters in the labor movement cultivate flowing manes and affect flowing ties, anathematize stiff collars and all but clerical, black clothes. They are burdened by their prophetic mission. Haywood's huge stature and his one damaged eye are the only things that make him conspicuous in a crowd. A Western soft hat, the collar, the tie, the suit, the overcoat that a million workingmen wear; neither foppish, nor slatternly.

Almost seven foot tall and with ample girth, he lets his appearance proclaim his strength; he does not stamp or pound, he does not act the bully; he does not use invective, he never damns or swears. Having been jailed perhaps a hundred times, he does not harp on his martyrdom. He does not whine. He does not boast. He is not a hero, nor an apostle. Just a big, strapping fellow, who came from far away to do some work that had to be done and who is going to do it regardless of what may befall him. If the police interfere with his plans he will neither be cowed nor will he provoke them to acts of violence. He will, once more, go to jail without uttering the empty words which textbooks record as historical sayings.

His many encounters with the representatives of organized capital have not embittered him; he is too healthy to be bitter. Familiarity with the woes of struggling mankind has not hardened him; a realization of how many maggots fatten on the rotten side of labor has not made him cynical.

Haywood is not mysterious, nor mystical; he is not distant with strangers nor unduly familiar with close associates. In a word a poor subject for the dramatist. "Clever, shrewd, a Machiavelli," thus speak those who watched him once or twice adapting himself to the mood, the temper, the level of a thousand miners, ten young children, a group of artists, a cultured woman. Watch him some more and you will find something more humanely interesting than Machiavellian shrewdness or cleverness: the faculty of sympathetic response. Uncover the strings of a piano and every sound in the room will call forth a sympha-

thetic vibration of the sounding board. Haywood vibrates sympathetically.

Haywood adapts himself to the audience, but that adaptation is the result of a reflex action, not of a conscious effort. The other day I watched him conducting a risky movement. He asked a crowd made up of perhaps twenty-five nationalities to select as many delegates, whom he sat on the stage in a row, calling upon them in turn to say a few words. The crowd had been on strike several weeks; which means that for several weeks those men, women and children had slept their fill, rested their limbs, listened for hours to argumentation, read pamphlets; their bodies and their minds were undergoing a crucial change; races were commingling, united by the same hopes; bold, energetic men with a halo of romance had come from the ends of the continent to lead their fight. Bellies were empty perhaps, but hunger is not so fierce in idleness as in times of factory speeding. A carnival spirit pervaded the hall; and the twenty-five were lined up on the platform, self-conscious, with the weak jaw of the scared or the swagger of the panicky.

Some of them rushed to the front when called upon and repeated stock phrases; these Haywood encouraged, in order to give heart to the others. Some launched upon a lecture. Some stuttered in a choked whisper; Haywood repeated their words, editing them a little, for the benefit of the last row in the audience. Some were ridiculous and called forth a storm of mock applause and giggling; Haywood reminded the audience of the fact that the hardest workers are not the best talkers. When a sweet-faced, child-like girl, the Italian delegate, almost ran off the stage in a fit of fright, Haywood, with the attitude of a father to his young daughter or of a courtier to a princess, came to her, took her hand and with a bow presented her to the audience. And the girl, feeling safe under the protection of the tall Cyclop, found something to say and the voice to say it. But for the strong restraining hand of Haywood the audience would have jeered the poor inarticulate delegates, shouted the little girl off the stage, and then delegates and crowd, the former humiliated, the latter ashamed, would have all born a grudge against the organizer of the performance.

As it was, the representatives of twenty-five nations gathered on the platform and, affirming the solidarity of their races in the present strike, felt thankful to Haywood and impelled thereafter to justify by deeds the trust placed in them. The

crowd felt that from the twenty-four men and the girl thus singled out a new activity would radiate.

Lunching once in a little restaurant patronized by Orientals, Haywood turned around and, looking into the men's faces, began to speak. The dark-eyed men laid down their cards or their forks, listened, asked questions in broken English. Haywood answered the questions slowly, in a simplified English which his Armenian or Greek audience could understand. Children drifted in. They were not boisterous, not intrusive, nor familiar. They too listened. Now and then Haywood had a word for "the babies," and the babies, some of them fourteen or fifteen years old, drew nearer and nearer; two sat on his knees evincing the confidence of chicks nestling under the mother's wing. . . .

Wherever Haywood happens to be there starts a little meeting at which he patiently explains, elucidates, reiterates as long as the audience seems to need his explanations. Shrewdness, cleverness? No. Power, simplicity only. Once Haywood made a great mistake. He debated with one who is clever and shrewd. The sight was as incongruous as the first part of a bull fight: A bull with savage horns versus a thin Spaniard who holds two light arrows topped with red and yellow. The bull rushes, the thin Spaniard steps lightly aside and plants his arrows into the beast's hide. Amusing to the idle and unthinking, but a waste of time. At least we know that the bull could turn up deep furrows in a fertile field, while the little fellow was born to plant little arrows which barely scratch the hide, all the while addressing his knowing smile to the audience.

Stripping Haywood of all the attributes which usually enable labor leaders to lead, we end by finding in him two qualities, rare ones: genuine power and genuine simplicity. Two qualities which every performer everlastingly tries to sham. Tragic antics, eloquence, emotionalism, bullyism, floor stamping, pulpit pounding, abuse, invective: weakness masquerading as power. Dirty hands and clothes, picturesque garb, slouchy, vulgar familiarity: shrewdness masquerading as simplicity.

Another man in this country is two-thirds as genuinely powerful as Haywood: Roosevelt. They are two-thirds alike. Roosevelt makes a successful effort, but an effort just the same, to interest himself in what interests the voters, that their sympathy may come to him more freely. Haywood in his spare hours reads books or looks at paintings, that his sympathy may follow more freely not only to those who work with their hands,

but also to those who work with their brains. Roosevelt is ceaselessly seeking what road the immediate trend will compel the crowd to take; his mind is broadening because the crowd's mind is broadening, and he must keep up with the crowd. Haywood's views are changing because he is seeing a new light and he trusts the crowd to follow him.

Haywood's power and simplicity are congenital; Roosevelt's power and simplicity are cultivated. One represents the melting pot, the other the bourgeoisie. Roosevelt represents the spirit of to-day; Haywood, the spirit of to-morrow and of the day after to-morrow.

State Socialism and the Individual

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING.

Individualistic capitalism and "State Socialism" work equally to maintain the present social system in its progress towards hereditary caste, *i. e.*, they are both fundamentally conservative. And both have "progressive" as well as reactionary features.

We are all sufficiently familiar with the individualistic progress of the past; the new "progressive" capitalists are making us familiar at once with the evils of individualism and with the progress that may be expected under "State Socialism" and reform. It is only the reactionary aspect of "State Socialism" that is in danger of being overlooked now.

Mr. Hilaire Belloc puts the danger of "Progressive" reaction in a single phrase when he says that "State Socialism" is making not for Socialism but for the "Servile State."

The Servile State, says Mr. Belloc, is a State in which the few are left in the possession of the means of production, while the many who are left without such possession remain much as they were, save that they have their lives organized and regulated under those few capitalists who are responsible for the well-being of their subordinates. The government, of course, is the agency which makes the capitalists responsible; the government may even step in between the capitalist and the worker and make itself the active agency of organization; but so long as it leaves the capitalist in possession of his capital, and, under sanction of punishment, which is absolutely necessary to such a conception, confines the workers to certain hours and habits, and sees to it that a proportion of his produce shall be paid to the capitalists, the State is servile.

Mr. Belloc asks if it is not true that many so-called "Socialists" (in reality they are State Socialists) have for the past few

years, as a matter of fact, followed this line of least resistance. "Governments have with their regulations," he continues, "introduced a larger and larger element of efficiency by such measures as the minimum wage, etc. But wherein," he asks, "does their action affect the special economic privilege of the few who own the means of production?"

Mr. Belloc points out that the absorption of the army of the unemployed by government works would by no means necessarily force capitalism to raise the wages of the workers, as so many trade unionists hope it will, and certainly wherever industries are monopolized, whether by private capital or by the state, the wages of labor are held down, not by competition of unemployed laborers, but by the fact that the monopolies control practically all the jobs. Belloc contends that the movement for labor legislation, good housing, the feeding of school children, free medical attendance, compensation for injuries, etc., does nothing whatever towards expropriating the owning majority, but on the contrary gives the capitalist "an increasing right to coerce his man since you cannot create obligations without creating rights at the same time."

The "right to work" clause proposed by the Labor party in its unemployment bill and supported by almost half of the British Parliament, specified that if an unemployed person showed any "deliberate and habitual disinclination to work," he might be "detained" in a reformatory colony for a period not exceeding six months, and be apprehended if he escaped. In other words, the Labor party is ready to pay for such employment and wages as the state is likely to give by the complete surrender of individual liberty!

It was this kind of Socialism, so common in Great Britain, that Herbert Spencer had in mind when he called all Socialism "a coming form of slavery." Not only is liberty surrendered in this reform, but it also carries with it that whole plan of military regimentation which Spencer most feared.

It was the Social-Democratic party of Great Britain, for instance, that proposed conscription—with the well-intentioned but useless proviso that the "citizen army" is to be "free entirely from military law in times of peace, officered entirely by the selection of the rank and file," and "used for defensive purposes only." This resolution was supported at the British Trade Union Congress of 1911 by the only representative the above-mentioned party has in Parliament, Mr. Will Thorne, with an argument drawn from the Labor party's Right-To-Work bill. Mr. Thorne

declared that if this bill is granted it must be accompanied either by conscription or a citizen army (which he asserts to be different), because if everyone is assured work there would be no army without compulsion. Certainly the coercion involved in the proposed "citizen army" is based on the same principles as that of the Right-To-Work bill. Though several hundred thousand votes were cast against Mr. Thorne's resolution, there were nearly 100,000 for it, and we can be sure that this division within the unions themselves was most valuable to the "State Socialist" forces outside.

"Deliberate and habitual disinclination to work!" Is not this condition, denounced by the Labor party, the normal condition of the normal man until his work and wages satisfy him? William Morris and others have pointed out the gulf that lies between true work, which we may love, and the mere toil that falls to the lot of the average man. As to the work which ninety-nine per cent. of the world must do to-day, are we not all deliberately and habitually disinclined to it, and if we undertake it willingly, is it not merely because the reward promises what we consider to be a fair return for our labor? Now the plans of State employment contemplate only the most meagre "minimum" wage, sufficient it is true to maintain the workers in health, but scarcely going beyond that. Shall we surrender the liberty of the unemployed in order to give them nothing more than the bare privilege of living?

Would we not wish something more, something altogether different for any of the unemployed who might be under our immediate personal care—especially if they happened to be relatives? Can we allow any other standard to be applied by the State? Is there any reward high enough adequately to replace the loss of personal liberty? And finally, may not the creation of an army of regimented state servants do even more harm to the community than the present chaotic and planless waste of health and labor-power?

This coercive plan of "State Socialism" in dealing with the individual as a worker, though frowned upon by the Socialist parties outside of Great Britain, has been endorsed, not only by the Labor party there, but also by leading Socialists and Socialist organizations, and also by prominent Socialists in America, where it has been proposed to enact it into law. We should at least expect that if Socialists go in for the practical application of these principles, they would demand also *that the rich should be compelled to labor at the same time as the poor.*

Perhaps the leading authority in this field in England is Mr. Sidney Webb, whose whole elaborate scheme for dealing with the unemployed considers them as something between criminals and free men—not criminals perhaps, but certainly not guiltless and equal citizens. Mr. Webb proposes that while the unemployed are "detained," they should be given a certain industrial training, but "while the training in itself is valuable to the community as well as to the men themselves," its chief functions in the scheme, as stated by Mr. Webb, are: (1) To occupy men's time, in order to prevent the deterioration of ideals; and (2) To supply the necessary deterrent element so that the men may find their periods of unemployment less "pleasurable" than their employment.

That is, the men are to be treated like children and not even as well as the children of to-day are treated, for education by artificial discipline and punishment is rapidly becoming an obsolete method. The Kaiser favors keeping the soldiers busy with similar exercises, with the definite expectation that this plan will prevent them from becoming interested in democratic theories, ideas of personal rights, and ideals of personal liberty.

To the late Edmond Kelly, a prominent and typical American social reformer and at the end of his life a member of the Socialist party, the burning social question was that of the moral and physical degeneracy among the people. Like Mr. Webb and a considerable number of Socialist party members, who would probably deny that they are "State Socialists," he reasoned that the only remedy for this supposed condition was that every unemployed individual who can labor should be compelled to do so. But while the others usually feel that there should be the widest and freest choice of that particular labor which the individual prefers to perform, Mr. Kelly suggests that this question will, to a considerable degree, have to be "decided by lot." He writes that the people will not be justified in complaining against this, since it is not so bad as the system that prevails in "military service to-day in France and Germany," returning, precisely as Spencer predicted, to military standards.

One of the principal features of Kelly's highly typical scheme of "State Socialism" is his labor colonies. This plan and others he elaborated in a bill which has now been passed by the legislature of the State of New York, having been supported by such prominent persons as the Commissioner of Charities, Mr. Robert W. De Forest, President of the Charity Organization Society, and the philanthropist and reformer, Mr. R. Fulton Cutting.

These colonies of the unemployed are to engage in agriculture, and in the course of time, Mr. Kelly hopes, are to furnish work to all persons "who cannot make a living in Socialist industries or under competitive conditions"; and they are ultimately to become so numerous that they will "standardize production," "weed out" less capable farmers and lower the cost of living for the whole community. Mr. Kelly says he does not contemplate "discipline of a harsh character," but merely the occasional use of dark cells and bread and water. The "discipline is not to go beyond that necessary to secure the observance of rules necessary to all institutional life."

"Just enough discipline to keep lazy men at work," writes Mr. Kelly—and we must add under such conditions and at such wages as are offered. Nor does he attempt any more than Mr. Webb to hide the fact that it is difficult in such schemes to draw hard and fast lines at any given point between the criminal class and the various grades of the unemployable, some of which are clearly not criminal at all. There are so many who fall into intermediate classes! As a result there are several grades of labor colonies, those for the criminal, for the semi-criminal, and for the merely unemployable. But we soon perceive that certain characteristics run throughout all three. We have already taken note of the discipline of the "free" labor colonies. In that part of the forced colony assigned to "misdemeanants, able-bodied vagrants and paupers" conditions are to be somewhat more severe; while in the criminal farm colony the strictest discipline is to be forced. Mr. Webb, like Mr. Kelly, argues in defense of his plan that at least it is much better than the present penitentiaries and work-houses, where vagrants are now often confined.

These schemes for the employment of the unemployed justify, point after point, the worst fears of the laborers concerning all labor reforms enacted or administered in whole or in part by the employing class. This is equally true of the scheme itself and of the arguments used to support it. Mr. Kelly, for example, makes much of the distinction between the "free" and "forced" colonies that form a part of his project. However, the essential similarity between the two may be grasped from his statement that "should a vagrant decline to sign a two-months' contract (with the "free" labor colony) then there will be no alternative but to commit him to a forced labor colony"; or from this: "Should any individual unfit for such conditions desire to abandon the free colony, he can easily be *induced* to remain there by the fact that liberty

should be given to the director to bring his case to the governor, with the alternative of a forced labor colony."

"Under these conditions," he continues, "there should be no objection to the indeterminate sentence," and thereby he places still more power in the hands of the magistrate or director of the colony. He says that the objection to such sentences on the part of the public might be removed by dropping the *words* "sentence" and "committal," and using *words* "to indicate that a particular free colony is selected as the *home* to which the inmate is to be directed."

In another place Mr. Kelly hints rather clearly that it might be a good thing to institute corporal punishment, but only in a novel form. "When the objection is made," he writes, "that corporal punishment causes more harm to the person who inflicts the punishment than it does to those who receive it, they (its advocates) reply that mechanical contrivances could easily eliminate this condition. Upon this it is not my intention to express my personal opinion; the question of punishment is one of the most difficult with which the penologist has to deal."

He is certainly not very strongly opposed to corporal punishment, by machine or otherwise, for he adds later that there is nothing in the labor colony system "which prevents the use of corporal punishment, should the legislature consider corporal punishment advisable," and further, that "some check must be found to a disposition to abuse of the labor colony system; the severity of the check must depend upon the extent of the evil." He fears apparently that without some severities he may have made his scheme too attractive, in which case it would withdraw too many of the unemployed from the labor market, and private employers would oppose it.

Significant is Mr. Kelly's reference, by way of illustration, to the system of rewards and punishments, "recognized by trainers of wild animals." The language of evolution also furnishes him the very elastic principle that "men unfit for the competition of life are a danger to the community and to themselves; they should be put where, without expense to the community, they can be rendered fit." The germ theory supplies the argument that vagrants "constitute a source of infection wherever they are *tolerated*." It seems they couldn't be given facilities for bathing. Finally comes in the recently discovered "law" that manual labor is not a curse, but a blessing, and that the love of leisure is a disease, that "it may be laid down as an indisputable fact that no perfectly healthy man or woman prefers begging to working."

Mr. Kelly wants alms-giving made a penal offense. One wonders whether alms-giving would be allowed to one's brother, to one's cousin, to a friend to whom one owed a deep moral debt? One wonders, too, how a determinedly benevolent person could be thwarted from committing this kind of offense? Human nature is not much considered in this mechanical "Age of Business"; it may be still less taken into account in the still more mechanical "Socialism" of the State.

Schemes of this kind are now coming forward everywhere, and there can be no doubt that there is a general trend in this direction. For at the bottom they are profitable—to the taxpayers and the employers—while they don't necessarily create competition for the skilled upper layers of labor, though they may tend to lower the wages of the middle grades. Mr. Kelly says that far from competing with free labor, the work of the "labor colonies" is to go for the benefit of all society, so that the more people are so confined, the less will be the burden the community has to bear. This will act as an automatic bribe and through its action the time may come in the near future when the labor colony plan will be adopted and applied to all the unemployed not otherwise provided for. In the "Elimination of the Tramp," Mr. Kelly has shown that in Switzerland, Holland, and other countries, labor colonies on these lines are already developed, and suggests how the principle in a moderated form may be applied immediately in this country. What he proposes is that the tramp shall be eliminated "without cost to the State." Certainly anything that can be done without cost to strengthen society (as it is) is going to secure support even from the most conservative classes.

In supporting the New York bill for "a farm and industrial colony for tramps and vagrants," based in large part directly on Mr. Kelly's recommendations, Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst says that it costs the State approximately \$2,000,000 a year to care for "these parasites, these blood-suckers," and also that the man who can work and will not should be made to, because "to pamper him means to promote his demoralization, physically and ethically."

This State Socialism ignores the difference in the situation of individuals, and first of all these differences is that between social classes. Mr. Parkhurst, in another article, compares human beings to the bricks in a wall:

Like bricks in a wall we are held in position in part by the human bricks that were wedged in between. . . . Clamp a steel spring and it will retain

its enforced shape so long as the clamp is on, but remove the clamp and it will fly back to the form that it was in originally; even after a thousand years it will fly back.

There is a great deal of efficacy therefore in clamps. Going away from home and from usual surroundings and people is therefore dangerous, for it means removing some of the clamps.

Much of what we commonly suppose to be our virtue is simply the unnatural and enforced shape in which we are held by external pressure. (*New York Journal*, June 3, 1912.)

Individual wills are here considered as in many cases inherently evil, and the admonition of Rousseau, that human beings are to be in all cases developed and never suppressed, is ignored.

But the chief evil in this point of view is that which ignores the most widespread and in some respects the most important of all distinctions between individuals. Like many other benevolent reformers of society, Mr. Parkhurst begins at the bottom. They do not propose to apply force to the idle rich or the half idle well-to-do. They do not intend to investigate how far even those who work hard and earn a part of their income may be parasites as to another part. They apply their beneficence necessarily to those who do not have the power to resist—and they will, no doubt, extend the same principles, when they can, to the whole laboring class.

The farm colony bill has now been enacted into law. The Socialists and labor unions sent a delegation to the capitol to protest against it, but without result. The law provides that "reputable workmen temporarily out of work and seeking employment shall not be deemed tramps or vagrants, or be committed to the tramp colony." The Socialists and unions oppose the whole idea of giving authority to government to impose "humane discipline" upon perfectly normal adults whose only crime is that they do not find acceptable work in our marvelously perfect form of society.

All over the world, wherever agricultural laborers are numerous and agricultural employers control the machinery of government, legislation has already been directed to drive the former class, more or less forcibly, to labor. This is true in Prussia, Austria, Hungary and the other European countries and it is true in a section of the United States. The South is the only section where the agricultural laborers constitute a large part of the population. It is ordinarily supposed that the legally encouraged schemes of peonage, as well as compulsory labor on the ground of vagrancy and petty offenses, could arise under our institutions only in the case of the Negroes. It is true that the Negroes, being the majority, are most affected. But the tendency to apply the

same measures to whites on the same economic level, whether agricultural or industrial laborers, is universal.

In this country, then, it is in the South, that the tendency to compulsory labor is strongest. The State of Georgia is typical and it will be noticed that the arguments used there to support the system are of the new type.

There is enough to be done on the public works in Georgia to consume indefinitely the energies of the vagrant Negro and the class of whites predisposed to perpetual indulgence in the rest cure, says the *Atlanta Constitution*.

A large percentage of this element can, moreover, be added to the regular and honest workers of the State, once their habit of indolence is broken and they understand that taking things easily (too often a literal statement) will not be tolerated.

This is an age of conservation. An excellent phase of this very admirable science would be one that conserved the industrial assets of Georgia and every other State by compelling members of the quasi-criminal class, now a drain upon the community, to transform themselves permanently into producers.

The next day the *Chronicle* of Augusta, in the same state, showed the intimate relation of this policy of labor conservation to the labor needs of the State's private employers as well as its taxes and its public works. It suggests also a sharp distinction between idlers with and idlers without a private income, and displays the usual solicitude for the wives and children of the unfortunate (the future labor supply):

Several years ago, said the *Chronicle*, an anti-vagrancy law was passed by the State Legislature. It was drawn to meet the peculiar labor and social conditions of a Southern State, and was hailed quite justly as the best vagrancy measure on the statute books of any state. Immediately following its passage, officers of the law, whose hands had been tied by the cumbrous difficulties of the old statute books, became peculiarly vigilant. Employers who had been treated with scorn by hundreds of stalwart Negro loafers, who languished around the incubators of crime, were able to obtain help that the crying needs of the industry demanded. The chain gang forces on the roads were augmented considerably, too

Officers of the law have no right to wait for private citizens to "swear out" warrants against vagrants; it is their sworn duty to take such warrants for the arrest of every person they have reasonable grounds for suspecting to be within the class well and liberally defined in the above statute.

The Calvin law defines vagrancy as follows:

First. Persons wandering or strolling about in idleness, who are able to work and have no property to support them.

Second. All persons able to work, having no property to support them, and who have no visible or known means of a fair, honest and reputable livelihood. The term "visible and known means of a fair, honest and reputable livelihood" as used in this section, shall be construed to mean reasonably continuous employment at some lawful occupation for reasonable compensation, or a fixed and regular income from property or other investment, which income is sufficient for the support and maintenance of such vagrant. . . .

Sixth. All able-bodied persons who are found begging for a living, or who quit their homes and leave their wives and children without means of subsistence.

Seventh. That all persons who are able to work and who do not work,

but hire out their minor children and live on their wages, shall be deemed and considered vagrants.

This law places the courts at the fewest possible disadvantages. In fact, it puts the burden of proof upon the suspected party. . . . It also makes it the sworn duty of officers to corral these leeches on the body politic and, while making nothing but a general criticism, if these would do half of their duty in the premises much crime would be prevented; *industries would not suffer for lack of common labor*; and a great deal of innocent suffering, the product of indolence, would be relieved.

These various schemes and theories of beneficently compelled labor undoubtedly are most menacing where we come into contact with the so-called inferior or backward races. If we are ready to proceed to such lengths with our own race, it may well be imagined what we might do when such theories are applied exclusively to a people separated from us by a so-called racial or social gulf, as it may soon be in the South. Yet it is Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, one of the most able of our constructive "State Socialists," who has suggested their special application to the Negroes. The proposal is wholly benevolent and contemplates administration by thoroughly just administrators. But we can picture its application to the Negroes of this country within our own generation at the hands of administrators representing either the Northern or Southern sentiment on the race question—especially if they represented the majority of employing farmers that govern most of the States.

"Let each sovereign State," she suggests, "carefully organize in every county and township an enlisted body of Negroes who do not progress, who are not self-supporting, who are degenerating into an increasing percentage of social burdens, of actual criminals, who should be taken care of by the state."

Mrs Gilman speaks with fervor of "the construction trains carrying bands of new workmen, officers and men, with work for the women and teaching for the children," which "would carry the laborer along the roads he made and improve the country at tremendous speed." The proposed organization, she hastens to reassure us, is not enslavement but "enlistment." "The new army," she says, "should have its uniforms, its decorations, its titles, its careful system of grading, its music, its banners and impressive ceremonies," while at the same time "*the strain of personal initiative and responsibility would be removed.*" Here the military regimentation that Spencer feared takes the most positive and definite shape.

(To be concluded.)

France and Proportional Representation

By PAUL LOUIS (Paris).

For some time past France has been in the throes of an electoral crisis, on which some stress should be laid, since the very basis of the electoral system is involved and since the Socialist party has played in the matter a part growing daily more important. It is the famous question of "proportional representation," or the "*R. P.*" as we say in France, for short.

The electoral system now in force in France goes back to 1889. Universal suffrage has been in operation since 1848, but it has expressed itself in different ways. From the origin of the Third Republic down to 1885, elections were conducted on the single candidate ballot (*scrutin uninominal*), that is, each group of 100,000 inhabitants at the most elected one deputy. From 1885 to 1889 this ballot was replaced by the list ballot (*scrutin de liste*). France was divided into 87 departments, and each department elected a number of deputies proportionate to its population, each elector in the department voting for a whole list of candidates.

Between 1881 and 1885 much discussion took place between the partisans of the single candidate ballot and the supporters of the list ballot. The former said that in the single candidate election the deputy is closer to the voter, who knows him better and controls him more easily. They furthermore considered that the list ballot favored the formation of great political cliques and might prove dangerous in a country like France, where there are always present Caesaristic undercurrents and sympathies with personal dictators. Their adversaries, on the contrary, held that the single candidate ballot substituted individual influence and financial corruption for the struggle between ideas, and consequently was incompatible with the proper operation of a great democracy.

The list ballot was used in the elections of 1885. These elections were almost disastrous to the Republican party, for a great number of monarchists succeeded in getting into Parliament. The Boulanger crisis of 1887 and 1888 caused a great revulsion of feeling and the single candidate ballot was re-established just before the elections of 1889. It has been maintained ever since.

The debate that has since arisen around the question of proportional representation resembles in certain respects the preceding ones; in other respects it is different.

It is an incontestable fact that the parliamentary regime has seen its influence decline during recent years in France. Corruption has spread by leaps and bounds. The voters control their nominees by the pledges they impose upon them and these ordinarily have no relation to the public weal. They ask of their candidates all sorts of personal favors, they ask them to use their "pull" in ways often unjust and humiliating, by making absurd attempts at influencing the administration. Those who do not yield to such suggestions do not get the votes. The deputies in their turn dominate the successive governments, which they have the power to overthrow on the merest pretext, or even without a pretext. A whole chapter might be written on the role that such matters have played during recent years in the politics, both interior and foreign, of France. The ministers however have their schemes for procuring votes in Parliament and thus maintaining their power: they serve the personal interests of the chiefs of parliamentary groups and at times even of secret rings. Such is the complicated mechanism which the operation of the parliamentary system leads to. Thus the thinking portion of the electorate is wondering whether this system, the advent of which is contemporaneous with that of the bourgeoisie to power, does not entail intrinsic defects, and whether it should not be overthrown from top to bottom. It is well known that a wing of the Socialist party has always stood for direct legislation by the people. It may turn out that the problem may soon have to be attacked at the very base.

In the meantime, however, people are trying to correct the vices of French parliamentarism by patching up its machinery. There has been denunciation of the plutocratic influences operating quite at ease in the single candidate ballot system. It has been thought that another kind of ballot would vitalize the moral sense of the country and raise its level. For some eight years now a campaign has been going on for re-establishing the list ballot, adding however the corrective of proportional representation.

The partisans of this new electoral device have been recruited in part from the Socialists, in part from the moderate Republicans and Royalists. One faction only of Parliament has rejected the innovation, the one actually in power, the radicals.

Well, what do they say for the list ballot plus P. R.? They say it will rouse great currents of opinion, without which a country falls in spite of itself into intellectual stagnation. Without doubt, the list ballot taken by itself would be dangerous, since in each department the half plus one would crush the half less one; but if proportional representation is instituted, if each party obtains a number of seats corresponding more or less exactly to the number of its votes, there is no longer danger of stifling any opinion.

Other arguments are also brought forward to support this thesis. The proposed system would force parties to organize, and each one could better control its nominees and prevent the frequent treasons which have so sadly disfigured the parliamentary history of the last years. Finally, the elector, voting for an idea and not for a man, would no longer think of giving his vote in exchange for personal favors promised and expected. The morality of the Chamber would gain by this quite as much as that of the electorate.

The opponents of P. R. retort that the mechanism provided for would be altogether too complicated to please the French public, accustomed to things clear and simple. This public could never get it through its head that Candidate So and So, coming at the head of a minority, is elected, while Candidate So and So, third or fourth on the majority list and with a double number of votes, is defeated. They object further that the project had its origin in anti-republican circles, and that it would put the country at the mercy of political committees. They conclude that even with regard to strict justice it is superfluous to make any changes whatsoever, inasmuch as all parties are already represented in Parliament proportionally to their importance.

From 1906 to 1913 the struggle around this question has not ceased for a moment, and rightly or wrongly it has become the fundamental issue in French politics. The general elections of 1910 gave some idea of the progress made by the proportionalists. The partial elections between 1910 and 1913 have been favorable to the reform by three to one. A faction of the Radical party, hostile to P. R. at heart, saw that the current of public opinion was against the old system. They had misgivings lest a coalition take place between the proportionalists of the right and those of the left; at the same time the Socialist party, whose position was becoming more and more well defined, was increasing public agitation concerning P. R., and all the more disinterestedly in that, being at present the only organized party,

it would run a definite risk of losing ground once a change in the voting system were instituted.

The feeling of the country was so clear that the successive ministries of Briand, Monis, Caillaux, Poincaré, and Briand again, depending for their strength largely upon the Radicals, pronounced in favor of P. R. On two occasions, in 1911 and again in 1912, the Chamber voted with practical unanimity for the revision of the electoral system. The device finally adopted, nine months ago, was not of P. R. pure and simple, as it is practiced in Belgium, but of the representation of minorities, or "quotients," which leaves an advantage to the majority. Through an impulse toward conciliation, the Socialists rallied to this scheme.

But many of the radical deputies who adhered to this program, were not at all sincere. They voted it in order not to shock directly the trend of public opinion. They relied on the Senate, which would have to sanction the reform, to hold it up on the way. And they guessed rightly.

The Senate is elected by indirect suffrage: it has accordingly nothing, or practically nothing to fear from great movements of thought. The Senate is elected by the list ballot but without P. R. Thus the majority has full sway there without any check whatever, while the minority representation is very weak. The Senate felt that if P. R. were applied to the Chamber, it would not be long in reaching the Senate itself. Immediately in that case, of the 160 seats that the radicals now possess in the Senate, they would run the risk of losing 80. On the 18th of March, accordingly, the Senate rejected the measure by 33 votes, 161 against 128. The Briand ministry fell. Its resignation in such circumstances creates a political crisis, the exact significance of which it is difficult at this moment to foresee.

Whatever be the ulterior developments, the Socialist party is the only one that can derive any marked advantage for its propaganda. But if P. R. gives it a good platform, this measure can never be its single issue of appeal to the working classes. In all domains contemporaneously, and primarily in the economic field, must be laid its future plans of action.

Concerning Historical Materialism

By PAUL LAFARGUE.

(Translated by Richard Perin).

(Concluded.)

IV. THE NATURAL AND THE ARTIFICIAL ENVIRONMENT.

The influence of the environment is not only direct, that is to say, it is not confined exclusively to the functioning organ (in the case of the pianist and ditch-digger, for instance, to the hand), but it is also indirect and is reflected in all the organs. This influence upon the entire organism has led the naturalists to an understanding of Geoffroy St. Hilaire's theory, which he designates by the name of "subordination of organs," and which Cuvier expounded as follows: "Every organic being forms an ensemble, a unitary, closed system, the parts of which correspond to one another and by reciprocal action contribute to the same final effect. None of these parts can be altered without the other parts being also altered." (Address on the Revolutions of the Earth's Surface.) For instance, the form of the teeth of an animal that for generations has become accustomed to a new kind of food, cannot be altered without entailing many other modifications in the jaws, the muscles that move them, the cranial bones to which they are attached, the brain enclosed by the skull,* the bones and muscles that support the head, the form and length of the intestines, in a word, all the parts of its body. Darwin asserts that the skeleton of many kinds of Scotch cows had undergone many changes solely because of their habit of grazing on sloping declivities. The naturalists are unanimous in regarding the *cetacea* (seals, whales, etc.) as former land mammals which found more favorable food conditions in the sea and for that reason became divers and swimmers. Hence this new mode of life effected a fundamental transformation in their organs and reduced to rudiments those

* The anatomists think that in the carnivora the strongly developed temporal muscles, by exerting pressure upon the skull, hamper the development of the brain, so that it is relatively small in comparison with that of those animals which, like man, have a little developed masticating apparatus and weak temporal muscles. In a given case we probably could, by intentional dwarfing of these muscles, alter the inner wall of the skull and increase the size of the cerebral chamber.

which were superfluous, and on the other hand formed others adapted to the requirements of the new aqueous environment. The plants of the Sahara and other deserts, to adapt themselves to the barren environment, must limit their growth and reduce the number of their leaves to two or four; their process of vegetation takes place in a manner the reverse of the normal, for they rest in summer, during the hot season, and grow in winter, during the relatively cool and moist season.

The cosmic or natural environments, to which plants and animals must adapt themselves under penalty of death, form (precisely like an organic being) ensembles, complicated systems without precise limits, and their constituents are: the geologic formation of the earth, its chemical composition, its distance from the equator, its height above sea-level, the water courses which traverse it, its rainfall, its stored-up sun's heat, and the plants and animals living upon it. The individual parts are so interlocked that not one can be altered without producing alterations in the other parts also. Although the alterations in the natural environments are less important than those of the organic being yet they are appreciable. For example, the forests have an influence upon the temperature, the rain, the moisture of the ground, its proportion of humus. Darwin has shown that insignificant animals, such as worms, have played an important part in the formation of the soil; Berthelot and the German agronomists, Hellriegel and Willfahrt, have proved that the microbes which swarm on the roots of the legumes make the ground more fertile. By the cultivation of plants and by stock-raising, man exerts a noticeable influence upon the natural environment. Deforestations begun by the Romans have transformed fruitful regions of Asia and Africa into uninhabitable wastes. Plants, animals and men, who, in the wild state, are subjected to the influence of the environment without other means of resistance than the capacity of adapting their organs, must finally, if for generations they live in different natural environments, become differentiated from one another, even when they have a common origin. Thus heterogeneous environments tend to divide plants and animals, and men as well, into different races.

Man's ingenuity not only alters the natural environment, but also permits him to create an entirely new, artificial or social, environment, which enables him to avoid, or at least to weaken considerably the influence of the natural environment upon his organism. But this artificial environment, like the natural en-

vironment, also exerts an influence upon man. Hence he is subject to the influence of two environments. The various artificial environments that one after another have been created by men greatly resemble each other, so that men are simultaneously subjected to the differentiating action of the heterogeneous natural environments in which they live, and to the effect of the artificial and similar environments the tendency of which is to diminish race distinctions and to produce the same needs, the same passions and the same intellectual condition. Moreover, natural environments situated in the same latitude and at the same altitude exert a similar unifying influence, owing to the similarity of their flora and fauna. Thus the artificial environments tend to unify the human species, which the natural environments have divided into races and varieties of races.

The evolution of the natural environment proceeds with extraordinary slowness. For this reason the species of plants and animals that have adapted themselves to it appear to be fixed. In the artificial environment, on the contrary, evolution proceeds with increasing speed. Hence the history of men, compared with that of animals and plants, is extraordinarily rapid.

Precisely as with the organic being and the natural environment, the artificial environments form ensembles, systems, the parts of which are adapted to each other and are so closely connected that no single one of them can be displaced without all the others being disturbed and in their turn displaced.

While among savage tribes the artificial environment is of extreme simplicity and consists of but few parts, it becomes complicated in proportion to human progress by the addition of new constituents and by further development of those already present. Since the beginning of the historical period the artificial environment is formed by the methods of production, the social, political and legal relations, the habits, customs and moral ideas, public opinion and sound common sense, the religions, literatures, arts, philosophies, etc., and the men who live in society. If all these mutually adapted parts were stable or varied only with great slowness, as do the parts of the natural environment, the artificial environment would remain in equilibrium and would have no history. But on the contrary, its equilibrium is extraordinarily and increasingly unstable and is constantly disturbed by alterations in some one of its parts and the consequent reactions in all the others.

The parts of an organic being and of a natural environment react upon each other directly, mechanically so to speak. If, for

instance, the layer of vegetable soil of a place is increased by angle worms or through any other cause, it will then be able to nourish a forest instead of stunted plants, which in turn will alter the rain conditions, whereby the water-courses will be increased, and so on. But the parts of an artificial environment can only react upon each other through the medium of man. The altered part must first transform, in an intellectual and physical respect, the men affected, and suggest to them the modification of the other parts, so that these may reach the level attained by itself, for only then will they not hinder its further development and be completely adapted to it. The re-establishment of the equilibrium among the individual constituents of the artificial environment can often be effected only after struggles between the men interested in the partial transformation and those opposed to it.

In order to illustrate the action, produced through the medium of man, of the constituents of the artificial environment, it is sufficient to recall historical events of most recent times, which are still fresh in the memory of all.

After industry had made useful the dynamic force of steam, it required new means of transportation to convey its fuel, its raw material and its manufactured products. Thus it suggested to those interested in industry the idea of moving carriages upon iron rails by means of steam power, which was put into practice for the first time in France about 1830 in the coal fields of the Loire. But when it was desired to extend further this method of transportation, lively resistance was encountered in many quarters which delayed its general introduction for years. Even Thiers, one of the political leaders of the enfranchised bourgeoisie and one of the representatives of sound common sense endorsed by public opinion, opposed it energetically because, as he declared, a railroad was impracticable. But the railroads overthrew the most sensible and well-established ideas, and among other impossible things they demanded a transformation of the property-form that served then as the basis of the social structure of the dominant bourgeoisie. As a matter of fact until that time a citizen conducted an industrial or a commercial enterprise with his own money alone, at the most with the money also of one or two friends or acquaintances who had faith in his honesty and ability. He managed the money and was the actual owner of the factory or commercial house. But the railroads required such gigantic capital that it was impossible to find it accumulated

in the hands of a few people. Hence a great number of the bourgeoisie were obliged to entrust their beloved money, which they had never allowed out of their sight, to people whose names they hardly knew and of whose morality and capability they knew still less. When the money was once yielded up they lost all control over its use, nor had they any property right in the railroad stations, the cars, locomotives, etc., which they had helped to manufacture. They had merely a right to the profits; instead of an article, which had volume, weight or some other substantial characteristics, there was handed to them in exchange for their money an insignificant little sheet of paper, which represented the fiction of an infinitely small and intangible share of the positive property, the name of which was printed thereon in large characters. As far back as bourgeois memory goes, property had never been clothed in such metaphysical garb. This form of property which alienated possession (or "impersonalized" property), was in such strong contrast to the form with which the bourgeoisie was familiar and which had been inherited through generations, that there came to its defense none but people accused of all sorts of crimes and reputed to desire the overthrow of the social order—none but Socialists: Fourier and St. Simon approved of the mobilization of property in paper shares.* Among its adherents we find manufacturers, engineers, financiers, who had taken part in the revolution of 1848 and had been accomplices in Napoleon's *coup d'état*. They utilized the political revolutions in order to revolutionize the economic world by centralizing banking, legalizing the new form of property and making it acceptable to public opinion, and by creating a net-work of railroads in France.

*In his "*Traité de l'unité universelle*," Fourier recites in detail the advantages which this form of property offers to the capitalists: "It runs no danger of being stolen, or of damage by fire or even earthquake A minor never runs the risk of loss in the management of his property, for the management is the same for him as for all the stockholders A capitalist, even if he possesses hundreds of millions, can convert his property into cash at any moment." etc. It secures social peace, for "the subversive inclinations are transformed into love for the existing order so soon as a man becomes an owner of property"; on the other hand, "the poor man, even if he owns but a dollar, can buy an interest in the popular shares, which are divided into very small fractions and thus, though to an infinitely small degree, can become a joint owner of the entire country and can speak of *our* palaces, *our* stores and *our* treasures." Napoleon III. and his accomplices in the "*coup d'état*" were greatly taken with these ideas; they made it easy for the lightest purses to acquire national bonds, which up to that time had been a monopoly of the heavy purses; they *democratized* the national debt, as one of them expressed it, by introducing the privilege of buying bonds for five francs, even for one franc. This way they hoped to interest the masses in the security of the public credit and thus to prevent political revolutions.

The great mechanical industries, which must fetch their final and raw materials from a distance, and again must send their manufactured articles to distant points, cannot endure the partition of a country into small, independent states, each with its own customs tariff, laws, measures and weights, coinage, banks, etc.; they require united nations for their development. It was not until after bloody wars that Italy and Germany answered these requirements of great industry. Thiers and Proudhon, who resembled each other in so many respects and who represented the political interests of petty industry, were among the most zealous advocates of the independence of the Papal State and the states of the Italian princes.

Since man creates and alters the constituent parts of the artificial environment, the impelling forces of history must lie within him, as Vico and popular wisdom believe, and not in metaphysical virtues (justice, progress, humanity, patriotism, etc.), as the historians and the philosophers stubbornly reiterate. These confused and indefinite conceptions vary with the historical epochs and with the groups of men within an epoch, for in them are ideally mirrored the phenomena occurring in the various parts of the artificial environment. Thus, for example, the government official, the employer and the worker have each a different conception of justice. The Socialist understands by justice the restitution of the wealth stolen from the workers; the capitalist, the continuance of the robbery practiced upon the workers, and since he holds the economic and political power his idea is the prevailing one and has the force of law. For the very reason that the same word covers altogether contradictory conceptions, the bourgeoisie has made of these ideas a tool of rule and fraud.

That part of the social environment in which a man is active gives him a physical, intellectual and moral education. This education by the things which create in him ideas and arouse his passions is unconscious; when he acts he believes himself free to follow the impulses of his passions and ideas, while he really yields to the influences which are exerted upon him by a part of the artificial environment, which in its turn, can work upon the other parts only through his ideas and passions. While he unconsciously obeys the indirect pressure of the environment, he ascribes the guidance of his actions to a god or divine being.

What is the least rigid part of the artificial environment, the part that changes most frequently in quantity and quality, the

part that is most often suspected of effecting in men physical, intellectual and moral changes?

Marx answers: The mode of production.

By mode of production Marx means the *manner* in which man produces, not *what* he produces. Weaving has been carried on since prehistoric times, but we have been weaving with machines for only about a century. Machine production is the essential characteristic of modern industry. We have before our eyes an unparalleled example of its elementary, irresistible power to transform the social, economic, political and legal relations of a nation. Its introduction into Japan has, within a generation, raised this country from a medieval, feudal state to a constitutional, capitalist state.

Manifold causes co-operate to give it its omnipotent influence. Production absorbs, directly or indirectly, the energy of the overwhelming majority of a nation, while a small minority is active in the other parts of the artificial environment. In order to procure its material and intellectual means of existence, this minority also must take an interest in production. Consequently all men are mentally and physically subject to the transforming influence of the method of production, while a very small number of men is subjected to the influence of the other portions of the environment. But since the separate constituents of the artificial environment interact upon each other through the medium of man, that constituent which has the most energy to sway the whole will effect changes in the greatest number of men.

In the artificial environment of the savage, the mode of production is of relatively subordinate importance, but it gains an ever increasing importance in that of civilized man, for the reason that man has uninterruptedly impressed the forces of nature into his service from the time when he learned to know them. Prehistoric man began this subjugation when for the stone tool he substituted one of bronze and iron.

The advances of the method of production are so rapid, not only because production engages a vast number of men, but also because it involves "the furies of private interest" (Marx), the three great vices which, according to Vico, are the impelling forces of society, cruelty, greed and ambition.

The advances in the method of production are so precipitate that the men engaged in production are continually obliged to remodel the other parts of the social environment in order to

bring them up to the level of the mode of production. The resistance which they encounter in carrying out this task gives occasion to ceaseless economic and political conflicts. Hence, if we desire to discover the fundamental causes of the historical movement, we must seek for them in the mode of production of the material life, which, as Marx says, generally dominates the development of the social, political and mental life.

Industrial Unionism and Syndicalism

By ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE.

In the International Socialist Review for March, William English Walling points out the obvious truth that there are differences between French Syndicalism and American Industrial Unionism. But he bears down so hard on the differences that his article practically obscures or eclipses the essential identity of the two movements. This can but breed and foster pernicious confusion.

Let us get back to first principles. Social movements are begotten by economic conditions. Like causes produce like effects. At a certain stage of the development of Capitalism, Socialism inevitably emerges. At some stage in the further development of concentration of capital and of the gradual demonstration by growing political Socialism of its inefficiency, Revolutionary Unionism under some name is equally seen to appear. Its substance or essence must be the same in all countries. Its details cannot be identical in any two countries, since no two countries have precisely the same present economic conditions and historical traditions.

What gives unity everywhere to Revolutionary Unionism is its determined purpose to use labor unions, not merely to ameliorate working conditions, but to overthrow wage-slavery.

In spite of superficial differences this living spirit of revolutionary purpose unifies French and British Syndicalism and American Industrial Unionism. To forget or even to make light of this underlying identity can but substitute muddle-headed confusion for clear thinking. In fact it is tantamount to a denial of Economic Determinism.

Because Revolutionary Unionism is the child of economic and political conditions, it differs in different countries. In

France the use of machinery on a large scale has not gone so far—nearly so far—as it has in America. France produces a vast quantity of articles of luxury, and in the production of these manual dexterity and skill still count for much. In these respects France is behind both England and America. Hence we find craft differences less obliterated in French Syndicalism. On the other hand, the revolutionary tradition is far more vital and virile in France than with us, while no country in the world has had such an enlightening experience as France of the demoralizing and paralyzing effects of political ambitions and parliamentary tactics on the Working Class Movement. As a consequence there is in French Syndicalism a vividly keen consciousness of the necessity of the spiritual re-birth of the proletariat—the ethical quickening inspired and effected by the daily revolutionary conflict. This idea appears everywhere in the literature of French Syndicalism. Unfortunately, though quite naturally, it is as yet far less common in the literature of American Industrial Unionism.

Similarly, French Syndicalist experience of the disastrous effect upon French Labor Unionism of the former Kilkenny cat fight of the five different factions of French political Socialism to capture the union movement, has begotten an apathy or hostility to the ballot, which is still for the most part happily lacking in American Industrial Unionism.

French Syndicalists can well learn from American Industrial Unionists that the growing use of modern machinery, with its transfer of skill from the worker to the machine, is going to remove the economic foundation of craft divisions in Labor Unions.

American Industrial Unionists may well learn from French Syndicalists that the Revolutionary spirit far transcends in importance the mere form of organization. They may well learn from the French also the supreme importance of the revolution within each individual worker, in other words, the indispensability of moral transformation. The American Industrial Unionists may and should also learn from their French and Italian fellow-workers, that while the withholding of efficiency—in other words, sabotage—is sometimes (unfortunately) necessary and useful, the increase of efficiency to the highest possible point is in long drawn-out battles a far more reliable working class weapon.

This last is a cardinal doctrine of the Italian Syndicalists, but

I have no doubt it will sound strange to the ears of most American Industrial Unionists.

It is well enough to recognize with Walling that our American Industrial Unionism has some points of superiority. But let us not be contemptuous of what has been done by our fellow-workers in other lands. We want the very best and most effective Revolutionary Unionism to be had, and to get it we must be ready to profit by the experience of others.

In spite of Walling's strange anxiety to differentiate, he admits the battle for a different name is as good as lost. He writes: "So that it is possible that what we call 'Industrialism' to-day will also be spoken of as Syndicalism in the future." Why should it not be? If we can use the word "Socialism" in England, France and America in spite of local differences of organization and tactics, why not "Syndicalism"?

In my pamphlet, "The New Socialism," I tried to show that there was no necessary conflict between Marxian Socialism and Syndicalism. I think I succeeded. Walling, in his eagerness to establish a distinction where there is no real difference, writes: "The basis of the Syndicalist opposition to the Socialist party is the belief that 'the state is only an instrument of oppression.' The Socialist view on the contrary is that the state is only an instrument of *exploitation*--as long as it remains in capitalist hands."

In the name of common sense what's the difference? The purpose of "oppression" is "exploitation"; exploitation cannot be carried on without oppression. Who cares whether you call the state the instrument of the one or the other?

I am inclined to think that the real reason some of us are so eager not to be called Syndicalists is that some Anarchists in this country have become Syndicalists. If Syndicalism is a good thing, shall we be afraid to say so because Emma Goldman happens to say the same thing? For my part, I am not willing to pay Emma the compliment of thus exaggerating her importance.

But the fact is that the Anarchists did not invent Syndicalism, nor have they since captured it. On the contrary, Syndicalism seems on the testimony of no less distinguished an expert than William English Walling, profoundly to have transformed Anarchism, for he writes the "modern form" of Anarchism "is that of an economic and class struggle movement." Further on he tells us "the communist Anarchists, led by Prince Kropotkin, and

supported in this country by Emma Goldman, have gone over bag and baggage to Syndicalism." If we can rely on Walling, the Anarchists have not captured Syndicalism, but rather Syndicalism has converted the Anarchists from the error of their ways.

Is that a thing to be regretted, or hidden, or apologized for?

It was the hope of the great Socialist philosopher, Joseph Dietzgen, that education (on both sides) would unite and reconcile the Anarchists and the Socialists. In 1886 he wrote: "While the Anarchists may have mad and brainless individualists in their ranks, the Socialists have an abundance of cowards. For this reason I care as much for the one as the other. The majority in both camps are still in great need of education, and this will bring about a reconciliation in good time."

According to Walling, Dietzgen's hope has been fulfilled, Anarchists and Socialists are reconciled in Syndicalism. But the "education" that has reconciled them has not come from books, but from the actual battle fields of the Class War.

It is the glory of Syndicalist tactics that they have thus been able to accomplish the dreams of philosophers and seers.

Walling closes his article by attacking the Syndicalist doctrine of the "conscious minority" or the "militant minority." He sets up a man of straw by identifying this doctrine with the utopian notion of many Syndicalists that the workers in each or any industry, *e. g.*, the steel industry, will "dictate to the rest of society in matters pertaining to the steel industry."

That this latter notion carried out all around would lead to something like dynamic chaos is evident. That many Syndicalists share this notion is true. But it is likewise true that many, very many Socialists hold equally visionary notions as to the details of the administration of the Co-operative Commonwealth. They are none-the-less effective fighters in the Comrade Army for that. Nor are the Syndicalists, who hold the notion of industrial autonomy just referred to, at all reluctant to join in Sympathetic and General Strikes for the benefit of workers in other industries or of society at large. This belief, to which Walling attributes so much importance, has nothing to do with the essence of Syndicalism. It is what modern German theologians call an "Over-Belief," which the individual can hold or not as he likes without affecting his orthodoxy.

But to identify this harmless "over-belief" with the doctrine of the "conscious minority," is simply to render "confusion worse confounded."

It is true, practically all Syndicalists accept the doctrine of the "conscious minority." It is likewise true they did not invent it, and have no monopoly of it.

I do not know who first invented it, but I fancy it was already old when the Carpenter of Nazareth told his disciples, "Ye are the yeast, which shall leaven the whole lump."

The same doctrine appeared the other day in Woodrow Wilson's Inaugural Address when he called on the sincere "forward looking" men to uphold him.

I have never met an intelligent Socialist who had been two years in the movement, who did not accept this doctrine of the "conscious minority." It is all a question of how far you push it. The old Blanquists, who believed that a little knot of conspirators by seizing the political government could inaugurate Socialism, pushed it to an absurd extreme.

But one has only to examine the figures of the number who vote in Socialist party referendums and compare them with the figures of our enrolled membership to see that as a matter of hard fact our party affairs are now conducted by a very small "conscious minority."

Not to recognize this requires blindness or insanity.

Were our entire population so universally and equally educated and developed that there was no role for a "conscious minority," there would assuredly be no need for a Social Revolution.

So far from the doctrine of the "conscious minority" being undemocratic, it is only by the strivings of "conscious minorities" that the democratic tradition has been kept alive during the Dark Ages of capitalist exploitation and oppression.

I am utterly unwilling to believe that American Industrial Unionists do not accept and habitually act on this doctrine, whether consciously or unconsciously.

Let us get together, Comrades!

We who believe in Industrial Unionism or Syndicalism have much in common with even the narrowest and most fanatical devotees of Pure-and-Simple Politics. We also have much in common even with the Anarchists who have been transformed by French Syndicalism.

Let us cease hunting for points of difference! Let us search unceasingly for points of union! Let us be willing to learn from our comrades and fellow-workers in all lands and in all camps!

When we must fight, let us fight, not with one another, but with the Common Enemy!

THE WHITE BIRCH GROVE AT TATNUCK, MASSACHUSETTS

By Eliot White

This is the dell of the birches. Aloof from the farmyards and dwellings,
Clustered in comely display and laved with the warm winter sunshine,
See where the bright-bodied trees adorn the brown undulant meadows!
Well may a group of such forms by the shore of some Greek lake or river
Have thrilled the quick soul of a poet to see them as Artemis' maidens,
Startled in midst of their bathing, yet heedless who sees their own beauty,
So they may throng to their queen to screen her from mortal's beholding.
But vain are such efforts here, for white from the midst of the thicket
Rises the radiant shape of the birches' magnificent mistress.
Enter the luminous grove, and press to the great tree's foundation, — —
See where the ponderous roots are knit to the trunk's mighty pillar,
Like the thick-muscl'd thighs at the groins of a Parthenon torso.
Scan the vast girth of the column, like a prop in a mine of bright silver,
Then look above if your sight can endure the boughs' sun-smitten splendor, —
Lustrous as snow undefiled, and strong as the thews of a glacier,
Curve they in massive grace against the pure deep of the azure.
Oread worthy to dwell in a tree of aspect so regal,
Surely in stature and force must rival the smooth-limbed Brunhilda,
Noble in poise must she be as the firm-hipped Venus of Milo,
And free 'neath her wind-swept robe as the form of the wide-pinioned Niké.
Gather then close to your queen, environing maids of the birch-vale,
Yield her your homage for richly she merits your high admiration,
Yet envy not to the seekers of beauty, whose vision is guileless,

Share in your gladness and awe 'neath the arches of warm alabaster.
Well were you chosen to troop in the train of this presence majestic,
You that are lovely yourselves in caress of this April-mild winter.
Though a few stand in loose-girded tunics pale-gold and a-flutter with ribbons,
The most are blamelessly nude as youths in the ancient gymnasium;
While quick 'neath the clear, satin skins there mantles the flush of their vigor,
Greeting with full-pulsing sap the First-month's unwonted allurements,
Till all in a sheen of frail rose they glow like slim clouds of the morning.

AS ITS SCENT TO THE HEART OF THE ROSE.

By Louise W. Kneeland.

As its scent to the heart of the rose,
The sway of the grain to the wind that blows,
So art thou to me, my Belovéd.

As the song to the throat of the bird,
To the ear the fond voice that is heard,
So art thou to me, my Belovéd.

As to the star is its gleaming,
To earth is its teeming,
Through sun and through shower,
With fruit and with flower,
As to the word is its meaning,
To youth is its dreaming,
To life is life's ecstasy,
So, even so, art thou unto me,
Unto me, my Belovéd,
Oh Belovéd, even so
Art thou unto me!

The Novels of Albert Edwards

By ANDRE TRIDON.

For the second time Arthur Bullard, who in literature wishes to be known as Albert Edwards, has produced that rare thing, a radical novel which is also a work of art. Most radical novels have only the passing interest of a "muckrake" magazine article. Their authors are not satisfied with "letting life do it." They have some theories dear to their heart which must be demonstrated. Instead of writing a good pamphlet they create, out of thin air a set of puppets who debate on the subject of the evening, bore us, and convince only those of us who agree in advance with the proposed "Resolved". We know how those things always end, "Resolved that Socialism is great and Capitalism bad."

Now pamphlets and speeches can be exaggerated and untrue to life, just like mathematics; for they must present a proposition in the clearest possible way. Even as mathematics always deals with perfect circles or triangles such as never existed in the world, pamphlets and speeches must deal with an ideal workingman, paragon of virtue, and an imaginary capitalist, exponent of all vices. Fiction, however, has to be more scientific than that and must admit discrepancies from type, much as they may conflict with personal preferences.

To give only one example: A sweat shop boss should be fat, puffy, brutal, sport a heavy watch chain, smoke cigars one foot long, and ride back to his beautiful suburban home in his \$20,000 automobile. . . . Edwards happened to observe a youngish fellow, rather bashful, who only kept his head out of the water by starving his workers and whom a perfectly justified strike landed on the rocks; it landed him so hard that we find him later peddling suspenders or rat traps, I forget which, somewhere on the East Side.

Also, the typical sweat shop boss should drive his women to "shame" by his "pressing advances." Edwards shows us a poor driver whose first attempt at corrupting a girl (by the way, he proposes marriage to her) is met with ignominious exposure and ridicule.

This would never be used as a propaganda pamphlet. . . . And yet after reading the chapter in "Comrade Yetta"* relative to the Vest Makers' strike one derives as complete and inclusive a view of the various factors of the disturbance as one could ever wish. That is the fascinating part of Edwards' genius: he is broad enough to see the question from several sides and to glimpse impartially at the conflicting elements making up human personalities.

His first novel, "A Man's World," dealt with the motely humanity which comes within the ken of a probation officer. "Comrade Yetta," just off the press, is the biography of an East Side girl whom circumstances transform gradually into a Socialist journalist and agitator.

From her father's little book shop on East Broadway to the International Socialist Congress, to which she is sent as a delegate, her life's path runs logically, plausibly, through the sweat shop, the haunt of white slavers, a reformer's room, the Woman's Trade Union League, the workhouse, the *Star's* and the *Clarion's* offices, every step preparing the next, every new development of her mentality resulting unavoidably from some previous experience.

Yetta is of the efficient type, equally removed from the manish and from the pathetic; she has in her a desire for accomplishment, with enough inward fire to keep away from the moods that cause one to disintegrate, while never running to freakish self-assertion.

An analysis of the other types comprising her world, Walter Longman, the radical dilettante whose convictions depend greatly upon the kind of woman he is courting; the self-controlled, unsexed Mabel Train; the passionate Beatrice Karner; the unprepossessing Isadore Braun, whose almost only thought on his honeymoon is for "the paper"; the various contributors to the *Clarion*, and their financial struggles, make up a real, living, tangible world. There are no lay figures, no symbols, in this novel. No attempt at artificial "composition," no research of style, no esthetic synonyms for the current words. Edwards uses everybody's vocabulary, which after all is the only powerful, virile vocabulary, made up of live words and renewed daily at that fountain head of the language called slang. I will not

* "Comrade Yetta," by Albert Edwards. The Macmillan Company, New York. \$1.35 net.

say such is the book, but such are the main characteristics of the book.

The fact that publishers either had the courage to buy two such books from one author, or, more likely, made profits out of two such books, is a social portent. Both books belong to the category designated by our emasculated critics as unpleasant. Neither is sensational. Neither rides into favor on the back of some "yellow" wave. Both books, however, let life tell us of the forces which are making continuously for radicalism; both books show the outcome of all desire for growth, of all striving upwards; they also interpret the force of inertia, the spirit of things as they are, which hatred or scorn alone will not overcome. They do not reduce life to formulas; they make the high lights of life more visible above the dust and haze of numberless phenomena.

Edwards is a broad-minded optimist. The usual definition of an optimist is a man satisfied with whatever is. This does not apply to Edwards; he is practically dissatisfied with whatever makes up the modern world, but he has an unbounded faith in the human urge towards social betterment. "Human nature" does not seem to him one of the forces of inertia, but on the contrary one of the factors in the onward rush. And nowhere does he show his broad-mindedness more clearly than in these words: "All people seem to be in the same plight: they are all admirable and pitiable."

This saves Edwards from the novelists' greatest sin, the use of stereotypes; there are no villains and no heroes in his fiction. I already referred to the sweat shop boss in Comrade Yetta. Another type taken from Edwards' first novel can be offered as supplementary evidence. One of the main characters of "A Man's World," Ann Barton, a hospital nurse, is a free lover out of sheer devotion to her life's work. She is too strong-willed to allow a binding matrimonial arrangement to deflect her from her purpose. G. B. Shaw has accustomed us to that transvaluation of values, but Shaw derives out of such observations a satirical, sneering satisfaction. Edwards derives also a great deal of satisfaction from the delineation of such types, which upset the usual conceptions of "good" and "bad". Only his satisfaction is not of the Shavian order. He does not endeavor to bring out a smile, but to open our hearts to all beings, because they are all "admirable and pitiable." This is one of the traits which makes us expect very great things from Edwards in the future. He now ranks with Herrick as a writer of

fiction manly and worth while. He has, however, a powerful human quality which will carry him much further than Herrick could ever reach. I mean of course the Herrick of "Together" and "The Healer," for the Herrick of "One Woman's Life" seems to be backsliding alarmingly.

JUSTICE

By ROBERT CARLTON BROWN.

The room was large, plain and bare; as uncompromising as Justice.

Already a score of loungers, witnesses and curiosity-seekers sat hushed and humbled in the court room, well-behaved as in a school room; austere, severely-mustached court attendants eyed them coldly.

On the Judge's platform a frowsy, near-sighted interpreter sat huddled over a book, like a tramp dog over a bone. An alert clerk handled folded bits of white paper at the adjoining desk; a slim, sleek youth sat below the Judge's stand, biting the tip of a long, painstakingly pointed pencil and glancing carelessly through note books filled with short-hand, attentively ignoring the crowd in the court room.

At the gate between the police and the populace stood a marble-eyed attendant with the hard face of a jailer, and behind him a toss-haired Irish youth who received papers from plain-clothes-men and uniformed police passing through the corridor in front of the Judge's stand.

There was a sudden stir; the court room Captain, standing by a door at the right, leading from the Judge's chambers, cried, "The Court's in session," and a middle-aged gentleman with a kindly, though pouchy, face, and a thin frame, almost concealed by voluminous, ominous, black robes of Justice, came hurriedly in.

As the audience rose at jarring cries of "Stand up!" from the bailiffs, Magistrate Ryan pushed open a wicket and stepped into his circular enclosure, dropping into the high-backed great chair and folding his nervous, neat little hands on the table before him, his eyes listlessly roving over the people in front.

"Well, well," he said in a brusque, impatient undertone, looking over his glasses at the attendant before him, "What's the first case? Bring it on."

The blue-uniformed youth, in a conscious flutter, opened an oblong paper and slid it obsequiously before the Court. At the same instant he showily megaphoned through a door at the left, "Officer Clinch---Mary Ryan."

The wreck of a woman, mired in mud and liquor, came shambling in. Officer Clinch swore that his affidavit was true, took the stand and told how he had found the woman intoxicated, fighting and shouting on a street corner. The Court smiled as Officer Clinch testified that on his interference the defendant had hurled a brick at him.

"Well, Maggie Ryan, what have you got to say to that?" asked the Judge mechanically.

"It ain't true, Your Honor. I was after buyin' some sauerkraut from a lady on the corner, but it was so rotten I just threw it in her nasty face. I did no fightin' at all, at all."

"Ten days," replied the magistrate curtly, dipping his pen in the spacious well before him.

As case after case went its way the Court grew excitable and nervous, continually dipping his pen and dashing off the ink, though seldom using it. The sentences Magistrate Ryan imposed became gradually more severe, until finally he caught himself up short and discharged a wholesome looking Swedish girl charged, by a sneaking detective attached to the central office, with loitering on the public streets.

The Magistrate glanced often from the packet of affidavits in the attendant's hand to the door leading to his chambers, where he always insisted on privacy. Night court, stretching from nine till one, was tedious, wearisome, unless he could snatch several half hours alone in chambers. Physically unsuited for night-work, the frail, nervous Magistrate often showed his fatigue in irritable actions and irrational remarks. But usually after a short rest in his chambers he came out miraculously freshened, sometimes smiling, and always calm, apparently at peace with the world.

Snippy little lawyers knew this peculiarity well, and hoped and prayed and managed that their cases might be called during one of these lenient hours when Magistrate Ryan often gave mild reprimands in place of thirty-day "stretches," and sometimes only joked with the lucky offenders.

But so far this night he had had no moment for refreshing rest. His eyes glowed hotly as he glanced at the clock and found it already past ten.

He twitched in his seat and asked abruptly, "Are there any more?" leaning over to glare at the affidavits in the bailiff's hand.

"Just that opium case, held over, Your Honor."

A furtive, hollow, hunted look came into the Court's eyes; the muscles about his mouth twitched, and two old night court habitués glanced at each other with eye-lids knowingly narrowed. The Magistrate nodded jerkily to the attendant.

"Officers Dane and Arthur! Rose Neil, Sarah Garten, Stella Miller, Elsie McConnel, Mary Moon and Alice Brown!" bawled the court officer.

Magistrate Ryan dropped back listlessly in his high-backed chair, then slid excitedly forward and peered sharply at a strange file of wasted women shambling in, in charge of Officers Dane and Arthur.

He started to rise as the hollow-chested, gaunt-eyed woman in the lead came to a stop before him, rickety with debauch.

"Oh, God," she moaned. "Let me off this time, Judge. Oh, Lord, let me off this once!" Her fingers picked at her skirt, her wasted face twisted beseechingly.

Magistrate Ryan forced himself back into the chair from which he had started up as though to fly from duty. For a full minute he sat staring glassily at the six muttering wrecks before him, salvage tossed up by the breakers of life.

In each hard line in each hard face before him drug addiction had graved deeply. Human scare-crows they stood, wretched after twenty-four hours without the drug.

One woman strung out a long, low, moaning chain of mangled oaths and toppled unsteadily. Another fixed her eyes on the Judge's big pen with hypnotic fervor, little understanding the struggle expressing itself in the eyes of stern Justice she feared to meet, little guessing the story known by those two old twitch-mouth habitués nodding curiously in their corners.

The drug devotees ranged in age from sixteen to sixty and each bore the stamp of brutish self-indulgence, blunted sensibilities, shrunken humanity, wan and gray, with grimy wrinkles sharply accentuated by black bits of dingy cloth bound tightly about their heads; for they had been wrenched, jerked from their lair in *deshabille* and had torn up an apron between them to make suitable court head-coverings.

And so they stood before their judge; infirm, tottering, hardly human.

Having stared them out of all countenance, Magistrate Ryan, his face fixed in contempt, glanced down at the papers before him, nervously dipped his pen four times, wavered, paled, sent a sneaking glance toward the door of his chambers and looked sharply at the interested audience in front. The two court habitués exchanged ominous, knowing winks, furtively, under bushy brows.

"Your case was put over until to-night to allow time for the Board of Health to pass upon the drug you are charged with having purchased and used in a resort conducted for the smoking of opium," the Magistrate's voice seemed strained, uncertain, indirect. "What have you to say?" he finished in a cold, deliberate tone that clanged like steel through the court room. There was none of the mellow mercy of those moments after he had rested and refreshed himself in his rooms.

"Oh, let us off! For God's sake let us off! This one time, Judge!" pleaded one quaveringly, yearningly, like a mother hungry to caress a child after a twenty-four-hour separation. The others joined in the Miserere.

Magistrate Ryan winced, unnerved by the concerted wail.

Dragging his mind back to duty, he recalled having taken the officers' testimony the night before, his own words flitted through his mind, he had advised the wrecks of their legal opportunity to secure counsel and witnesses. He had hoped they would. Their guilt was written on their faces; the ravenous, unappeased appetites had torn the soul from their faces and sent racking shivers through their shabby forms.

He saw it all, and his duty was clear. It stood stark before him, pointing at him its righteous finger. They were fiends; a menace to society. He was a magistrate, a defender of law, order and decency. Before him were six hideous heads thrust up through the crust from the city's hell.

Sixty—ninety—*thirty* days in the work house? Could he conscientiously let them off with that? From habit, the number of days flitted debatively through his subconscious mind.

Then his clutch slipped of a sudden, his mind went blank to reason; his blood burned, he glanced uncertainly, waveringly, with gaunt eyes, about the court room; he gripped the edge of his bench, tottering mentally. His mind mechanically formed the words "ninety days"; the words roared in his ears.

Torn, tortured, with head swimming, he reeled to his feet and rushed to the secure haven of his chambers.

Once safe in the private room, he locked the door, feverishly turned a key in his secure desk drawer, groped in a well-known corner, and with quivering hand jabbed a hypodermic needle filled with cocaine, into his arm, from which he had frantically torn back the sleeve.

With a gasp he dropped into a comfortable lounging chair, tugged at a cigarette, wiped the perspiration from his streaming face and slipped into the caressing, motherly arms of Calm, Peace.

Ten minutes later the Captain of the court attendants, alert in the passageway, sang out, "The Court's in court," and immediately followed with a sharp "Sit down!" to a group of inexperienced onlookers who thought they should rise in respect a second time.

Magistrate Ryan, leisurely and calm in manner and movement, strolled to the bench, seated himself slowly, straightened his robes of dignity and smiled down at the ghastly prisoners, their tense mouths, their burning eyes.

He addressed them like a fond father, in words of full judicial justness: "There is a disagreement in the Board of Health report as to the strength of the deadly drug you are charged with having taken."

He paused and beamed down upon them mellowly: "The samples of the drug showed such different results that I am inclined to give you the benefit of the doubt this time. Reprimanded and discharged." He finished abruptly.

A murmur of surprise echoing through the court room was frowned down by zealous attendants. The dazed prisoners tumbled out into freedom, and only the two old habitués exchanged solemn winks of understanding as Magistrate Ryan passed easily to the next case, his lenient, indulgent smile bringing hope to the hearts of transgressors and joy to their lawyers.

BROTHERS.

By Louise W. Kneeland.

Should you think that in some there's no virtue,
And your feeling of comradeship halts,
Believe me, the reflection won't hurt you
That at least we're made one by our faults.

BOOK NOTICE

AMONG THE ESKIMOS

"The Eternal Maiden"* is a vivid story of life among the Eskimos. It pictures their struggle with Nature in the cold north and shows how those struggles affect their morals and ideals.

Annadoah, an orphan daughter of an Eskimo mother and a member of Greely's party, is seventeen years old. As a severe winter is coming on and the food supply is short, she must soon be married. Papik, one of her Eskimo lovers, woos her ardently. "Thou canst sew with great skill," he cries as the climax of all his compliments. But to him Annadoah refuses to listen. "Thy fingers are very long—and long, indeed, is thy nose!" she says. The length of a man's fingers and nose, he is reminded, is in inverse ratio to the favor he may find with a maid. For in the terrible cold, long extremities are liable to freeze and render their possessor ineffectual in the struggle to provide for himself and family. Annadoah turns from all her Eskimo lovers to a white trader, Olaf, whom she proudly finds to be taller than her hut. With the help of her sweet voice and the charm which her beauty casts over the Eskimo men, Olaf is able to get away from them most of the scanty supplies of food and furs which the impoverished tribes have in store.

Then at the winter's height the trader deserts his wife. To her aid comes Ootah, a lover who had left his tribe in despair when Annadoah had taken to her hut the crafty Olaf. Ootah is not, however, able to save from death her little blind baby, born the next spring while he is absent on a hunting expedition. By the law of the Eskimo, a fatherless defective must be killed at once. Annadoah, to save her baby, takes it on her back and walks—often running—a distance of twenty miles over the ice and snow to a hut where she hopes to find the baby's white father. He had told her he would be there in the spring. The hut is empty. Her people, who have followed her, find Annadoah, exhausted and despairing. Ootah, who appears as the law-abiding Eskimos throw the baby into the sea, cries that he will father it, and leaps heroically into the water, only to be drowned with the child clasped in his arms.

Against the tragedy of these individual lives, the happiness of the Eskimos as a people is a surprising background. The constant presence among them of mortal danger from famine and cold renders them almost immune to fear. Even in the long winter arctic nights they play with the spontaneity of youth. "Troublous as is their existence," says the author, "they preserve till old age that playful joy of life, that carefree ignoring of danger, which we find only in our children—which, alas, we lose too soon."
G. P.

*"The Eternal Maiden" by T. Everett Harré. Mitchell Kennerley, New York. \$1.20.

Shall We Recall the Recall?

To the Editor of the NEW REVIEW:

I am one who has been a NEW REVIEW subscriber and reader beginning with its first number, and I have enjoyed its contents very much, but now your editorial "Let us Recall the Recall" is so seriously at variance with my personal views that I am impelled to express myself to you.

At first we should remember that the Socialist party is a political organization created by the working class for the protection and promotion of its interests through political methods.

Next I believe it is recognized by our party membership that Haywood is inclined to minimize the importance of political action as compared with economic organization, and that this impression is based entirely upon the *words and acts* of Haywood himself, who has made no attempt to alter the impression, and this silence on his part may reasonably be considered equivalent to an acknowledgment of its correctness.

Now, if Haywood does believe in political action by the working class, even as a minor factor in the class struggle (and I judge that he does), he certainly is eligible for membership in the Socialist party. But if he does not consider political action the *most* important and efficient means of promoting working class welfare, then most certainly as a member of our National Executive Committee he did not correctly represent the organization for which he officiated. For it is undeniable that the Socialist party has been built up by that portion of the workers which believes in political action as the method of *greatest* importance. If they believed otherwise their enthusiastic efforts would have gone into the economic sphere, where Haywood's enthusiasm has carried him.

I am pleased to be known as a Socialist engaged in the promotion of revolution, but so far as my individual activities are concerned, the method is purely political. This preference in ways and means for accomplishing social reorganization brought me into the Socialist party in 1902 and I have been continuously a good-standing member up to date.

Of course I am not opposed to economic organization, but on the contrary consider it important for those workers who are so environed and constituted that they want to and can act effectively for their common welfare when so organized to get together on industrial lines.

I consider that the I. W. W. is doing much good for the army of unskilled, starvation-paid labor, perhaps for all labor, and that Haywood is an important factor in that good work. Perhaps they are making some mistakes and I expect learning by them. I am occasionally contributing cash to help their efforts but I could never personally engage in their tactics, and I do not believe that anyone who is conspicuously practising such tactics should be permitted to hold an official position of prominence in the Socialist party.

We want ALL workers in our party, Trade Unionists, Industrialists and Unorganized. The unorganized are the overwhelming majority, we must organize them for political action, we have a great task to remove their prejudice and to cultivate a correct understanding of our *political* principles. Why should we add to this task the unnecessary burden of explaining the personal actions of our high officials who are functioning outside of the Socialist party in such manner as to accumulate rather than remove prejudice in the minds of many we seek to attract?

Why not select as our officials men and women who will attract attention to our principles from probable converts of stability, rather than such as assist in perpetuating prejudice? We have a supply of such material. Let us use it.

Then again, let us not be fickle in our use of the Recall. There has been enough of that already. Haywood is apparently satisfied or indifferent. Then, too, if we must practise the policy of flaunting a victim in the face of capitalism, why not select one who is a victim because of Socialist party activity instead of a victim of I. W. W. tactics?

ERNEST D. HULL.

Naugatuck, Conn., April 16, 1913.

[The sentencing of Haywood to six months at hard labor was a blow aimed in the first place at the 25,000 striking silk weavers of Paterson, and in the next place at the entire working class of the nation. If in the face of such brutality on the part of our rulers we are unable to forget our minor differences, what is our boasted solidarity worth?

The I. W. W. and its leaders have become a special target of capitalist brutality not because of their sins, but because of their virtues. If the A. F. of L. leaders were as energetic in defense of working class rights, they would be subjected to similar treatment. Vide West Virginia.

It is true that Haywood's views on certain questions differ from those of the majority of the N. E. C. and of the party. But that was a very poor ground for his recall. On the contrary, in our opinion this is a very good reason for his being on the N. E. C. Is a large minority of the party membership to be completely suppressed? Are we not advocates of proportional representation? We say this all the more readily since our views by no means coincide with those of Haywood.

The chief error of Comrade Hull lies in the narrow construction he places upon "political action." To be sure, he follows in this the construction placed upon it by the Indianapolis convention, namely, that "political action shall be construed to mean participation in elections for public office and practical legislative and administrative work along the lines of the Socialist party platform." But this ultra-reformistic construction is in crass contradiction of the history, theory and practice of International Socialism. Just now the Socialist workers of Belgium are engaged in a general strike for universal suffrage, thus employing an economic means toward a political end. They are not "participating in elections for public office," nor are they doing "practical legislative and administrative work, etc.," and yet the entire Socialist movement the world over is giving them its moral and material support, even the Socialist party of the United States. The latter is thereby showing that in practice it repudiates the ultra-reformistic formula adopted at Indianapolis.

The fact is that economic organization and action is just as important as political organization and action, and that just as the former is dependent for success upon the latter, so the latter is dependent for success upon the former. Indeed, from one point of view the former is the more important, being the more elementary and fundamental form of working class action and embracing, as it everywhere does, by far the larger number of workers—Ed. N. R.]