JULY 1913 Ten Cents

The New Review

A-MONTHLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

150 Nassau Street New York

The New Review

Published Monthly
by the
New Review Publishing Association
150 Nassau Street, New York City

Alexander Fraser, *President*
Bertha W. Howe, *Treasurer*
Robert M. Lackey, *Secretary*

Herman Simpson, - - - - *Editor*

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE
One Year, ... $1.00 Six Months .. $ .50
Canada..... 1.20 Foreign 1.50
Single Copies, 10 cents

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

The New Review

Vol. I. **JULY, 1913** **No. 18**

Democracy on Trial

The early democracy of America grew out of the essential and indigenous equality of economic and social conditions that prevailed in most of the colonies. Excepting the Southern colonies, with their African slavery and plantation magnates, the great bulk of the American people at the foundation of the republic consisted of small property owners—frontiersmen, pioneers, small farmers and traders. To be sure, there were repeated and futile attempts to re-create on the virgin soil of America the classes and class divisions of Europe. Even in the Northern colonies there were large landed estates, oppressed and discontented tenants, contract laborers in a servile or semi-servile condition, a social chasm between the governing few and the governed many. But these inequalities and class distinctions did not spring from the native soil, but were imported from across the sea; they were not the living forces shaping the future, but the decayed survivals of a dead past. The native life of America inevitably tended toward social equality and political democracy. Among the founders of the republic there were not a few, and these among the ablest "practical" and "constructive" statesmen of the day, who failed to discern the inevitable drift. But Thomas Jefferson and his school saw it clearly, drew their strength from it, and bent all their efforts toward destroying the last vestiges of aristocratic privilege upon this continent.

The result showed that they read aright the signs of the time. The growth and expansion of democracy coincided with the growth and expansion of the American people toward the west, beyond the Alleghanies, beyond the Mississippi. Out of primeval forest and boundless prairie there emerged one free commonwealth after another—the distinctive American democracy

of freehold farmers, free and equal proprietors of the soil they tilled. Even in the East the great landed estates were broken up to make room for working, independent small farmers, every one of them a "sovereign American citizen." They constituted a true political democracy because they were a true economic democracy. These economic democrats valued the safeguards thrown about the "inalienable rights" of life and liberty because these were intimately bound up with that other "inalienable right," the pursuit of happiness, which our courts prosaically interpreted to mean *property*.

This democracy was distinctively American, the especial product of special American conditions. But it was also modern, that is to say, European, universal-bourgeois, furnishing a natural basis for the evolution of modern capitalism. It differed from the democracy of the tribe, which was based on blood relationship and common ownership of the soil. It differed from the democracy of the primitive village community, which everywhere furnished the basis for an Oriental, theocratic despotism. It differed from the democracy of classical antiquity, which was based upon slavery, the subjection of woman, and the exploitation of conquered communities in the general interest. But it was in essence identical with that democracy of individual, independent producers of commodities which took root and developed in the decaying feudal society and out of which has grown up that entire complex of ideas, variously known as *laissez faire,* individualism, Jeffersonian democracy, the rights of man, anarchism, etc., which has served capitalist society up to its latest trustified and imperialistic stage. In a passage of extraordinary brilliancy in "Capital" Marx traced the fundamental ideas of bourgeois democracy to their hidden source—the market in which the independent producers meet to effect the exchange of their commodities:

"This sphere (of simple circulation or of exchange of commodities) . . . ., within whose boundaries the sale and purchase of labor-power goes on, is in fact a very Eden of the innate rights of man. There alone rule Freedom, Equality, Property and Bentham (individualism). Freedom, because both buyer and seller of a commodity, say of labor-power, are constrained only by their own free will. They contract as free agents, and the agreement they come to is but the form in which they give legal expression to their common will. Equality, because each enters into relation with the other as with a simple owner of commodities, and they exchange equivalent for equivalent. Property, because each disposes only of what is his own. And Bentham, because each looks only to himself. The only force that brings them together and puts them in relation with each other is the selfishness, the gain and the private interest of each. Each looks to himself only, and no one troubles himself about the rest, and just because they do so, do they all, in accordance with the pre-established harmony of things, or under the auspices of an all-shrewd providence, work together to their mutual advantage, for the common weal and in the interest of all."

In these imperishable sentences Marx laid bare the basis not only of European, but also of American democracy.

The greatest expansion of this democracy was reached about the middle of the last century, when manhood suffrage was conquered and free schools were established. In its earliest existence it was a champion of state rights and an enemy of the national or centralized idea of the federal government, partly because the doctrine of state rights comported with its general individualistic life and outlook, but more immediately because the burdens of a national government appeared quite unnecessary and useless to the backwoods farmer. However, with further expansion toward the west and the growing need of internal improvements—the building of roads and the regulation of navigable waters for transporting the product of the farms to market—the western democracy began to entertain a broader idea of the functions of the national government. But it did not become decidedly nationalistic until it was confronted with the great menace of nation-wide slavery.

The Civil War was the first great test of American democracy. It was Abraham Lincoln who said that the men of his time were engaged in a great civil war, testing whether a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, could long endure. Nor was it a figure of speech when he called upon the people to resolve that the nation shall, under God, have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth. The contest against slavery was also a contest for the preservation of fundamental popular rights. In Baltimore Garrison was imprisoned because of an article he had written. In Boston he was dragged through the streets with a rope around his neck. Lovejoy was murdered while striving to defend his printing press against a pro-slavery

mob. In both Houses of Congress gag resolutions were passed, suppressing all petitions relating to the subject of slavery, in violation of the plain wording of the Constitution, and Representative John Quincy Adams, an ex-President of the United States, was threatened with the penitentiary, in spite of his constitutional prerogative, for daring to present a petition from slaves. United States post offices in the South were broken into and abolition papers brought in the mails were seized and burned, and a bill was proposed in Congress to prohibit the circulation through the mails of publications deemed by any state to be incendiary. Finally, the extension of slavery into the territories meant the exclusion from them of free labor, the shutting up of the natural outlet of the free farming population, the creation of new slave states, and the eternal domination of the slavocracy over the whole country through the Senate. The victory of the North was, therefore, also the victory of the original American farmer democracy.

It was the newly settled West that turned the scales in favor of the North, but the manufacturing capitalists of the East were a weighty factor in the organization of the Republican party. For years these manufacturers had clamored for a protective tariff against the factory products of England, but to this the agricultural South was unalterably opposed. As a result of the victory of the North, the farmers preserved for themselves and their descendants the lands of the West, and the manufacturers finally secured protection against foreign competition. Capitalist industry thereupon advanced by leaps and bounds. Forests, mines and oil fields were appropriated by the capitalists, the agricultural lands mostly by the farmers. The final disappearance of free lands meant the cessation of that process of democratic expansion which was so characteristic a feature of American history during the nineteenth century. The war against Spain—for the "liberation of Cuba"!—brings us at the dawn of the twentieth century face to face with the new situation: trustified industry, bank domination, colonial conquest, imperialistic world-politics.

It is against these phenomena of latter-day capitalism that the middle class democracy has been waging an almost ceaseless warfare for a generation past. The forms of this warfare have been as various as the elements that go into the make-up of the middle class conglomerate. The Populist party, predominantly agrarian, was chiefly directed against Eastern capital, which exploited the farmers through the banks, railroads, grain elevator companies, etc. The Bryan Democracy was a gathering of all the discontented, farmers and lower urban middle class as well as wage-workers, nor did it disdain the alliance of the most corrupt political rings of New York and Chicago. Republican insurgency shows us the same old Western farmer element fighting for its own special interests, as in the opposition to Canadian reciprocity, although it is no longer able to lead an independent political existence owing to the development of industry and the growth of cities in its own territory. Finally in Roosevelt's Progressive party we witness the open break with the *laissez faire* tradition and the grotesque attempt to reconcile trust magnates, farmers, urban middle classes and wage-workers in the ideal of State Socialism.

Thus does the old clear-cut American democracy vanish from the land of the living, only to lead a ghost-like existence. Now and then it even celebrates some political success, such as the introduction of the referendum, initiative, recall, direct election of senators, income tax, and what not. But having gotten all these weapons of democracy, it dares not use them in any effective manner for fear of bringing down upon itself the wrath of the plutocracy. This was most strikingly demonstrated in the last few days. Attorney-General McReynolds proposed a graduated excise tax on tobacco manufactures in order to tax the now dismembered Tobacco Trust out of existence. No sooner was the proposal published than Wall Street replied with threats of a financial crash. The Wilson-Bryan Administration immediately sounded a retreat.

The forms of democracy, old as well as new, may be inconvenient and even annoying to the plutocracy, but they are not incompatible with its continued and vigorous existence. On the other hand, the old popular rights, freedom of assemblage and combination, of speech and press, are essential to the very existence of the labor movement, and these are being violated everywhere with impunity and without protest from the middle class democracy. We do not refer here so much to the outrages perpetrated upon the miners of West Virginia—for these may be regarded as rather exceptional in character—as to the systematic violation of constitutional rights in industrial cities like Lawrence, Mass., and Paterson, N. J. Here are no isolated mountain districts with the semi-feudal rule of mining companies, but populous centres of industrial civilization, yet all

the rules of civil government are suspended and the policeman's club becomes the supreme arbiter of human rights. It is here that American democracy is again facing a most serious test.

We have seen that the essence of this democracy consisted in the equality of its members as property owners. The absence of sharp and deep class lines was its indispensable basis. The one great class conflict in American history that was fought to a finish threatened it with extinction. We are now only in the initial stages of a new class conflict, and already the democracy everywhere gives way under the strain. With the advancing years this conflict is sure to broaden and to deepen, for this is to be no sectional war, there is going to be no North and no South, but each and every industrial community is certain to become a battle-ground of the contending forces. The most numerous and most oppressed layer of the American working class has at last risen, the men, women and children without skilled employment, without the franchise, without even a common language. The only tie that binds together these pariahs of American society is the class tie, the sense of a common lot and a common wrong, while they have absolutely nothing in common with their exploiters, not even the tie of nationality. This offers an additional ground for keeping them in brutal subjection. The middle class of the cities, far from opposing this high-handed violation of all democratic tradition, actually encourages the police and the local courts in maintaining a reign of terror against the outlawed workers.

That there still are magistrates who have not altogether forgotten the existence of constitutional restraints upon the power of public officials is shown by the acts of Justice Minturn, of the New Jersey Supreme Court, and of Justice Robinson, of the West Virginia Court of Appeals. The petition of a group of New York intellectuals—ministers, philanthropic workers, lawyers, journalists, university teachers—to President Wilson and to Congress for an investigation of the Paterson outrages shows that the democratic tradition is not yet entirely extinct. The active and whole-hearted support given by the Socialists of New Jersey, and particularly of Passaic county, to the strikers, as well as the immense gathering of the workers of New York in Madison Square Garden, shows that the rank and file of the Socialists are eager to lend every possible assistance to their sorely pressed brothers. But the national Socialist party organization seems to be entirely unaware of the magnitude

of the issue involved in the Paterson reign of terror, with its twelve hundred arrests, three hundred convictions, fines, and imprisonments, suppression of free speech and press, the conviction of Patrick Quinlan, and the conviction and sentence of Alexander Scott, editor of the local Socialist paper. And the Socialist party of New York, which has not yet called a single meeting of protest against the goings-on in Paterson, also appears to be stricken with paralysis.

The democracy of America is now on trial. Also the Socialist party of New York and of the nation.

H. S.

Socialism and Labor Unionism

By Anton Pannekoek (Bremen)

In the working class movement there are great differences of opinion in regard to tactics, in regard to the best method of conducting the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat, and these differences often express themselves in acrimonious discussions and embittered internal conflicts. These differences can be cleared up and settled only by a thorough discussion of the fundamental principles of the class struggle.

The question involved is this: how can the proletariat conquer political supremacy? Those who do not concern themselves with this question, who do not consider it necessary for the workers to carry on a struggle for the conquest of power (anarchists and conservative workers) are disregarded here—we shall not concern ourselves with their opinions. To-day almost every militant worker knows that for him the political struggle is necessary. The bourgeoisie gained possession of political supremacy when it became the most important class of society. It is becoming to an ever increasing degree an economically superfluous, a parasitical class, but like every declining class it utilizes its power in the State to maintain its exploitation artificially. Marxism teaches that the political power of a class is always rooted in its economic importance: if a new class presses to the front, the political supremacy must devolve upon it. Not automatically, however, but only through struggle. The necessary connection which, according to Marxism, exists between economic importance and political suprem-

acy, signifies that to a rising class there flow from society so many streams of increasing power that it is finally strong enough to overthrow the exploiting class. Hence it is now the mission of the proletariat to wrest the political supremacy from the hands of the capitalist class, for the economic revolution from capitalism to Socialism is impossible as long as the state is a tool in the hands of the capitalists. And hence the important, all-absorbing question in regard to the method and manner in which the proletariat can win political supremacy.

In the discussion of this question two tendencies appear which are in sharp contrast to each other, even in America. On the one hand stands parliamentarism pure and simple, which wishes to win political supremacy by means of parliament and elections. On the other hand stands Syndicalism which, in its pronounced French form, will have nothing to do with the parliamentary struggle and wishes to conduct the struggle solely by means of the labor unions. These tendencies are distinguished by the role which they allot in the struggle for supremacy to the two forms of proletarian organization, the labor unions and the political party. We may say of these two tendencies that they are correct in their positive activity, but incorrect when they believe that they can succeed with that alone. Both lay stress upon a single side of the whole, and their methods, which are so sharply contrasted to each other, form narrow and one-sided distortions of the tactics of the class struggle, which are based upon Marxism.

Pure and Simple Parliamentarism

In all capitalist countries the political power is chiefly in the hands of the parliaments. In them the parliamentary majority can, if not entirely at least to a high degree, rule the state and control legislation. Every political struggle between the classes must become a parliamentary struggle. In those countries the working class also must be constituted as a political party, force its way into parliament by participation in elections, and take part in the parliamentary struggles.

The German working class has furnished a practical example. When general discouragement prevailed after the fall of the Commune, the steady advance of the German workers, the ceaseless increase in the number of their votes, showed the Socialists of all countries a new way to the conquest of political power. While formerly the idea had always been to seize power suddenly by a revolutionary uprising, as in 1848 and 1871, here the revolution, the conquest of power, appeared as the final act of a gradual but irresistible, peaceful development based upon the law. Thus was formed the idea of the *parliamentary conquest of power.* Parliament is the legislative body. whoever controls the parliamentary majority controls legislation and government. But parliament is elected by the people through universal suffrage. Hence the Social-Democracy need only win by propaganda and education ever greater masses of the people; when it has finally won over the majority of the people—which it must succeed in doing, because the workers, whose interests it represents, form the majority of the people—then it has also the majority in parliament and employs legislation and the power of the state to revolutionize property and to abolish exploitation.

That is logically the fundamental idea of pure and simple parliamentarism. The conquest of political supremacy becomes a peaceful process, which so far as the masses are concerned, consists only of propaganda and elections. It is the work of the Social-Democracy *as a political party;* other working class organizations, even the labor unions, are unnecessary. According to this conception, the difference between Socialist party and labor union consists in this, that the labor union struggles for the amelioration of living conditions under capitalism, while the party strives for the abolition of capitalism. The goal and the significance of the labor unions lies in the present, those of the party in the future; the labor unions have a reformistic, the party a revolutionary character. Practice also appears to confirm this contrast, for in the party we continually discuss revolution and Socialism, politics, sociology and philosophy, while in the unions we hear only of a few pennies more or less in wages and of petty differences with the employer. In Germany this contrast expressed itself in the early nineties, when the labor unions were painfully building up their strength, in this way, that many Social-Democrats declared the work of the labor unions to be a dissipation of force, because they sought only present amelioration, which was totally unnecessary since we would soon abolish capitalism entirely and all forces must be reserved for this complete emancipation. Prominent political leaders declared at that time that the labor unions had no future in Germany and indeed were hardly necessary.

This view of pure and simple parliamentarism, namely, that the conquest of political power was exclusively an affair of the party to be accomplished by means of elections and that the unions had merely a present-day significance, has spread from Germany to all other countries. Everywhere its supporters point to the German example, to the mighty electoral victories and the colossal power of the German Social-Democracy. But among the German workers themselves opinions have steadily undergone a change since the beginning of the present century. Even earlier the majority of Social-Democrats had the feeling that after all the revolution meant a much more difficult and violent struggle than mere electoral fights. But when after the electoral victory of 1903 the threats of our opponents to abolish the universal Reichstag suffrage became louder and louder, it became clear why the peaceful parliamentary conquest of power was impossible. It pre-supposes universal suffrage, and universal suffrage can simply be abolished by a parliament. But does this remove all hope of the acquisition of political power by the working class? No, for to such an attack upon universal suffrage the workers can oppose other weapons. At the Congress of Jena in 1905 the German party adopted a resolution that the working class would employ the political mass strike against a reactionary attempt to abolish the Reichstag suffrage and for the conquest of new political rights.

A form of suffrage is nothing rigid, unalterable or arbitrary; the suffrage is an object of struggles, and its form depends upon these struggles. In many countries where there is no universal suffrage, the workers are fighting for it, while on the other hand the reactionary parties are scheming to rob the workers of their suffrage when it becomes dangerous to capitalist supremacy

Herein lies the defect of the basic idea of pure and simple parliamentarism. Even now it is not true that the popular majority, through parliament, controls the state and the law. Not only in Germany, where the government is independent of the Reichstag and is supported by the Prussian Landtag, in which the workers are rendered absolutely powerless by a reactionary electoral law, but in all countries the suffrage is either restricted, or else there exists alongside of the popularly elected parliament an aristocratic body, called House of Lords, Senate or First Chamber, which also passes upon the laws, or else the judges exercise the right of interpreting the law. But even granted that there exists in a given country a completely democratic system

of government, so that there a Socialist popular majority might win the supremacy merely by means of votes—is there anyone in the world who believes that the capitalist class will allow itself to be simply voted out of power without resisting? Would the bourgeoisie, which is convinced that Socialism signifies the end of all civilization and the destruction of all human happiness, allow it to come peacefully into power, bewitched by the sacredness of a legal formula created by itself? The law is never anything more than a means for the purposes of human interests; and hence the bourgeoisie, as long as it is in the majority, will use the law to abolish, before it is too late, a universal suffrage that has become dangerous. Over this, then, the struggle rages. Hence here, too, the struggle about the *foundations of parliamentarism* will bring the real decision as to supremacy.

The Significance of Parliamentarism

The defect of pure and simple parliamentarism lies in the fact that it considers the form of suffrage as something absolute and independent. But precisely like the entire constitution, the suffrage is merely an expression of the *actual relations of power* in society. Constitution and suffrage rest upon the actual society of human beings in which the classes, of various power and importance, are struggling with each other over their diverse interests. The social power of a class determines to what degree its interests are represented in the constitution; in proportion as the social power of the workers increases, they are in a position to win political rights or to defend old rights against the increasingly reactionary tendency of the bourgeoisie. When the proletariat fights for universal suffrage or resists an attack upon universal suffrage—no matter what the weapons which it employs, meetings, journalistic campaigns, street demonstrations, mass strikes—the result always depends upon the magnitude of the social power which it brings to bear upon the struggle.

The social power of the workers is constantly increasing, and this forms the sure foundation of our future victory. The development of capitalism increases the mass of the proletariat, concentrates it into great factories and makes the whole of society dependent upon its labor. These masses are gaining ever clearer political insight, class-consciousness and Socialist knowledge; in that way alone do they become a fighting force against capitalism. These masses are welded ever closer together into

organizations, in which each individual subordinates himself to the will and the interests of the whole, and thereby alone will the workers, who as individuals are powerless, become a powerful, effective body. Upon these factors, mass and importance, class-consciousness and knowledge, organization and discipline, depend all successes in the class struggle. If they had reached their highest perfection, the end of capitalism would already be here. The further a knowledge of Socialism has spread among the masses, the more votes do we win in the elections. Where union struggles are won, it is due to the solidarity, the unshakable cohesion of the rank and file and to their self-sacrifice in the interests of the whole. And in the struggles for suffrage also, in street demonstrations and mass strikes, success depends upon the degree in which the workers exhibit firm discipline and a clear consciousness of their purpose, and are not confused or provoked by the enemy, but hold together as a solid mass in which each subordinates himself completely to the whole. Therefore we must lay the greatest stress upon increasing this power of the proletariat; the lasting gain of all struggles consists in the fact that by the growth of intelligence and organization the firm foundation of the future supremacy of the proletariat is built up. The question of the conquest of political power brings us to the question when the social power of the workers will be great enough to completely overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie.

Now herein lies the meaning of parliamentarism. Whoever considers the participation of the workers in the parliamentary struggle, in the sense of pure and simple parliamentarism, as the effort to win the supremacy by mere votes, must, as soon as he realizes its impossibility, swing to the opposite extreme. He must say to himself: What is the use of all the parliamentarism and all the voting? Is not all this infinite labor, this effort entailing immense sacrifices, this immense amount of money for the elections, simply thrown away if the bourgeoisie, when we are near our goal, can simply nullify every result by a decree of parliament, by a modification of the suffrage law? Hence is it not simply an immense error for the Socialist parties everywhere to regard the parliamentary-political struggle as the main part of its work? The statements made above answer these questions. If universal suffrage is abolished and the Socialist deputies vanish from parliament, the result of the earlier work is not lost thereby. The real result is the *Socialist thought of*

the popular masses, and that does not disappear. The basis of our strength, the real power of the proletariat is not affected, but must now exert its activity in new ways, according to new methods. In the electoral struggle—this the spokesmen of the German Social-Democracy have always emphasized—the electoral seats are only the apparent goal; the main purpose is to gain as many adherents as possible, to spread Socialist teachings further among the masses, at the moment when political interest is the greatest; the activity of the representatives in parliament is only a means to the same end, to enlighten the masses more and more through the practice of the daily political struggle.

The value of parliamentarism does not lie in the fact that it is a means of winning political power peaceably and without further revolutionary struggles, but in the fact that it has proved itself to be the *most advantageous means for developing and increasing the power of the proletariat.* That is the real lesson which the German example teaches us; the German workers were the first to show the world how universal suffrage and the parliamentary struggle—when rightly conducted, hence not like the British Labor party, for instance—can serve to make the working class great and strong. If to-day the German working class movement is the foremost in the world, this is chiefly due to its excellent fighting methods.

In the parliamentary struggle the classes appear in their real nature. Not only the industrial employer with whom the unions are struggling, but all the groups of the bourgeoisie—high finance, the colonial capitalists, the agrarians, the merchants—are represented and form a bourgeois totality which rules the state. There not only the question of wages, but the entire system of exploitation with all its ramifications, social legislation, militarism, taxes, the whole public life, are upon the regular order of business. The representatives of the workers fight there over each individual question with the representatives of the bourgeoisie; for the interests of the workers are opposed to those of the bourgeoisie in all respects—taxes, factory regulation, housing, schooling, colonial policy, militarism, administration of justice. Hence the activity of the parliamentarians does not consist in making speeches on the future society, but in ceaseless struggle over *practical questions of the moment,* and their Socialism consists in bringing each question into its proper relationship to the entire capitalist system and to the entire So-

cialist conception of life. For that reason the effect of their activity is in the highest degree enlightening to the widest circles; their criticism of the capitalist parties opens the workers' eyes; wherever the parliamentary discussions are followed, political insight is increased, men realize better and better the nature of capitalism, and interest in Socialism is awakened. This parliamentary activity, to which the electoral battle is added each time as a conclusion and a commencement, is more effective than the ordinary propaganda—which none the less is necessary—first, because it is exercised in a place where everyone in the whole country sees it and hears it, and secondly, because it is a practical and stubborn struggle for interests of the moment and hence makes a stronger claim upon men's minds.

Naturally the parliamentary struggle only has that effect when it is properly conducted, as a class struggle of the workers and for the political enlightenment of the masses. Where the parliamentarians look upon themselves as little gods who by means of their higher "political capacity" forge victories for the workers, and make deals with the other parties behind the scenes or become quite openly the tail of a bourgeois party—there the effect of parliamentarism is just the reverse, it is injurious. There it arouses in the workers illusions as to their enemy, the bourgeois classes; it destroys their self-confidence, their consciousness that they can be emancipated only through their own strength, it brings disillusionment and discouragement, and creates an anti-parliamentary tendency in those very workers whose feelings are revolutionary. However, it is not parliamentarism itself, but the false opportunistic tactics which are to blame for the harm; hence a struggle for correct parliamentary tactics, radical, Marxian tactics, which consist chiefly in the criticism of such parliamentarians, is entirely necessary in the interest of the party.

Labor Union Movement and Syndicalism

Hence if the real revolutionary significance of parliamentarism consists in the fact that it constantly increases the power of the proletariat—namely, its class-consciousness, its knowledge, its unity—and hence creates the conditions prerequisite to the revolution, it follows that other fighting methods may possess the same revolutionary significance. Hence the relation between the Socialist party and the labor unions is quite other than is assumed by pure and simple parliamentarism. *The*

labor union has just as great a revolutionary significance as the political party, for it contributes just as much to the social power of the proletariat. The labor unions unite the proletariat in great organizations, in which the common struggle against the employer takes the place of individual competition for jobs. Alone the worker is absolutely helpless; only as a collectivity, as a great organization the members of which act unitedly in the common interest, can he improve his working conditions. The practice of wage struggles shows that success is great in proportion as discipline and solidarity are great, as personal egoism is repressed in the interest of the whole, and as the latter determines the actions of each. Therefore the labor union movement is *the great school of organization and discipline;* it uproots narrow egoism, which believes in its ability to rise at the expense of fellow-men, and teaches the workers through ever new experiences that the individual can rise only together with his fellows, only as a member of a collectivity, and hence that each has only to further the interests of the collectivity. Naturally that only holds true where the labor union is actually fighting against the capitalists, and not where, as in the old conservative trade unionism, peaceable agreements are the goal, and harmony between capital and labor is the guiding rule of a narrow trade egoism. But where they regard their activity as a struggle, as a part of the great class struggle of labor against capital, they constantly increase the most important element of proletarian power; they are building the foundation of our future victory by making new men out of the workers, who through their rigid discipline, their strong organization spirit are capable of overthrowing the power of the bourgeoisie.

Syndicalism derives its vital force from this fact, that the unions have great revolutionary value for the overthrow of the political supremacy of the capitalists. It derides pure and simple parliamentarism, which believes itself capable of effecting the social revolution by means of the ballot. Such a violent change, the greatest revolution which the world has ever seen, which will reach to the root of all conditions, is simply to consist in this, that on a certain day men cast certain ballots in a box! Merely this easy, safe motion of the hand, and by the magic power of the ballot—because then the elected representatives will simply abolish capitalism by law—the whole weight of slavery and exploitation falls from the shoulders of the workers! But every man can understand that the yoke which has burdened

humanity for thousands of years cannot be so easily and painlessly cast off; a very different effort will be necessary for that. In order that the workers may emancipate themselves they must first become entirely new men, capable of conquering in hard-fought battles, in which they stake their very existence. Such men are only produced by the militant practice of the labor unions. Hence the activity of the labor unions is a sort of revolutionary gymnastics, the exercise of power and capabilities which are necessary to the revolution. While according to pure and simple parliamentarism the workers have merely to vote at elections and need do nothing else, since everything, the real struggle against the other parties and against the capitalists as well as the making of laws, will be cared for by their elected representatives, Syndicalism emphasizes the fact that the workers themselves must act, that only the direct struggle against the capitalists, only the direct action of the workers themselves can make them strong and capable of the conquest of power.

The defect of Syndicalism consists in this that it regards the entire parliamentary action of the Socialist party as no more than pure and simple parliamentarism. Hence it can only gain ground (and must necessarily gain ground) where the practice of the Socialist party gives occasion for this mistake. Wherever reformism prevails in the party, a reformism that plays politics in the same manner as the bourgeois parties, co-operates at times with those parties, and regards parliamentary party strifes, successes and trickery, and not the enlightenment of the workers, as the highest aim—there anti-parliamentary Syndicalism must come into being as a protest, in which is incorporated the natural class feeling, the instinctive hostility of the proletariat against the whole of bourgeois society. Hence it has chiefly developed in France as a reaction against the bloc policy and the "Socialist" Ministers, who have endeavored to restrict by government regulations the free activity of the labor unions. But it was unable to gain ground in Germany, because there everyone sees that the parliamentary policy of the party has always been a part of the class struggle of the proletariat.

When Syndicalism rejects parliamentary action, it renounces one of the most important and necessary means for the building up of proletarian power. It is certainly correct, and we so stated above, that to overthrow the supremacy of capital the working class requires a tremendous power of organization, revolutionary sentiment and rigid solidarity, which things can

only be the fruit of prolonged labor union struggle. But still more is necessary. Because the rule of capital is concentrated in the power of the state, in the political institutions, the workers must not merely regard these with hostile eyes, but must also thoroughly understand their nature; if they are to conquer this strong citadel of capitalism, they must know well the function of the state, the profound and many-sided influence of politics upon society, the influence of general ideas upon the political actions of men. The bourgeoisie has in the state immense intellectual and material means of power, with which the workers must become familiar if they are to be able to attack them. Where knowledge and political insight are lacking, the most convinced and staunchest revolutionary becomes all too easily the victim of the shallowest political treachery. Only by continual participation in all political struggles, attentive following of political actions, political education of many decades, can there be developed in the workers a knowledge and a political maturity and confidence sufficient to the conquest of power.

But this repudiation of the political struggle is not the worst defect of Syndicalism. For it is conceivable that, side by side with the party but without approval of its work, it might devote itself to its own task—the organization of the workers into labor unions, while the party at the same time took charge of the political struggle and political education; and then it would play a useful part. But the case is far worse, for due to the very attitude of Syndicalism toward parliamentarism *it is incapable of building up the organization of the masses.* The reason is that, by its rejection of parliamentarism, it allots to the labor unions the task of political struggle against the state and thereby diverts them from their real duty.

When labor unions wish to engage in the political struggle and for that purpose, as in England, send representatives of their interests to parliament, they constitute themselves a political party. It depends upon conditions how far this party develops into a Socialist party with revolutionary aims. But Syndicalism will have none of such participation in politics on the part of the labor unions. It regards the state, together with the government and parliament, merely as an organ of bourgeois rule, a means to oppress the workers, against which the workers must direct their struggle from without, by means of their organizations. The labor unions, as the real working class organizations, are to conduct the revolutionary struggle

against the power of the state, until such time as their ever-increasing strength enables them to overthrow it. The aim is indeed fine, but the trouble is that it will never be reached in that manner. For in this struggle the labor unions must neglect to a large extent their real duty, the struggle for immediate amelioration of living conditions, so that they grow not at all or very little, and hence do not attain to the necessary power.

The masses of the workers are not attracted by revolutionary watchwords and far-reaching aims; they must first slowly learn their significance. At first the Socialist party consists of a nucleus of workers of especially revolutionary tendency, but it grows by attracting to itself increasing numbers of the masses who become impressed with the fact that the party represents their interests in all questions of detail. And only after they have been won over by this practical work for small improvements do they gradually learn to understand our great revolutionary aims and to become enthusiastic over them. The same holds true of the labor unions. They only gather together the working masses by struggling tirelessly for the improvement of working conditions and defending against the employer the most immediate interests of the workers. Syndicalism, which believes it possible to attract them by revolutionary programs, presupposes in the workers an intelligence and an insight which can only be the result of a prolonged participation in the class struggle; hence its watchwords repel rather than attract the undeveloped masses. For not only insight, but self-confidence and courage also, without which no revolutionary vigor is possible, are an outgrowth of organization. The working masses, oppressed, powerless, and hence timid and fearful, will become bold and energetic only when and because they feel behind them the power of a great organization, the solidarity of an entire class, and then only does there awaken in the masses the bold feeling that they are capable of grappling with the whole mighty power of the bourgeois state.

The revolution will be prepared only by the small detail work of the present, which does not constantly have the word revolution upon its lips. *It may sound paradoxical, yet it can be confidently asserted that a labor union movement which pursues revolutionary aims is in reality not revolutionary; only a labor union movement which places before itself no revolutionary goal can really be revolutionary;* for only when it employs all its forces upon its own task, the struggle for the improvement

of working conditions, can it gather the working masses together into great organizations and thus contribute to the realization of the conditions necessary to the revolution. The best example of the latter is furnished by the German labor union movement which, because of its very restriction to the economic struggle against the employer, has grown in a score of years into a mighty organized power which will be of the greatest importance in the future revolutionary struggles in Germany.

Where syndicalistic tendencies showed themselves in the I. W. W., their membership groups opposing parliamentarism as "too little revolutionary" and desiring to conduct the revolutionary struggle by means of the labor unions—there they necessarily became small debating clubs, which intoxicated themselves upon revolutionary catch-words, but were without any real significance for the revolutionary development. But the I. W. W. was really revolutionary, that is to say, important to this development, wherever it entered the field as a militant labor union, led the masses of unskilled laborers in the struggle against their exploiters, and hence awakened in their hearts class-consciousness, solidarity, a sense of organization, self-confidence and pride. Here lies its great revolutionary duty: it should organize the masses of these hitherto neglected workers. This is, naturally, not accomplished by the sudden uprising of a formerly immovable mass, as in the successful struggles at McKees Rocks and at Lawrence. These form merely the beginning, the first awakening, and they must of themselves lead to renewed and greater struggles. The capitalists will seek, gradually and by indirection, to take back that which was won; through their agents they will seek to divide the workers upon national and religious lines, to discourage and to depress them, and with partial success. Then that which was won in the first onslaught must be held by stubborn fighting; then it will be found that the spirit of organization, which seemed suddenly to spring into being with wonderful strength, can only be firmly welded by long practice, in which the workers arm themselves in advance and fight as a permanent organization, and sometimes even suffer defeats, but ever renew the struggle.

It appears clearly from our statements what position the Socialist party should assume, according to the Marxian theory, toward the labor unions. Even where these labor unions will have nothing to do with Socialist teachings, it must not oppose them as an enemy and seek to injure them. For they do not

work in the direction of revolutionary development by conducting a Socialist propaganda—if they conduct an anti-Socialist propaganda, this must be opposed and an effort made to hinder it,—but only by accomplishing well their own task, conducting the labor union struggle for better working conditions. It is only when they neglect their own duty, when misled by bourgeois dreams of harmony, they avoid the struggle, so that the workers suffer constant defeats due to false union tactics and are thrust down ever lower, it is only then that there can be good grounds for replacing the old unions by better organizations. This has always been the Socialist party's attitude toward the American Federation of Labor; it does not originate in a weak opportunism, but in a clear perception of the independent importance of the labor union movement in building up the power of the proletariat. The craft solidarity of conservative trade-unionism, which at the same time is craft egoism, is merely an insufficient beginning of the necessary spirit of organization; but it should not for that reason be destroyed by splits in the organization and by conflicts; on the contrary, it should be broadened into a general class solidarity.

In America the power of the proletariat is slight. Although the capitalistic economic life exhibits highly developed forms, the class-consciousness and organization of the workers are still immature; bourgeois ideas and individualism still have possession of their minds. But everything indicates that the immediate future will bring great advances: the increase in the number of our votes in elections, the great mass struggles of the unskilled workers, the internal changes in the old labor unions, are all signs of this evolution. The great duty of the Socialist party is to urge forward this evolution by proper tactics. But that can only be accomplished by keeping itself free from the narrowness of pure and simple parliamentarism as well as from the narrowness of Syndicalism. Only by means of a revolutionary struggle on all fields, a struggle which upholds in the legislature as well as in the workshop, all the immediate interests of the workers, and which at the same time is filled with the spirit of Socialism, a class struggle upon the solid foundation of Marxian science, can the power of the proletariat constantly increase and become capable of overthrowing the rule of capital.

Story of the Putumayo Atrocities

By W. E. Hardenburg

I.

The Devil's Paradise

High up in the heart of the Colombian Andes, amid the eternal snows and massive grandeur of the towering *paramos*, a small, swift-flowing mountain stream has its origin. Plunging furiously down the steep declivities of the Cordillera, between the heavily-wooded crags, which rise almost perpendicularly to the clouds, it dashes itself into spray against the enormous boulders that form its bed, and hurls itself over the frequent precipices in its path with a deep reverberating roar like distant thunder.

This brawling mountain torrent is no other than the celebrated River Putumayo, which, finally leaving the towering Andes, flows in a southeasterly direction for more than a thousand miles through the great, fertile, wooded lowlands of the Amazon Basin, finally entering the Amazon in the extreme western limits of Brazil.

Although the whole of this immense territory is somewhat vaguely known as the Territory of the Putumayo, until recently it has been almost a *terra incognita* to the civilized world. The ownership of the Central and Northern portions is in dispute, being claimed by each of the three rival republics of Peru, Colombia and Ecuador. The Southern portion is occupied by Brazil, while the Peruvians have possession of the Central, and the Colombians of the Northern, part of the territory. Ecuador has no possession to strengthen her claim.

It is in the Central portion, which is under the nominal jurisdiction of Peru, in a district comprising roughly some 10,000 square miles, lying between the 72nd and 74th degree of West longitude and the Equator and the 2nd parallel of South latitude, that the scene of the notorious Putumayo Rubber Atrocities—now known as "The Devil's Paradise"—is situated. This district is traversed by two tributaries of the Putumayo, the Caraparana and the Igaraparana, both of which rise in the higher regions that form the divide between the Putumayo and its sister river, the Caqueta or Japura, which lies to the North.

This region is one of the most fertile and beautiful on earth. Healthful, rich in game and fruits, well watered by vast rivers and limpid lakes, covered with the luxurious and variegated vegetation of the tropics, it is, indeed, an earthly paradise.

Here, some twenty years ago, in the solitudes of these noble forests, uncontaminated by any of the vices and afflictions of "civilization," dwelt, free and unfettered, the ill-fated Indians of the Putumayo to the number of between fifty and sixty thousand souls.

These Indians, although split up into various tribes—of which the four principal ones were the Huitotos, the Boras, the Ocainas and the Andoques—nevertheless differed but little in appearance and in their habits and customs. While, owing to various local jealousies, bickerings and disunion prevailed among them, each tribe, as a rule, was content to go its own way and not interfere with the affairs of its neighbors.

In feature the Indians of the Putumayo resembled to a singular degree the Mongoloid or Malay type, and this resemblance extended even to the hair and eyes and the manner of walking. "A picture of a Sea Dyak of Borneo, using his *sumpitan* or blow-pipe," says Sir Roger Casement, "might very well stand for an actual presentment of a Boras Indian with his *cerbatana*. The weapons, too, are identical in structure and use, and in many other respects a striking similarity prevails between two races so widely sundered."

The different tribes were, as a rule, subdivided into clans or communes, and generally each of these had its own central dwelling-house, built of thatch in a circular form and often capable of housing two hundred persons. Surrounding this, in the region recognized by tribal law as belonging to that particular clan, individual members of it, with their families, lived in scattered huts at different cultivated clearings throughout the neighboring forest. Their weapons, almost entirely confined to the blow-pipe with its poisoned darts and small throwing-spears, tipped with wood or bamboo, sufficed to procure for them an abundance of game; while their plantations of maize and cassava and the countless fruits and edible growths of the forest yielded them, with but a minimum of labor, a living superior to that of many civilized workers.

It was in the early eighties of the last century that the simple and innocent life of the peaceful natives of the Central Putumayo was first interrupted by contact with the whites. It was at that date that the first Colombian *caucheros*, descending the Putumayo from Pasto in search of the fatal "black gold" of the Amazon, located themselves at different points throughout the district and entered into what are termed trade relations

with these unsophisticated savages. And it was at that date that the seeds of those fearful and wholesale horrors, that in recent years have startled and dismayed the whole civilized world, were sown. Together with those *caucheros* entered Greed and Lust, deadly and terrible plagues, far worse than those dread pestilences that from time to time sprang up in the Dark Ages to traverse all parts of the globe, sowing in their wake panic, death and desolation.

That the Indians welcomed the coming of these early buccaneers, it would be futile to assert. They were doubtless, it is true, glad to get the machetes and such further trifles as beads, mirrors, etc., that the *conquistadores* at first supplied them with in return for the rubber. But in proportion as the intruders became more firmly established, the system of barter gradually ceased and the regime of coercion began. Consul Casement puts this very clearly in the following words:

"Those who came in search of rubber had no intention of dwelling longer in the forest than the accumulation of the wealth they hoped to amass necessitated. They wanted to get rich quickly, not to stay and civilize the Indians or make their homes among them. The rubber trees of themselves were of no value; it was Indians who could be made or induced to tap them and to bring in the rubber on the white man's terms that all the invading *conquistadores* were in search of. Gradually a leading man fitted out an expedition with a few companions, partners in effort and initial expenditure; and with a gang of hired peons, or, as they are called in that region, *racionales* (half-breeds mostly who can read and write to distinguish them from the Indians, who are ignorant of all save forest lore), he journeyed to some part of the forest in search of tribes of wild Indians—*infieles* (infidels)—who could be easily subdued and induced to work the wild rubber trees in the territory they inhabited. An Indian would promise anything for a gun, or for some of the other tempting things offered as inducements to him to work rubber. Many Indians submitted to the alluring offer only to find that once in the *conquistadores'* books they had lost all liberty, and were reduced to unending demands for more rubber and more varied tasks. A cacique or *capitan* might be bought over to dispose of the labor of all his clan, and as the cacique's influence was very great and the natural docility of the Indian a remarkable characteristic of the Upper Amazon tribes. the work of conquering a primitive people and reducing

them to a continual strain of rubber-finding was less difficult than at first might be supposed."

In the course of a few years, numerous other Colombian adventurers followed, lured on by the rich fields for exploitation discovered by the early settlers, and gradually a series of Colombian establishments grew up on the banks of the Caraparana and Igaraparana. These *caucheros,* however, owing to the inaccessibility of the Colombian commercial centers up in the foot-hills of the Andes, were, as their numbers increased, more and more compelled to look for their fresh supplies of the necessities of civilized life as well as for such articles of barter as their dealings with the Indians required, to the Peruvian and Brazilian ports on the Amazon.

About this time there arrived in Iquitos, the chief rubber and commercial center of the Peruvian Amazon, a bare-footed young *mestizo* from the mountains of the interior with a quantity of Panama hats, which he hawked about in the streets. This individual was no other than Julio César Arana, to-day a multi-millionaire, a "captain of industry," a "gentleman"—and the designer and chief beneficiary of the system that has resulted in the ravishing, torture and murder of some 40,000 human beings!

There is no doubt that Arana was gifted with a certain amount of that same low cunning and tricky ingenuity which is a common characteristic of our own industrial kings and which produces such evil and alarming results in our own country, for it was not long before he built up an extensive business, which expanded steadily in all directions. In 1896 he entered the Putumayo and began trafficking with the Colombians there. It may be remarked that these latter were but rude and unlettered men, in many respects but little superior to the Indians whom they exploited. It is not surprising, then, that Arana, seeing the enormous possibilities of the region, should gradually absorb them and their holdings. In 1904 he acquired for a song the chief Colombian establishment on the Igaraparana, that of La Chorrera, which subsequently became the headquarters of his organization on that river. A little later, El Encanto, the principal Colombian post on the Caraparana, also came under the control of his company. With the two largest establishments in his possession, it was not difficult for Arana to acquire the remaining rubber centers, either by means of the

economic pressure he could exercise through his control of the means of transportation or by downright force of arms. Both of these methods were employed by the Arana Company to accomplish its ends, as will be made clear in subsequent articles.

It should be observed that neither the original invaders nor their successors had any title whatsoever to the lands they had settled upon. From the nature of the case, as the ownership of the territory itself was in dispute, no country could grant a valid title to any settlers. They were simply squatters, with no legal rights whatever, and the following extract from a statement made in 1908 by Sr. Vasquez Cobo, the Colombian Minister of Foreign Affairs, shows this clearly:

"The companies that are exploiting the adjacent regions of the Putumayo to-day have no legal existence in Colombia, but, on the contrary, are violating many of our legal dispositions and are even committing crimes for which our laws provide penal punishment. When the time comes, the Government of Colombia will not only refuse them protection, but will punish the agents of those companies that are responsible for criminal acts with all the rigors of the law.

"In conclusion, I will say that the Arana Company . . . . possesses absolutely no title to exploit these territories, where they are appointing agents and founding establishments."

As soon as Arana had succeeded in absorbing the Colombian settlements, and in securing control of the entire district, he immediately proceeded to reorganize and improve upon the crude methods of exploitation that the Colombians had heretofore employed. Scattered, isolated, working in a haphazard fashion, with no standards of output, no fixed rate of remuneration for their assistants, the Colombians had but scratched the great vein of "black gold" that followed its tortuous course through the Putumayo forests. Astute, possessed of some organizing ability, totally unscrupulous, Arana perceived that the rubber output of the territory could be enormously increased. That it would mean an enormously increased toll of human life meant nothing to him. Under the sway of the Colombians there was little blood-shed, and the Indians were fairly well treated, always receiving some little return for the rubber they delivered. Indeed, in many cases, there was a certain degree of affection between the Indians and their exploiters.

But Arana soon changed this. He divided the whole terri-

tory into two districts, one on the Igaraparana and the other on the Caraparana. La Chorrera was made the headquarters of the former and El Encanto of the latter. At each of these centers, superintendents were placed, who were paid by a commission on the amount of rubber their respective districts produced. The districts were, in turn, subdivided into sections, at the head of which was placed a chief, supported by a gang of miserably paid bandits, varying in number, according to the section, from eight to eighty, to overawe the Indians and keep them in slavery. These bandits, often themselves victims of the company and the chiefs of sections, were armed with the latest rifles to prevent any revolt on the part of the Indians The chiefs of sections held absolute sway and their word was law; in most sections they imposed upon each Indian a certain quantity of rubber which he was to deliver every ten days. The chief of section, being paid only by a percentage on the output of his section, was naturally interested in seeing that the quantities of rubber he imposed were promptly delivered by the Indians.

It will readily be seen that this system, which is very similar to that employed in the Congo, is a direct incentive to crime and cruelty. There are but two alternatives; either the Indian must be paid for the rubber--and the payment must be great enough to tempt an indolent and easily satisfied freeman to undertake severe and continuous exertion—or the Indian must be coerced into giving up his native liberty and becoming the permanent serf of a few idle and vicious white men. And it will also easily be imagined that to accomplish this, the coercion must be severe and continuous. Arana apparently chose the latter alternative as being by far the more profitable. With the making of this decision, the atrocities became inevitable.

Here in "civilization" it is difficult to realize how these wholesale horrors can have been carried out. But it must be remembered that "The Devil's Paradise" is situated in the heart of South America and that the nearest town, Iquitos, is a two-weeks' journey. Except by descending the Putumayo from Colombia—a long and tedious passage—the only way to reach the district is by traveling on the Arana Company's own launches. Moreover, in the greed for gold, the desire to get something for nothing, human life counts in the rubber regions of the Amazon for even less than in our own profit-ridden land.

French Chauvinism and the Socialists

By PAUL LOUIS (Paris)

For some months past the Socialist party in France has been forced to wage a bitter fight against chauvinism. The campaign against the re-establishment of the three years' military service, of which I have spoken already in the NEW REVIEW, is only one aspect of the struggle.

What is *chauvinism?* It is a combination of ideas, of aspirations, of methods, quite analogous to English *jingoism.* It is the French manifestation of imperialism, a form degenerate, noisy, theatrical,—a fine subject for caricature. Nevertheless it has played an important, a disastrous role in the life of France, and it merits attention particularly at this moment when armed Europe is the battlefield of conflicting brutal passions, threatening not only a militaristic crisis but a carnival of blood as well. There would be less cause for alarm if this French imperialism were operating singly in an atmosphere of moderation and reflection; but it is re-enforced by the pan-Germanism of Germany and Austria, by the pan-Slavism raging in Russia and the Balkan zone, not to speak of Italian pride fomented by the war on Tripoli. Here is a mixture of the highest explosive potentialities. How could the working classes, organized in their political party and in their unions, refrain from an attempt to prevent the explosion? They are the ones, in any case, even if the general interests of humanity be overlooked, to suffer most from such a catastrophe.

Chauvinism changes its color according to environment. The chauvinism of the capitalistic classes is not precisely identical with that of the unfortunate masses dominated by the capitalistic spirit. In the upper classes, there is a desire to militarize the people: they profess a limitless patriotism and vie with one another in setting the example. "A man without a country," they call everyone who is not certain about the beauty of war, who doubts the necessity of racial and national antagonisms, who dares to speak of human brotherhood, of the pacific settlement of international quarrels. However, this species of religion stops just short of fanaticism. The moneyed classes have too much scepticism in regard to too many things, to be permeated by serious convictions of any kind. So, after all, the chauvinism

of that minority which rules the French republic is only an expedient, an instrument of politics.

Unfortunately it found its prey ready made among those unthinking crowds who accept blindly the affirmations of the newspapers and of the bourgeois orators, and who rush headlong into the depths in a crisis of patriotic exaltation. By breaking forth from time to time into flaming glorifications of French superiority, it is easy to play upon the temperament of a people that has never been able to forget the glories of the Napoleonic escapade, notwithstanding the great suffering it occasioned not only while it lasted but long after it had ended. There has been no idea too vulgar, no literature too fraudulent, not to have served the purposes of chauvinism during recent months. The theatre, newspaper fiction, the songs of the music hall, everything has been turned to account: just to awaken a tumultuous patriotism, to revive the memories of the days when French armies were making and unmaking the thrones of Europe and everywhere creating states dependent upon France. The sentiments expressed by the chauvinists formed by this systematic campaign of excitement and historical falsehood are pitiably stupid, to an extent that arouses disgust and hatred, when it does not produce a smile. This soap-box patriotism of mountebanks and chorus girls is the symptom of a moral degeneracy, of a mental weakness, against which the enlightened proletariat will have to bestir itself in earnest.

Going back three quarters of a century to the reign of Louis Philippe, the chauvinists were shouting for the left bank of the Rhine, for the territories and cities seized by the Revolutionary armies and given back as a matter of course in 1815. Now it is the return to France of Alsace-Lorraine, snatched away by victorious Germany through the treaty of Frankfort in 1871 Or to be more accurate, it is not exactly this return that they are calling for. The people of Alsace-Lorraine themselves, the people who would have to bear most directly the frightful burden of a Franco-German war, and whose territory would become a charnel house, declare that for their part they would be content with neutrality or even with autonomy under mitigated German rule. The real fact is that the chauvinists are looking for revenge. The men who fought the war of 1870-71, the men who passed through those tragic hours, who heard the bullets whistling above their heads, these men are either in their declining years or else have already passed away. It is among

their sons, who have seen nothing, that the champions of violence are recruited. These youngsters dream of nothing but decimated regiments, mashed skulls, and fields covered with carnage; for they are quite aware that a victory, if indeed it be victory, would be bought only at the price of appalling sacrifice. Theirs is the barbarous thirst for combat, the love of blood for blood. They hate the Germans, just as at the time of Fashoda and before the Entente Cordiale they hated the English. They feel only hatred, hatred for the man who is not of their clan, who has not their language, who has not their traditions.

The disease of chauvinism sweeps periodically like a destructive pestilence over French democracy. It is the result of the Caesarian virus, which has never completely died since Napoleon's day, which lies dormant for longer or shorter spaces of time, as the case may be, only to break out again in all its power afterwards.

The Boulanger craze, which almost overthrew in 1888-9 the parliamentary republic (already ruined, for that matter, by its own scandals), was a first manifestation of chauvinism. General Boulanger, who was posing as the reviver of the Napoleonic idea, that is to say, the radicalism professed by Louis Bonaparte before his advent to power, was sung, was glorified in all the music halls as the apostle of revenge. When this chap had passed from the sublime to the ridiculous, there was ten years of peace. Then, all of a sudden, nationalism springs up with the same men who had succumbed to Boulangism, if not with the same doctrines, at least with the same spirit. Twelve years go by, and here we are at the third phase of chauvinism. Possibly it will be the last, though one dares not be too sure about it, much less proclaim it to the world.

As in 1889, as also in 1899-1901, from the stages of the melodramatic theatres, from the music halls, people are declaiming doggerel tirades, laborious and trivial couplets, sanctifying war, rendering homage to the French army, reviling and blasting everything that is German. It would seem that these appeals to the patriotism of the bar-room and the theatre corridors showed profits to the box office: they are to be found almost everywhere, in Paris and through the provinces. As usual, this attack of chauvinism coincides with a renewed vigor of anti-democratic, anti-Socialistic campaigns among those who represent the propertied bourgeoisie, the so-called republican factions and those expressing a preference for a monarchical restoration.

To find the origin of the chauvinistic impulse which is active to-day, one must go back really to 1905, that is, to the signing of the Entente Cordiale, which freed France from England, her great adversary in the colonial field. At that time, the French government, which for many years had been looking hungrily at Morocco and had been restrained from the conquest only by the ugly humor and the certain opposition of Great Britain, thought the time had come for realizing this old dream. From 1905 to 1913, by incessant expeditions, by laborious diplomatic dickering, with crises which brought Europe to the very brink of the abyss, France has been devoted to the annexation of Morocco. Socialist resistance has been tenacious, employing every argument, bracing itself on every occasion. It has failed. The occupation of Casablanca, Fez, Mequinez, and the city of Morocco represents the triumph of colonial imperialism. The only ones who profit by this vast activity are the professional manufacturers of chauvinism, the cliques which are constantly demanding the extension of the foreign domain, the financial establishments which speculate on the burdens of the state, which buy for a song vast areas of the conquered territory, which are bent on bagging the construction of roads, railroads, harbors, the development of the mines, etc., the great trusts which supply arms and ammunition to the state, the subsidized press in the employ of these companies, whose lucrative trade is to advertise continuously the necessity of extending the field of "pacification," that is, of robbery and carnage.

These gentlemen realized fat profits from the Morocco steal. There has been likewise a revival of the military sentiment, and a return to militant nationalism. It could only be expected that the dominating class would further its everlasting purpose of greater domination by exploiting this fanatical and ignorant patriotism, unresponsive to all the subtler considerations of wisdom. An overdose of chauvinism was necessary to put to sleep the antagonism to the Morocco campaign. The injections are kept up in order to preserve this marvellous instrument of Caesarism, from which the French people, from atavistic tendencies, are with difficulty weaned. It was only necessary to shift in the direction of Germany the sentiments aroused and sustained by the Morocco question.

To be sure, the cause of chauvinism has been strangely facilitated by the policy of the German cabinet and by the spirit of

pan-Germanism. German imperialism, which collided in Morocco with French imperialism, rests on the same economic foundations, on the same rapacity of the capitalistic classes, the same appetite for easy gain and for violent conquest. To listen to its apostles, it would seem that this whole globe is too small for Germany; she must despoil all the surrounding countries; she must claim the most desirable spots in the universe and erect an uncontested military supremacy. Three times during the Moroccan campaign German provocations replied to provocations from France. The Berlin cabinet is not more innocent than that of Paris. Morocco actually was a matter for international regulation. The proof is that in the Madrid concordat of 1880 France had manoeuvred to disinterest England and Spain. Between 1904 and 1905 France had had no conference with Germany on the subject. After the Algeciras conference, even after the Franco-German understanding of 1909, the Morocco government was largely internationalized; but France undertook the campaign of Chaouia, then that of Fez. Fully three times, in 1905, in 1909 and in 1911 (this time it was Agadir), Germany rattled the sword. This furnished a brief to the French chauvinists, who, since the arrival of William II in Tangiers, have daily proclaimed the imminence of war.

The nationalist party, cleverly sustained by successive governments, has tried to show the urgency of increasing armaments. It has succeeded, through the complicity more or less brazen of those in high places, in fomenting a current of patriotic exaltation, which almost swept the country off its feet. The recent Nancy incident was a symptom of this deplorable state of mind. A few Germans, simply because they were Germans, were insulted, hustled, and some say even beaten, in that great frontier city of the East. Assuredly those who were so bitter against them were entirely without that French courtesy with which foreigners usually are only too glad to credit us. Whatever their social rank—we trust there was no one of the proletariat among them—they were sad witnesses to the influence that unbridled chauvinism has acquired among us. The incident was settled without serious trouble. Regrettable as it was intrinsically, it might prove salutary in certain respects, if it succeeded in causing a little reflection on the part of those who give way to sudden attacks of blind passion. Perhaps the episode will save us from other incidents of wider significance and more serious consequences. It occurred at a moment when

a reaction against chauvinism was still possible, and when the most deadly effects of this madness had not yet become a fact.

If one asks why the French nationalists have, in recent years, so systematically pursued the policy of patriotic exaltation, and why, at the risk of provoking international conflicts of exceptional danger, they have harrowed the masses with every known device, from the pamphlet to the cabaret song, from the insult to the grandiloquent apostrophy, from the nightly marching of troops with bands and colors to the magnifying of the most trivial colonial skirmishes, one will find the most elementary of answers.

Socialism and syndicalism have made very considerable progress in France during the past years. The Right, to win back the positions it had lost; the Center, which feared the progress of the organized proletariat, since above all else the Center represents large banking and industrial interests; the Radicals, because they saw their following slipping over little by little to the Socialists, all have formed a coalition, not officially, of course, but in secret. The Clemenceau cabinet, seven years ago, first established that alliance, which the successive governments exploited to their own advantage. The declining parties welcomed the chance to play a role of importance denied them for many years, and to sell their assistance to the presidents of the council. When these men spoke of pacification and compromise, it was not to the advantage of the working classes but of the monarchistic factions, whose royalist, Bonapartist and Roman Catholic inclinations were more or less deftly kept from view. Many radical voters, not at all fond of the chateaux and hostile to the dominance of the priest—petty bourgeois, faithful to the democratic traditions of their class—protested intermittently against these unexpected deals. But the Radical party, which had welcomed into its ranks the more or less sincere deserters from the old Conservative parties, was glad to accept this strange amalgamation which had been brought about under the auspices and in the name of patriotism. Intensified chauvinism was the instrument with which they thought they could repel the claims of the wage earners.

What seemed to facilitate the enterprise, was the return to antiquated ideas of that portion of the intellectual bourgeoisie which had been tending toward Socialism during the last years of the Nineteenth and the first years of the Twentieth Century The entire university élite, professors of the Collège de France,

of the Sorbonne, of the provincial universities, had come over to the cause of social democracy, justifying or approving Socialism, and carrying with them half, at least, of the youthful student body. But all that was rather a fad, a fashion of philosophical and sociological snobbery, than a meditated conviction,—it was one of those temporary currents which quickly yield to contrary influences. Among such men, many came to fear Socialism the moment they perceived it was not a docile force, that the class struggle was a reality, that passing reforms were not enough to check the onrush of the masses, and that the workers were bent on getting *all* that belonged to them. The professors of the upper faculties still on the side of Socialism are few in number. Most of those who in 1900 greeted in polished language the advent of a new age, either are now contented with an impotent radicalism, or have retired completely into their shells. As for the young men of bourgeois families, they tend towards the purely reactionary parties. A great uproar has been made about a volume recently published by two young university men under the pseudonym of Agathon, which is the result of an investigation. The students to whom they applied for confidential expressions of feeling prove to be chauvinists, nationalists, adversaries of Socialism, deferential to the powers of the past, traditionalists, enemies of every sort of proletarian emancipation, loyalists of the social hierarchy. There is a chance that this investigation may not have been impartial. It has a practical value only for those indeed who accept the social hierarchy: it indicates in fact only the dominant state of mind of the young bourgeoisie, and only of this class. Socialism, which has never depended on this young bourgeoisie for its triumph, and which is no longer laboring under the hallucinations of 1848, aiming at social transformation through class compromise, is not at all worried at this defection from its ranks—if defection it may be called, since there is no more reason to trust the sincerity of the Socialistic impulse of the students of 1900, than to trust the depth of their anarchistic individualism of 1895.

In this renaissance of chauvinism, the fundamental influence has been the press. As in all, or nearly all, the countries of the world, the newspaper is only a commercial enterprise, for which the diffusion of this or that idea has only an immediate market value. More than ever before, the adage "Silence for the poor," which Lamennais uttered seventy-five years ago in the face of

the enormous fiscal penalities oppressing freedom of speech, appears now in its naked truth, but we must interpret it in a special sense. Only those papers which have huge financial backing and which are supported by powerful financial interests, have a chance to live. That is why so many of them have fallen before the pressure of the great metal companies. It has been well said that for us the age of metal has supplanted the age of textile industry. The metal trade is to-day as fully in control as were the textile works between 1840 and 1860. States are now ruled by the metal companies and they have won over the newspapers by sheer financial power. Chauvinism was to serve their economic interests by exciting peoples to accept, even to demand, new armaments. They have stimulated, irritated, inflamed the chauvinistic spirit by every means which the press could put at their disposal. Few are the newspapers in France. outside the press of the Socialist party and the syndicalists, which have succeeded in evading the deadly influence. The exaltation of patriotism is a commercial and political enterprise; it has been furthered by commercial means. Publicity has sped it on its journey like any new make of automobiles or any new patent medicine. The Krupp scandal in Germany has called attention to armor-plate patriotism; in France we have shrapnel patriotism, thirteen-inch-gun patriotism, hard-tack patriotism, camp-bed patriotism. The chauvinistic impulse would be incomprehensible except for this fundamental element: newspaper advertisement.

In a preceding article we showed how the election of M. Poincaré was secured. The success of the former President of the Council, representing in the Senate one of the departments of the Eastern frontier, was in a sense the crowning moment of the chauvinistic enterprise. No wonder the chauvinists made use of the opportunity, believed themselves masters of France, and immediately after this presidential election considered themselves strong enough to force through the three years' military service scheme.

Against this nationalistic impulse, so dangerous for the peace of France, so damaging to the working classes, so portentous for Europe as it comes into conflict with aggressive pan-Germanism, the Socialists are now fighting with might and main. They feel they are echoing a deep feeling of the working people; they have been brought into relations with the rural masses, hitherto but slightly affected by Socialism, but which do not want war, nor a burden of armament for which they alone would have to pay. Socialism stands as the champion of civilization, which can progress only in the peace and fraternity of neighboring peoples. Socialism will be the principal gainer from the struggle. The chauvinistic agitation has provoked the resistance of the proletariat which will break it, and the Socialists, mobilized in their groups, will henceforth exercise a much more far-reaching influence on the still scattered multitudes.

Sidelights on the Census of 1910

By Benjamin Glassberg.

Statistics have become a fetich of universal worship; for figures never lie, we are told. We forget that if properly manipulated, they can be made to. No fact is safe unless based on a solid foundation of figures. And of all figures, those prepared by the government Census bureau are considered most sacred and unimpeachable. No debate is complete without them. From the public platform we are constantly called upon to accept statistics as incontrovertible evidence.

To prove to us that prosperity reigns supreme, our statistical friends will dig up from the Census returns the fact that 9,000,000 families own their houses—forgetting to mention how many of them are owned free, and how many are mortgaged, and the number of families that hire out part of their homes; that consequently we have 9,000,000 happy, contented families, who are loyal to the flag, and who are satisfied with our social and political institutions. Or, again, we are told that the per capita wealth of this country is higher than that of any other, that our corn crop reaches several billion bushels yearly, and that our unemployment figures are ridiculously low. We enjoy a wonderful prosperity, in short, but do not realize it, is what these statistics are intended to make us believe.

Let us, however, try to bring truth to bear upon our much vaunted statistics, Census Statistics in particular, and perhaps our veneration for them will slightly diminish. A knowledge of the methods used in their preparation may even shake our firm belief in their accuracy and trustworthiness.

The Thirteenth Census of the United States, taken in 1910, was divided into three divisions: Population, Manufactures and Agriculture. I shall confine my attention entirely to the work of the division of Population.

The work of this division began on April 15, 1910, when an army of 68,000 enumerators was sent out over the country armed with "Instructions to Enumerators," a large portfolio containing the population schedules, and a trusty fountain-pen. It was indeed a motley and variegated crew that set forth so boldly. In the cities most of the enumerators were of a fairly intelligent character and most of them performed their Census activities in conjunction with their regular work. In the sparsely settled sections of the country the grade of people secured to do this work was a rather poor standard. Even a cursory examination of the schedules they sent in shows this; words are misspelled, columns are often left blank, and definite instructions are disregarded and misunderstood.

An untrained army such as this should have been impressed with the necessity of being careful, exact and painstaking in their reports, for on the raw material they furnished depended all the later deductions and generalizations. The conditions under which they worked, however, tended to influence them in the opposite direction. The enumerators in cities were paid two and a half cents for each name. In country districts a somewhat higher rate was paid. What is the result of such a system? Instead of careful and painstaking efforts to arrive at the truth, the most powerful and sustaining incentive for haste, namely, payment on a piece price basis, is furnished. Inevitably the enumerators become impatient at delay. In their anxiety to make haste. to enumerate so many, no attention is paid to enumerating correctly. Should we wonder, then, that the schedules are replete with error, incomplete returns and fraud?

Not only is the work marred by errors, but the still greater temptation of packing the returns and thus fraudulently increasing their pay confronted them, and many did not withstand it. When the fraud is as flagrant as it was in Tacoma, Washington, an attempt can be made to correct the returns. When the experts at the Census Bureau at Washington went over the Tacoma population schedules they were surprised at the great number of boarders and lodgers enumerated along with most of the families. They became decidedly suspicious and it was determined to send special agents to check up each person enumerated. When

the work was completed and the schedules were returned to the Bureau, every page had its quota of red lines through the fictitious names fraudulently entered by the enumerators. It is well to keep in mind that the supervisors of the Census in Tacoma were supposed to have examined the original returns. They had found them satisfactory and sent them on to Washington as absolutely correct. The amount of fraud perpetrated in that one city was shocking, even to people well acquainted with Census affairs.

As another example of the great inaccuracy of the Census returns we may take the case of Omaha, Neb. In 1880 it had a population of 30,518, and was the sixty-second city in population. In 1890 it had amassed a population of 140,452, and became the twentieth largest city. A gain of 110,000 in ten years, almost four times its population of 1880. The 1900 Census gave the population as 102,555. After a tremendous gain came a loss of 38,000 in a decade when all other cities showed a gain. What conclusion can be drawn from this except that in 1890 fraud had gone unchecked?

The method of payment is of course not the only explanation for false Census statistics, such as the ones pointed out above. Local pride is probably to a great extent responsible. The desire of rivalling the population of some neighboring city is very intense in some places. Or it may be an attempt to attract investors by showing what a wonderfully growing city the one in question is. These and similar reasons, however, can at best account for only a small part of the fraud committed, because to be really effective it necessitates the silent connivance of an entire community. The moral code of most of our municipalities is none too high, but in the final analysis it is the method of paying for each name enumerated that is chiefly responsible.

Thus the very basis of our statistics is fraught with fraud. Where it is so flagrant that it cannot escape detection, the guilty work can be corrected, but what about the hundreds of cases where the fraud has gone undetected, where the entries have escaped the none too vigilant eyes of the special agents?

Of the thirty-two questions that appeared on the population schedules which were to be answered for each individual, those of most value were questions 21 and 22, which inquired as to whether the person was out of work on April 15, 1910, and how many weeks the person was out of work during the past year. These two questions, if properly handled and correctly

filled out, would give us a fairly accurate idea of that most vexing of all questions—unemployment.

We see around us daily a vast proportion of workers, able and willing and ready to work, but who cannot. There are not enough jobs to go round, is the explanation, although in many factories we see the lights burning early in the morning and late at night, accompanied by the hum of machinery. The statistics on unemployment ought to give us a fairly accurate knowledge of the status of the unemployed army; just how many people were out of work during April, 1909—April, 1910; how long were they out of work, and what is the comparison between 1910, 1900, and 1890. Is the number greatly increasing, or is it diminishing?

These columns can also give us the correct number of children employed in mills or factories or at other occupations. If correctly returned, we would have an authoritative estimate of the extent to which children are being exploited to enable our millionaires to take a leading rank among philanthropists. And were every woman employed in any gainful undertaking correctly returned, we could justly estimate the extent to which women daily go forth to battle for bread.

These are the things these two columns should point out, namely, the extent of unemployment, child-labor and woman-labor. In reality do the statistics do that, and how correctly? The method of collecting the facts from which the statistics are prepared has been pointed out.

When the schedules are completed they are sent to the Census Bureau, where a temporary force of several thousand clerks begins the actual work of tabulating. The information contained in the population sheets is transferred to cards by means of specially constructed machines. Each person in the United States has a card punched on these machines containing the information that was entered in the schedules. The face of the machine resembles a typewriter with about 240 keys, on which is printed every possible answer to the information asked for in the schedules, such as age. place of birth, nativity of parents, occupation, etc. Of course, the several thousand different occupations are not printed on keys, but instead four rows of numbers are used which, when combined in a certain way, represent a certain occupation, as O-O-O-O stands for farmer, O-O-5-5 for proprietor of a saw mill.

Underneath these keys was a space into which a card about

seven inches by three was fed which contained a duplicate of the printing on the keys. If, for instance, the key New Jersey was pressed for a person born in New Jersey, it would cut out a small circular space of the card just below the space on which was printed New Jersey. By pressing the necessary keys, the entire information for an individual was thus transferred to the card. These cards were later fed to tabulating machines, which would add up all the holes cut out in the various fields, and then print the totals on ribbons.

To make sure that the clerks who operated these punching machines would not shirk their work, they, like the enumerators, were placed upon a piece price basis. They were paid at the rate of twenty cents per one hundred cards punched. And so these schedules, conceived in haste, were executed in still greater haste. The divergence between the real facts and the information contained on the cards as finally fed to the tabulating machines, kept continually increasing. The clerks, urged on by the desire of earning large salaries, soon found it expedient to adopt various schemes for increasing their speed. The majority of names on a sheet were those of women and children, who, in most cases having no occupation, were not out of work on April 15, 1910, and had not been out of work any week during the past year. Therefore they had to have a punch "No" and "O" in columns 21 and 22. (These two columns had to be filled in for every person enumerated.) These two keys were right alongside of each other on the keyboard, and the clerks naturally learned to use them together, because they were used so frequently. When a laborer or woman, but especially a child, *was* out of work on that day, and in addition had been out of work for several weeks during the past year, the appropriate keys had to be searched for. These, being used less often, were not so familiar to the clerk. In very many cases the clerk, not caring to spend time looking for the proper key, would press down those he was most familiar with, which would then transform this person out of work for some weeks or on April 15, into one who was *not* out of work and had *not been* during the past year, and so would be tabulated later on.

There was a force of clerks whose duty it was to examine the punched cards, and compare them with the original schedules, to see how accurate the punching was. This examination was not intended to be thorough. In order to be so, it would be necessary to spend several times the amount of time that it took

to do the punching for examination. So a few cards out of a thousand were taken at random and examined. If the number of errors did not exceed five per cent. the box of cards was passed. Not a very thorough examination, to say the least. In reality, the clerks satisfied themselves if they saw that there was a punch in each of the necessary fields.

The Census officials are not to be blamed for allowing this laxity in the examination of the cards. They had to make haste. Congress puts a time limit—and usually a short time limit—for completing the Census work. There is a tremendous amount of work to be done, and an untrained temporary force of employees, who know they must go soon, is provided to do that work. In an endeavor to complete that work, care and exactness are lost sight of.

So. who knows how many people out of work in that year are recorded as not being out of work? How reliable are our 1910 unemployment figures? In 1890 these statistics were collected for the first time. The percentage of unemployment was given as only 15.1. This was such a ridiculously low figure that in the 1900 report on "Statistics of Occupations," published in 1904, the then Director of the Census acknowledged that these figures were probably incorrect because the enumeration was not accurate or thorough enough, and that the leading economists refused to accept them. The Director goes on to argue that the unemployment figures prepared under his direction were probably correct, and they showed a percentage of 22.3. That is, over one person out of every five was out of employment on the day of enumeration in 1900. In a year of prosperity, too, when the expounder of the "Full dinner pail" reigned at the White House. What story would the true figures have told?

Let us see how the numbers of the unemployed were still further decimated and made into laborers who were never out of work—in the Census Bureau only. In very many cases, as has been pointed out, many answers had been ommitted by the enumerators in their haste, and most often it was columns 21 and 22 which were neglected. All clerks were however given definite instructions—oral, not written—that in all cases where these columns were left blank, they were to punch them as if they had been filled "No" and "O"—that is as if the individual was not out of work on April 15, 1910, and had not been out of work at all during the year. Whenever the enumerators had shirked their work, it was to be taken for granted that the person enumerated was one who had not been unemployed. What were the logical steps leading to this startling conclusion? Perhaps the official responsible could enlighten us, but as to his ability to justify it. we must remain a bit sceptical.

In spite of all this juggling, misrepresentation and fraud, 6,468,964 laborers were out of employment in 1900 out of a grand total of 29,073,233. It is interesting to note the figures for the building trades for that year. They are astonishing for the high percentage of unemployment which the Census force credited them with. These are the figures:

	Total employed	Unemployed	Per cent. Unemployed
Carpenters	599,707	248,182	41.4
Masons	160,638	89,091	55.5
Painters	275,782	116,892	42.4
Paperhangers	21 7 ;9	9,686	44.5
Plasterers	35,649	19,983	56.1
Plumbers	97,659	21,497	22.0
Roofers and slaters	9,065	3,311	36.5

The average of unemployment for the building trades was thus over forty per cent.

Out of 2,505,287 general laborers, 1,109,725, or 44.5 per cent., were unemployed, and so on through the various grades. Were the figures carefully enumerated, and then carefully and accurately tabulated, how different they might be from these haphazard ones, the result of a hasty enumeration, with its incomplete padded returns and of a careless tabulation and perfunctory inspection. These are the statistics we are asked to swear by, to accept without reservation.

Another interesting phase of the occupation statistics is the method employed in handling the returns of women marked "prostitutes" or "public women." Enumerators were cautioned in every case to give the exact occupation followed by the individual, especially so in regard to women. It is not at all a surprising thing to see pages filled with names of women in large resorts, drawn from every nation on earth, whose occupations are returned as "prostitute',, "public women," or "sport."

After making great efforts during the enumeration to arrive at the truth in this matter, it is curious to note the policy pursued when the schedules reached the Census Bureau. There was a corps of specially selected clerks to "edit" occupations—that is, place above the occupation the letters chosen to represent it. All prostitutes, however, were marked "N. G."—meaning, "nothing gainful." This was the same symbol used to designate children who did not work, housewives and other

women not following a gainful occupation. In this class were placed the prostitutes, and the best available method of arriving at a correct estimate of the real number of the prostitutes in the country was deliberately destroyed.

At a meeting of the American Federation of Sex Hygiene, held in Washington, on Sept. 17, 1912, Prof. Vernon M. Cady declared that there were 300,000 registered prostitutes in this country and that the police of the various towns estimate the number not registered as one million more, and that three billion dollars are annually spent upon prostitution, its diseases, and immorality in general. The terrible result of prostitution on the race was vividly portrayed. Only the truth, said the speaker, can rid us of its horrible and loathsome diseases. Sex Hygiene and the facts regarding the transmission of life must be taught. Ignorance is no longer a guarantee of innocence, was the verdict of Science.

But our government officials, with eyes turned piously toward the past, shrink from publishing the number of prostitutes in the country, and deliberately suppress the figures. Why are not these statistics tabulated? "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Therefore the government buries the truth or falsifies it.

Shortage of Common Labor

By Phillips Russell

The most conspicuous fact in the world of industry at present is the shortage of labor. Officials of the great basic industries, such as steel and iron making, textile manufacturing and packing, report almost with unanimity that the supply is considerably below the demand. Steel makers declare that they could use 20,000 more men with ease. Textile manufacturers assert that at least 12,000 more laborers are needed in the textile districts of the East to keep their machinery running full time. Packers in Chicago, Indianapolis, and Omaha say that 10,000 people could be put to work immediately. Machinery makers report that 5,000 additional men would be welcomed. From a hundred different industrial centres the cry is going up for "more men." Not since the high-speed era that prevailed before the panic of 1907 has the demand for labor been so great.

It is worthy of note, however, that this demand is almost entirely for common or so-called "unskilled" labor. This phenomenon is due in great part to the constant introduction of improved and well-nigh perfect machinery which is steadily eliminating the craftsman, doing away with the necessity for skill and experience, and making room for the untrained labor derived mostly from foreign immigration.

But in even larger measure is this shortage due just now to European disturbances which have checked, and even drawn back, the tide of immigration. The outbreak of the Italian-Tripolitan War immediately absorbed the attention and energy of a large section of the Italian people and drew back thousands of vigorous young Italians from our fields, mines and factories. This was followed by the uprising in the Balkan States, and the war of the allies upon Turkey has created a tremendous drain upon the industries in which sturdy young Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbs, and Montenegrins were leading producers, especially shoe, steel, and textile making. At the first news of this war it will be remembered that patriotic immigrants, their imaginations fired by the prospects of revenge upon their ancient Turkish enemy, deserted their jobs and embarked for the scene of conflict by whole shiploads.

Other contributing causes to the present stringency in the labor market have been the international scare created by the panic of 1907 and the widespread fear engendered by the election of a Democratic administration.

The panic of 1907 created a distrust in the stability of American institutions in the minds of hundreds of thousands of immigrants and prospective newcomers. They take fright now at the slightest unfavorable symptom in industry and untold thousands of them scattered over the face of the United States hold themselves in readiness to desert the country at virtually a moment's notice.

The sensitiveness of the supposedly ignorant and stolid immigrant to changes in economic conditions is remarkable. The ebb and flow in the tide of immigration acts as an unfailing barometer in this respect. For example, immigration to the United States set its high water mark in the year of the culmination of highspeed business in America, 1907. The number of arrivals from foreign shores in that year was 1,285,349, having swiftly risen from 448,572 in 1900.

At the end of the year 1908 immigration had dropped to

782,870, a loss of almost exactly half a million. In the following year there was another drop to 751,786. By the end of 1909 conditions had somewhat improved, with the result that the figures in 1910 shot up to 1,041,570. But in the very next year, due no doubt to political agitation, there was another marked decrease, the register showing 878,587 arrivals. And that confidence had not yet been restored in 1912 is shown by the fact that there was another loss of 40,000 immigrants. As a well-known financial expert recently put it: "The sense, the acumen, the intuition—call it what you will—of the untutored laboring classes who supply this country with muscle is almost as fine as that of migratory birds. Aided, or guided, by the tidings received from friends already here, the peasantry of Southern Europe and other lands have proved that they can diagnose with wonderful accuracy the time to emigrate and the time to stay at home. The spring exodus this year in all probability will be below normal."

This last observation will probably prove to be accurate. Laborers of foreign birth, who are now laying the foundations of all our great construction works and doing all our rough, disagreeable tasks, have departed hence in armies in the last few months because of their fear of what might happen under the new Democratic administration. During the presidential campaign they were told by many spell-binders that the election of Woodrow Wilson as president would mean the loss of their jobs by wholesale, because Wilson had threatened to break up all the great industries and to cut down profits by meddling with the tariff. Workers of foreign birth forthwith began to pack their goods and engage passage for the old country.

A striking example of the effect of this sort of agitation was afforded recently by the city of Utica, New York. More than one-fifth of the inhabitants of that big manufacturing town are of Italian birth and many of the city's industries are dependent on Italian labor. Co-incident with the election of Mr. Wilson, the Italians, believing that there would soon be no work for them, began to make arrangements for returning to the old country. So serious did the situation become that employers became alarmed and the city authorities were finally forced to hold a mass meeting at the principal theatre in the Italian district to allay the fears of the populace. However, before these assurances of safety had got abroad an army of foreign-born toilers had left our shores, leaving gaps in the producing ranks of many

industries. Of course, as soon as it is seen that President Wilson is not going to do anything serious to the country, many of these pilgrims will return, but others of them, having saved enough to sustain them in some comfort on their native hearths, will undoubtedly remain or fail to return for several years.

Present conditions point to a revival of prosperity in the near future, but this does not mean that there is no army of unemployed in the United States to-day. There is one, but it is composed entirely of skilled workmen. In the principal industrial centres, around the assembly places of mechanics and artisans, there can be seen numbers of idle men who can obtain work only occasionally. They are idle because they have not yet accommodated themselves to the changing conditions in American industry and have not reconciled themselves to the lower wages that go with common labor. Rather than make the best of the new situation, they seem to prefer to work for short periods at the high wages obtained by the unions of closely restricted membership.

But so rapidly are economic conditions changing that even casual employment will soon be hard for the journeyman and the skilled mechanic to find. Production is becoming more nearly automatic every day and the employes of great industrial establishments are even now, to a large extent, little more than automatons acting in harmony with gigantic and highly perfected machinery. The skilled mechanic of to-day is doomed to be the apprentice of to-morrow.

It is a fact not yet generally realized that it is our foreign born population which furnishes practically all the common labor that is absolutely essential to the upbuilding and operation of the basic industries of the nation. But many far-sighted foreigners realize it; and it is because of this fact that the newspapers and leaders of foreign elements are making no strenuous efforts to arouse agitation against the enactment of national laws restricting immigration. They frankly say that if any serious check is placed upon immigration, in two or three years such a demand for common labor would be set up by our great manufacturers and capitalists that the gates of the nation would be flung wide open and statesmen would send a Macedonian cry across the ocean.

Furthermore, these spokesmen say if immigration is checked or prohibited, the demand for common labor would soon be greater than the supply, and unskilled labor would then be in a

position to make demands for increased wages. These demands will become more general as additional examples are furnished of what common, unskilled labor can do for itself when organized by industries, as in Lawrence, Mass., Paterson, N. J., Akron, O. and other industrial centres where great uprisings of common labor recently have taken place.

The day of the common laborer has arrived. He holds American industry in the hollow of his hand.

THE OLD SONG

By Louise W. Kneeland

O Love, I hear you in the evening come whistling down the lane,
And ah, my longing heart beats fast to hear that tune again,
'Tis one we knew long years ago when we were blithe and young,
And quick the fond and tender words come crowding to my tongue.

O Love,
Dear Love,
Take a walk with me,
The blackbird's in the hazelbush,
A sail is on the sea;
My love's
True love
And thus 'twill ever be,
So come away
At close of day
And wander, Sweet, with me.

The fragrance of the blushing rose, the light of summer skies,
The balmy breeze that softly stirs and then as softly dies,
They come to me the while I sit beside an open door
And dream I hear that whistled tune and hum these words once more:

O Love,
Dear Love,
Take a walk with me,
The blackbird's in the hazelbush,
A sail is on the sea;
My love's
True love
And thus 'twill ever be,
So come away
At close of day
And wander, Sweet, with me.

A JUNE SUNSET AFTER RAIN

By Eliot White

The day's bright chancel ruined!—
All the wheeling lights that swept its floor
Below the groinings of the marble clouds,
Crushed by the vandal storm, we thought,
Beneath the débris of its rubble fogs.
The carvéd work thereof quite broken down
With ax and hammer of the thunder,—grim iconoclast.
And through the shattered roof
The gray rain leaping unabashed, before irreverent winds.

Yet ere the dusk there issued golden splendor,
Like to that great vision of the priestly prophet
By the river Chebar, with the exiles,
That healed his sorrow for the razéd temple in the west
With promise of a nobler yet to be.

A sudden ruddy gleam invades the room
To call us to the windows whence it falls
Through leafwork frames of burnished ivy,
Crusted with their emeralds of rain.
And lo! beyond the dripping maples of the hill,
And far along a strip of open heaven
The hue of melon-flesh, and crystal-deep,
Vast, dull-hot bars of cloud are massed,
All patterned down their flanks with glowing ash,
And breathed upon by some supernal breath,
Until their contact leaps to jewel-blaze
Of orange topaz and the fire of rose;—
Untamable transfiguring of flame
Across the hearth majestic of the gloaming,
In gold and garnet pageantry.

As timid, 'neath the silence of the awful light,
Within the somber woods faint syllables of birds
Fall, liquid-sweet, with those fresh-gathering tears
Far-heard, in liquid intervals, from all the rain-drenched trees;
As when a child, with sorrow past, yet sobs aggrieved.

An hour gone, where heavy on the night
Wistaria yields fragrance, through its trellised vine
Gleams one last spark of cloudy embers down the west,
Where God has drawn His colors back to Him,
Yet left his covenant against the dark
Of all the morrow's splendor of His June.

Benjamin J. Legere

By J. E.

"Ablest of all the Little Falls strike leaders"—in these words the Utica *Globe* appropriately characterized Benj. J. Legere. A modest, unassuming young man, with good oratorical, literary and organizing abilities, Legere is of the new type of labor leaders whom the capitalist class is sending to prison in an effort to destroy the working class movement and prevent its own overthrow. A machinist, assistant factory superintendent, a Socialist party member, with all the inspiring idealism of the great cause of Socialism, Legere is also editor and playwright, as well as orator and organizer. Two of his three plays, "The Reformer" and "The Woman's Place," have won the approval of competent critics. The first has been pronounced more powerful than any of Briuex's plays on the sex problem; the second, Leonard D. Abbott declares, is "Charlotte Perkins Gilman dramatized." "The Reformer" was produced in Legere's native city, Taunton, Mass., where it created a great impression. It was suppressed, because of its boldness, by the orthodox Mayor.

At Little Falls Legere brought order out of chaos and welded the unskilled workers of many nationalities into a victorious organization of strikers. For this, he is now to be imprisoned in Auburn, at hard labor, for one year and three months, on the charge of inciting to riot. In an address to the court, Legere boldly declared that his conviction had been secured by the textile capitalists of Little Falls and that the law was being used to oppress labor in the interests of capital. He affirmed his innocence, portrayed the class struggle in society, of which his trial was a result, and predicted its continuance until the working class won emancipation from wage slavery. The Utica press reports that Legere took his sentence with a smile. No doubt his Socialist knowledge led him to anticipate it as a foregone conclusion.

In closing, a word of acknowledgment is due to the Socialists of Schenectady; they have stood nobly by the Little Falls strikers and their imprisoned representatives. At this writing, the

Young People's Socialist League of the Electric City is preparing to stage both "The Reformer" and "The Woman's Place," for the benefit of the defense fund. Herein is a suggestion that might be followed by workmen's and suffragists' dramatic societies elsewhere.

Legere, with his many-sided abilities, is a credit to Socialism. There are many more like him; and in this is the hope of progress and of the human race.

The Roman Catholic Jubilee

By Louis C. Fraina

An apostolic letter of Pope Pius decreed a universal jubilee from March 20 to December 8, of this year, in "commemoration of the religious tolerance edict issued by Emperor Constantine."

Religious hysteria rarely conduces to accuracy. The Pope's letter being conceived in the spirit of apostolic fervor, inaccuracy follows.

What the jubilee actually commemorates is not religious tolerance, but the acquisition of political power by the Church and immediate religious *intolerance*.

The circumstance that Constantine was not the one to establish "religious tolerance" indirectly attests the fact. The Emperor Galerius in 311 A. D. put the Christian upon legal equality with the Pagan creeds. A passage in his edict reads:

"After the publication, on our part, of an order commanding the Christians to return to the observances of the ancient customs, many of them, it is true, submitted in view of the danger, while many others suffered death. Nevertheless, since many of them have continued to persist in their opinions and we see that in the present situation they neither duly adore and venerate the gods nor yet worship the god of the Christians, we, with our wonted clemency, *have judged it wise to extend a pardon even to these men and permit them once more to become Christians and re-establish their places of meeting;* in such manner, however, that they shall in no way offend against good order. We propose to

notify the magistrates in another mandate in regard to the course that they should pursue."*

The German scholar Seeck** has conclusively shown that the "Edict of Milan," hailed as the proclamation of religious equality, was really a letter issued by Constantine's colleague, Licinius, to a government official in the East, demanding the thorough enforcement of Galerius' edict. And this "Edict" which was not an edict forms the basis for commemorating Constantine's establishment of "religious tolerance."

The service of Constantine to the Church was official recognition of Catholic prelates and granting them all sorts of privileges and power. In doing this the emperor paid political debts, for the Christians assisted him mightily in usurping the imperial throne. The Church historians would make Constantine a Christian prior to 313, although up to that time, says Duruy ("History of Rome," Vol. VIII) "nothing testifies to the Christian faith of the Emperor." Church historians have constructed an ideal mythical Constantine, just as they doubtlessly manufactured the "Edict of Milan," the supposed text of which has never been found. Constantine was not a religious but a political ruler. He protected Christianity for reasons of state. Each strengthened the other, and for purely temporal ends. The forms of the old Roman state religion were revived, but now, instead of merely Pagan gods, there was an amalgamation of the old and the new—old gods under new names. In its organization the Catholic Church was inspired not by Jesus' teachings, but by Roman hierarchic despotism and compromise with Paganism for political purposes.

Constantine's victory over Maxentius, accordingly, marked not the triumph of Christianity over Paganism, but the final extinction of Primitive Christianity and the rise of the Catholic Church as a political power. The early Christians were persecuted not so much for their religion as for their hostility to the government and Roman civilization. The Church, on the contrary, derived its strength from that very government and civilization. In making Christianity practically the state religion,

*Cited in "Readings in European History," by James Harvey Robinson, Vol. 1. H. Stuart Jones in "The Roman Empire" says that Galerius "had been compelled to own himself beaten in his struggle (against the Christians) and to accord to the Christians the free exercise of their religion."

** Robinson, loc. cit., cites Seeck's "Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte," Vol. XII, pp. 381 sqq.

Constantine completely destroyed its revolutionary aspirations. The Arians, Donatists, and other sects still holding partly to primitive Christianity were mercilessly rooted out. The clergy now began to acquire the power which ultimately made the Church supreme in Feudal society. Clerics were exempted from public burdens and later from public taxes. Clerics generally could be accused only before a bishop, and minor civil cases were tried by ecclesiastical tribunals.* Pagan priests at this period also possessed these privileges. Under succeeding Emperors the Church "tolerantly" monopolized this power and crushed the Pagans.

An edict, "On the Catholic Faith", issued after the Council of Nicæa, illustrates the "religious tolerance" which the Church now commemorates:

"We ordain that the name of Catholic Christians shall apply to all those who obey this present law. All others we judge to be mad and demented. We declare them guilty of the infamy of holding heretical doctrine; their assemblies shall not receive the name of churches. They shall first suffer the wrath of God, then the punishment which in accordance with divine judgment we shall inflict." (Cited by Robinson, *loc. cit.*)

Prior to this edict Constantine (315 A.D.) renewed the edict of Vespasian and Severus, punishing those embracing Judaism. (Duruy, *loc cit.*, Vol. VIII.)

A later edict decreed capital punishment upon any person concealing or possessing "harmful books written with criminal intent."

A triumphant Church construes "tolerance" as favors for itself and persecution for others. A universal peculiarity: the Puritans, Calvin and Protestants generally fought and fled from religious intolerance only to establish a religious depotism of their own.

Catholics cite the "beneficent" influence of Christianity upon Constantine. Yet soon after his rise to power the Emperor issued an edict against the slaves than which none more brutal was issued by the Pagans: "The master whose slave perishes under

*Jones, *loc. cit.*, says: "The most remarkable enactment of Constantine in favor of the Church is the first of the so-called *Constitutiones Sirmondi* (not found in the Theodosian Code, but in a small independent collection of laws) which sets up episcopal tribunals, from whose judgment there **is no appeal,** in certain civil causes. Its genuineness has very naturally been called in question, but is accepted by many scholars of high authority."

the rod is not guilty of homicide if he declares he did not intend to kill the man. The woman who had criminal intercourse with her slave was put to death and the slave burnt at the stake." (Duruy, *loc cit*, Vol. VIII).

The rather lenient policy of the later Pagan emperors was succeeded by bitter persecution under the Christian-Catholic regime.

The Church intends the jubilee to be historical as well as sacred. We suggest three statuary groups or paintings of historical interest, worthy of a place in the contemplated memorial chapel near the Milvain Bridge.

(1) Jesus and the Apostles preaching their revolutionary message to the lowly and oppressed of the Roman Empire, inscribed with the words, "The lowly shall inherit the earth. The first shall be last and the last shall be first."

(2) Constantine and Catholic prelates at a banquet unctuously discussing their political schemes; in the background hover the slaves of field and hearth, cadaverous of face, forms bleeding, and crushed with oppression and despair; while one group of slaves experiences the first fruits of Catholic triumph in the execution of the brutal edict of Constantine.

(3) A composite group of all the popes and priests and prelates of the Middle Ages blessing the arms of the murderous barons, especially when directed against rebellious serfs, casting divine sanction on Medieval exploitation, and preaching submission to the serfs on pain of hell-fire should they revolt.

The Catholic Church was not alone in crushing Labor. Pagan society did the identical thing; but upon that crushed mass the Pagans reared a brilliant intellectual monument. It is a common thing for Christianity to be extolled over Paganism. But wherein does the intellectual achievement of Catholic Christianity compare with that of the Pagans? Medieval genius as expressed in Dante and the Renaissance was in revolt against the Church as an intellectual and political institution. And as a philosophy of life Paganism needs no demonstration of its superiority over Christianity. Macchiavelli, a master-mind of the Renaissance clearly saw the inferiority of Christianity:

"Our religion has glorified men of humble and contemplative life, rather than men of action. Moreover, it has placed the *summum bonum* in humility, in lowliness, and in the contempt of earthly things; Paganism placed it in high-mindedness, in bodily strength, and in all the other things which make men strongest. And if our religion requires us to have any strength in us, it calls upon us to be strong to suffer rather than to do." (Cited in "The Cambridge Modern History," Vol. II, Chap. VI.)

The Pagan spirit is abroad in the world to-day. Its manifestations are manifold. And no amount of Roman Catholic jubilees can stem the rising tide that shall carry the race into a world where religious and political tyrants are no more, and humanity shall live for the Joy of Life.

The Apotheosis of Pragmatism

By Robert Rives La Monte

Walling has a provoking and perverse fondness for giving his books misleading titles. His "Socialism As It Is" was notable, not so much for what it told us about Socialism and the Socialist movement, as for its marvelous analysis of the present trend of capitalist society toward State Capitalism or "The Servile State" as Hilaire Belloc dubs it. In his latest book* Walling once again utterly misleads us by his title. "The Larger Aspects of Socialism" might far more fitly be called The Apotheosis of Pragmatism. It is a sort of ecstatic epic—if a volume as full of heterogeneous quotations as a badly made legal digest may be called an epic at all—in praise of Pragmatism in general and more particularly of the brand of Pragmatism formulated by Professor Dewey. If it pleases Walling to become the protagonist of Dewey's philosophy surely no one shall say him nay, but equally surely it is not mere idle cavilling to protest emphatically against labelling such a piece of special pleading "The Larger Aspects of Socialism."

The root idea of pragmatism has long been familiar in the form of popular proverbs, such as "the proof of the pudding is in the eating." Jesus' "By their fruits ye shall know them" is not far from what Walling loves to call "the pragmatic spirit." In the New Review for March 29th Paul Lafargue embodies this same spirit in a single sentence: "In the material and intellectual world the deed alone is fruitful."

It is difficult to overstate the importance of this pragmatic idea that a speculative theory that will not stand the test of prac-

---

* *The Larger Aspects of Socialism*, by William English Walling. The Macmillan Co., New York. Cloth, 12mo, 403 pp. $1.50.

tical experience is worthless as a guide or compass in practical life and affairs. Speculative theories must constantly be drawn down from the metaphysical skies to see whether or not they fit the vulgar earth-born facts. I remember pointing out in an editorial note in the *Sunday Call* that this true and practical pragmatism had been long since clearly formulated by Friedrich Engels in "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific" and in other portions of his famous polemic "Anti-Duehring," and even more remarkably by Marx in one of his notes on Feuerbach, "The life of society is essentially practical. All the mysteries which seduce speculative thought into mysticism find their solution in human practice and in concepts of this practice."

Walling gives us these same quotations in his "Appendix A," but he seems unwilling to rest content with this home-spun, fact-founded pragmatism of Marx and Engels. And he appears to believe that William James and Dewey and perhaps Bergson and others have added new and important contributions (just what I was unable to discover) and converted this lowly pragmatism into an essentially new, marvelous and unfailing compass, not to say sextant, by which the most clumsy landlubber may nonchalantly navigate the seven seas of modern thought. Concealing my inner misgivings I followed my blithe pilot Walling on board his new-fangled clipper, and merrily we sailed o'er seas smooth and seas stormy. "Social Philosophy" was only a bit choppy, and from it we glided onto the glassy mill-pond of "Science"; in crossing "Evolutionism", "Biology", "History", and "Sociocracy" we struck only one or two squalls; but the waves ran threateningly high when we approached the line where the Gulf Stream of Max Stirner's forgotten Anarchism was striving to mingle itself with the sea of modern Pragmatism; here I suspected my pilot of unconfessed seasickness, but the strange emulsion formed by these so different currents appeared to have a peculiar fascination for his debonair spirit so that he sailed along the line of commingling until Anarchism had completely disappeared, swallowed up by the smoother, though still distressing waves of Pragmatism; fortunately this reckless and terrifying adventure was followed by a delightful cruise on the balmy Gulf of "Ethics"; but from here on the waves rose ever higher; we were well nigh swamped by the Antarctic current of Nietzsche's "pragmatic" morality; the frail craft rolled horribly in the long swelling cross seas of poor Madam Montessori's "pragmatic" pedagogy; our troubles were not yet at an end, for to reach

port we had yet to cross the mountainous seas rolling and raging madly in the Bay of Biscay of Free Love. Never had I seen such a stormy sea. It was as though a myriad of maelstroms were dancing the Tango with the utter abandon of frenzied Bacchantes. My brave pilot could no longer conceal his *mal de mer*. When he returned saddened and depleted from the taffrail he told me the incredible roughness of the waters was caused by the forcible commingling of four mighty ocean currents—the Bebel Stream, the Key Current, the mighty Shreiner surge from the Sargasso Sea, and the Perkins Gilman Tidal Wave. Small wonder four such streams pouring themselves into the Sea of Pragmatism should make a commotion!

When we were safe in port I offered up a *Te Deum* of Thanksgiving the while I marvelled at the miraculous intrepidity of my gallant pilot.

What has the brave explorer brought us back from this Cosmos-encircling voyage? I fear very little that is new or valuable in the form of either fact or theory. But while his cargo will not weigh much when put on the scales, there have followed the craft into port many a refreshing breeze of stimulation, inspiration and suggestion.

Seriously I counsel all truly fearless souls to buy a ticket for this Round-the-World trip with Pilot Walling. The timid would do well to hug the shore.

I cannot use up my space in minor criticisms, such as Walling's astounding failure to realize in how many particulars Bergson and James had been anticipated by the tanner Dietzgen, or his assumption that James' fascination "even by the repeatedly exposed Paladino" showed a bias toward credulity on his part. As a matter of fact Paladino could be "exposed" only to those who were wholly ignorant of her history. For twenty years Professors Lombroso and Flournoy had studied her case and written of her childish trickery. What was marvelous in her case were precisely the facts which could not be accounted for by such trickery. Had there been no "trickery" for our clever reporters to "expose", Paladino would not have been the Paladino so often and so searchingly tested by Continental savants.

There is a danger and a serious danger in such unqualified glorifications of pragmatism as Walling has given us in this book. While it is true that a hypothesis that will not "make good," that will not work when put into practice, is valueless, it is likewise true that many tactics that appear to "work" beauti-

fully are not founded on rock-bottom facts, and are therefore not sound in theory, and so in the long run carry us not forward but backward.

We Americans, whether Socialists or not, are sufficiently prone to worship success no matter how won. As Socialists we are far too ready to believe that any tactics that win elections are the *right* tactics. Sometimes I fancy there are those of us who go to the other extreme and think that tactics that win must be somehow wrong. But the great majority of our comrades believed and still believe that the Milwaukee tactics must have been *right,* because they won in two elections. Here in my own state, Connecticut, when Bridgeport in 1911 polled over 3,000 votes for the Socialist candidate for Mayor, the comrades all over the State were quite sure that the Bridgeport tactics must be the *right* tactics. And articles on "The Bridgeport Idea," "The Bridgeport Plan" by Comrades Robert Hunter and Ernest Berger covered the editorial page of the New York *Call.* But since the election of 1912, when our vote in Bridgeport dropped back to about 1,500, we have heard but little of the "Bridgeport Idea." I have sometimes thought it would be instructive if the *Cali* would reprint those articles.

Tactics cannot be right unless they are right in theory, and a theory has no right to the honored name of theory unless it conforms rigidly to the facts. Pragmatism may but too readily be converted to the uses of those who prefer to believe in comfortable lies rather than to face disturbing truths. With equal ease it furnishes a doctrinal support to those despisers of doctrine and theory and dogma who urge us to forget a Marx they never knew and to be practical and "constructive."

This pernicious and attractive teaching is to-day the greatest menace to the American Socialist Movement. Its exponents are in almost undisputed control of the official machinery of the Party. And therefore it is all the more imperative that the radical members of the party never let go their hold of the saving truth that without sound theory there cannot be a sound movement.

In fairness to Comrade Walling be it said there is not a line in his latest book to give any support to the contrary view. But unfortunately there is much unmeasured and very sparingly qualified eulogy of the only philosophy now being used to give the support of dogma to the popular crusade against dogma.

Dramatic Criticism

By Felix Grendon

If we paid specialists in physical culture to recommend a daily dip in the Gulf of Mexico on the ground that a superior brand of sharks abounded there, we should not be doing hygienic science a madder turn than our treatment of dramatic critics is doing the drama. For we actually encourage these gentlemen to recommend an evening's dip in a theatre on no better ground than that the performance abounds in a superior brand of repartee, or of pathos, or of sartorial masculinity and adipose femininity, or, worst of all, in a superior brand of well-made play.

Now we need not deny that humor, pathos, feminine charm, masculine address, and the mechanics of playmaking, all occupy legitimate places in the finished dramatic product. But our good-natured tolerance of these factors should not prevent us from insisting on their subordination to the main substance which the author serves up to the audience. One might expect a professional critic of the theatre to be swift to explain how a play of intellectual pretensions is cheapened by emphasizing its extrinsic qualities. One might depend upon him to call the playwright to account for yielding so feebly to the public's vulgar infatuation with a fashionable or glittering veneer. Unfortunately, dramatic criticism in America is like the clock in *Great Expectations:* it stopped in 1800. The critic is thus not only the last to condemn the strangling of the salient by the inessential, he is often the first to praise the accessories of a play under the impression that he is championing its essence. This puts him in a class with the gourmand whose jaded palate mistakes the seasoning of a dish for its inherent flavor, and with the salesman of pianos who recommends an instrument for the piquant coloring of its woodwork.

How do our critics get their names advertised on expansive bill-boards throughout the city and in dazzling letters of electric light on Broadway? Very simply, by assuring the public in every review that God's in his heaven and all's right with the theatrical world. The scribe who is in the game solely to make it pay never deviates from this reliable formula. He has a shrewder colleague who, by qualifying his praise with an occa-

sional dash of disparagement, secures a fine effect of just appraisal. "Critics" of both these classes are quite harmless. Like the barkers at Coney Island they fool only the people that want to be fooled. Everybody else knows that they are not critics of the theatre at all, but merely advertisers of theatrical amusements.

But there is a third sort of critic who is not so harmless. This is the sort with brains enough to get a reputation for depth of thought. and sensibility enough to feel the pangs of artistic blackguardism. It is the critic of this type who forges a quite brilliant technic for reaching neat compromises between what is left of his pride and what is coming to his bank account.

This technic has been highly organized by the reviewer of an evening newspaper who passes for one of the most intellectual dramatic critics in New York. A few weeks ago he opened a review with the information that the play was execrable and every actor except the star thoroughly incompetent But how did he follow up this sop to his artistic conscience? The star, he continued. "was excruciatingly funny," she "kept the audience laughing from beginning to end," and therefore, he concluded, everybody ought to see the play, since it afforded "an evening's capital entertainment."

Thus is dramatic criticism boiled down to triple extract of theatrical advertisement. A play is impossible, the players are worse, and the producer and the leading actors jointly spare no pains to show the public a bald scepticism of its brains and a flat derision of its taste and feelings. Where do these premises lead the critic? They lead him to the irresistible conclusion that the box office deserves support! And—such is the triumph of his amazing logic—this support the box office usually gets. Now the injury such "criticism" does is not that it tricks a few people into going to a worthless play: gullible people deserve to be tricked. The injury lies in the alienation of the choicest readers and playgoers. In other words, dramatic criticism is given a black eye, and the result is that a critic jealous of his integrity finds it doubly hard to inspire confidence or command respect.

Now, what equipment may we reasonably expect of a dramatic critic worthy of the name? In brief, he must possess a critical instinct so incorruptible that he will express what his insight reveals, though the Heavens fall and managers gnash their teeth. The quality of his insight will depend on his knowing what in our time an alert man may know of religion, the social revolution, and the Life Force. In fine, he must have first-hand convictions on the purpose of life, on the duel between man and his environment, and on the functions and obligations of sex. Not that a working knowledge of the technics of play-making and play-producing will be out of place. But this accomplishment will be as sounding brass unless enriched by a penetration deep enough to distinguish between plays revealing the purely vegetative aspect of human life, plays unfolding a panorama of life's conflicts, and plays interpreting life's high purpose of creating life still higher.

When we measure the season's critical reviews of plays by a standard entailing any such equipment on the part of the reviewer, the result is extremely dispiriting. Take the dramatic criticisms of the two most noteworthy plays acted in New York since last September: "Fanny's First Play" by Shaw and "The Affairs of Anatol" by Schnitzler. These plays, far as the poles asunder, elicited reviews as like as two peas. Of each play it was almost unanimously said that it was brilliantly written, ingeniously conceived, and admirably staged, the only drawback being that "it was not in any vital sense a play." One reviewer of "Anatol" went so far as to pronounce the author a confirmed sceptic who neither denied nor affirmed the soul's existence. But this was a particularly audacious remark. And when a later review referred to Anatol as a fastidious man of the world, serious enough to be cynical but not passionate enough to be serious, the writer of the antithesis was promptly hailed on Newspaper Row as a new intellectual giant.

And so he was, among our New York journalists, reaching as he did their top notch of intellectual discernment. But he no more grasped the salient facts about "Anatol" than did the meanest of his fellows. The play's ethical basis, its insidious glorification of rich drones, its blithe etching of the high-class *demi-mondaine* in the guise of a radiant *bien aimée,* and its playful complacence towards the whole fabric of capitalist morality—these things were wholly ignored. Or they were tacitly dismissed in the dictum that the play was too light "to be taken seriously," an imbecile catch-phrase which was coupled with the feeble conclusion that the play was not immoral: hadn't the dramatist cleverly arrested our attention on moments in the hero's life when his idle enjoyment of his wealth was marred by some disillusion?

Now, the question of a play's morality is not important, while the question of an audience's morality is supremely so. In the case of "Anatol," not the play but the audience was immoral. For when the audience reacted favorably to the sociological implications and the economic bias of the play, it identified itself with anti-social thought and thus stood convicted of the only immorality worth counting. Nothing speaks worse of the stupidity or venality of American criticism than that not a single article made this position clear or explained that "Anatol" had to be taken seriously not because it embraced an immorality new to the world, but because it beglamored a morality old to the world and fatal to our social health.

But it was in the reviews of "Fanny's First Play" that an unrelieved poverty of critical ability was exposed. Here was a play by the master hand among European dramatists, and our critics could do no better than declare the play no play at all, padding columns of good paper with a sort of dialectical drivel that any high-school boy would blush to write. Would anyone look for such an appalling exhibition in any other branch of criticism? Imagine art or musical critics solemnly proving that a new picture by Cézanne or Monet is really not a picture, a new prelude by Dukas or Strauss not a prelude, or a new statue by Rodin not a statue! But the mind refuses to conceive an absurdity so huge that only a critic of plays can practise it. A specialist in art tells us that a picture is good or bad and why he judges it so, and we get the same information from specialists in sculpture and music. Even the dullest critic of the recent exhibition of Independent Artists did not gravely assure the public that certain paintings were not paintings. To such humiliating depths of inanity only a critic of the theatre can sink and it is curious how promptly he sinks to those depths every time a Shaw play is staged.

With their usual bravery, the critics disappointed nobody after "Fanny's First Play" was put on at the Comedy Theatre. The immortal platitudes about Shavianism were jauntily trotted out, none the worse for the deathblow Shaw himself had given them in the prologue to his comedy. The veterans resurrected them with an air of seasoned profundity, the novices did the same with an air of rollicking wit. In deference to the fame Shaw has acquired in the face of continuous press disparagement the scribes, both old and young, expanded to certain handsome concessions: the playwright was an incredibly clever

fellow, the play was a riot of humor, and the characters were as unlike the author as the author's weakness for identifying himself with his characters permitted.

But on the only matter of consequence—the relation of the dramatic stuff to modern life—a diplomatic silence was maintained. Not a critic pointed out that "Fanny's First Play" sets forth the scornful disregard of the love-instinct for legalized mating, the spiritual rebellion of the rising generation against the tyranny of material respectability, and in fine, the conflict between the newer, bolder morality from which Socialism is borrowing its power, and the slavish, decaying morality from which Plutocracy is borrowing its death rattle.

Such ineptitude, however amusing, is no joke in our experimental age. Signs press upon us that the whole pretentious edifice of formal education—from its foundation, the compulsory free school, to its superstructure, the mushroom college and the philanthropized university—is on the point of crumbling. What is to replace the great pedagogical illusion? The public library, the political forum, the scientist's lecture platform, the inventor's demonstration ground, the picture gallery, the concert hall, and the theatre—these stand out as ready substitutes. Purge them of their present snobbery and they can readily be turned into effective instruments for the freeman's democratic education.

Among these instruments, the theatre offers the richest promise of deep and wide social influence, if only men of first rate ability can be enlisted to take command. Unhappily, our American theatre is at present too dull and feeble an instrument to invite thinkers of great power to experiment with its educational possibilities. And until it is sharpened and tempered in the smithy of keen, relentless criticism, we need not blame men of genius for contemptuously passing it by. We may as well make up our minds that American imaginative talent will continue to exploit Peruvian rubber or Chilean nitrate as long as it is not worth the sacrifice involved to exploit the theatre.

How can the drama get the start of business in pre-empting the genius of able men? Only through the will and devotion of the militant minority. By the militant minority we mean the few people with sufficient brains and passion to give motive force to the best ideas and to make noble living a necessity. Not until we realize the democracy at which Socialism aims, however,

can this choice body of militants grow large enough to become a power. In the meantime the dramatic critic can do a great public service as a recruiting officer for the militant minority of the future. He can quicken playwright, actor, and producer to a livelier consciousness of their missions. He can assist them in turning the theatre into a rendezvous for dynamic minds. And he can focus these minds on the task of making the best ideas prevail on and off the stage.

Could New York get two or three such critics, our theatrical situation would improve by leaps and bounds. Before long, we should have insistent audiences craving a drama of finer ideas and loftier morality, and this drama would spring up to fill the demand as surely as air rushes in to fill a vacuum. For that matter, a single forceful writer on an important metropolitan paper could work wonders, provided he were endowed with a critical passion strong enough to resist the flattery of actors, the advances of managers, the bribe of electric and poster advertising and the other corrupting temptations a rich theatrical business can offer a willing servitor. In a year, such a critic could do more to stimulate the demand for a lively native drama than all his predecessors combined have done since 1800.

Giovanna's Laugh

By Andre Tridon

Giovanna's throaty, passionate laugh rose above the prelude to "Santa Lucia" which the three blind men were plimping wearily on their guitars. For the third time, Rinaldo, their leader and guide, was singing; he, so lazy; and in this stuffy foul café, where four, five nickels, never more, would fall on the collection plate. When she laughed like that, it meant a whole evening of it; Rinaldo would sing and sing. Malediction! And then they would trudge to Washington Square and pick up thirty cents or so at the Arcade café; then up Sixth avenue to Moretti's, then to Varella's on 12th Street; then a plate of lazagne; a glass of red, and the sleepy tramp back to the hovel on West 4th Street.

Oh that Giovanna! Before they began to hear her deep, crooning voice, her ringing, animal laugh, things had been going so much better. Five, six dollars a night! Once at Varella's, a drunken Neapolitan had requested "Bella Napoli", sent in a five

dollar bill and ordered zabaione for everybody. Rinaldo divided up fairly then. Of course, he drew an extra dollar for his trouble in leading them about; and then it was his tenor voice that conjured coin out of the leather purses. They realized that. Now, oh now! Nights of three dollars, of two dollars, even. Some nights he wouldn't sing anywhere. He would keep his voice fresh for the stuffy little place on East Sixteenth Street. Then he sang; he sang for hours, for that laughing young beast of a woman. And even then, if they only received their share! They kept count of the coins as they fell on the plate; the scattering of pennies, the dull thud of nickels, the dancing ring of light dimes; once in a great while, the heavy settling of a quarter. . . . The count was always short now. On Saturday nights they hardly played anywhere else; they heard several men's voices talking and laughing with Giovanna in the back room: Rinaldo was loath to leave her with them; he sang; he ordered drinks; that is where their money went; one night there had been a fierce scuffle; Rinaldo remained alone with Giovanna; she didn't laugh; she whispered; oh! their blood boiled; they closed their gaping mouths, rolled their dead eyes, set their teeth; their anger made their playing fiery, brutally inspired; if Rinaldo had not been so lazy, if he hadn't cheated them, they could have had women too, whispering to them, laughing with them.

Night after night they decided to say something to Rinaldo; they didn't dare to begin a discussion; they were too angry; they felt it would lead to terrible words; and then? They had starved pitifully until they met him; he had been a godsend to them; he had been kind; and then, what a voice he had! They used to get lost almost every night, in this beastly town, with the roar of the elevated, the threatening clangs of car bells, the honks of motors, the jostling of indifferent crowds. . . . But this couldn't go on! They hated Rinaldo. Sullen, they hardly ever spoke to one another; they walked side by side, hostile; they were too cowardly, too excitable, too inarticulate to voice their grievance; they couldn't forgive one another for being all of them so cowardly, so excitable, so inarticulate. Oh, that Giovanna! How they hated her; and at the same time. . . . that voice, that laugh! They cursed their blindness, they cursed New York, they cursed their fate. Ah, to be like Rinaldo! Giovanna must be some healthy, red-cheeked, coarse-haired woman of Tuscany to laugh like that; and strong, deep-bosomed to speak in that throaty passionate contralto.

Spring came. The collection plate was always empty; who

would sit and play loto in the stuffy little cafés? Evening after evening was spent at Giovanna's. . . . .

Then summer restaurants opened on the Palisades and they had three good weeks of it; once at 16th Street Rinaldo and Giovanna had a terrible discussion; for several evenings Rinaldo refused to sing anywhere; he drank and abused them on the way home.

One night he took them to some strange place beyond Jersey City. They played for an hour and gathered about forty cents; then a voice, a laugh; the throaty passionate laugh of Giovanna rose again and Rinaldo sang; and then he led them back to the station along a lonely road, under a tunnel where not a step echoed but theirs; they crossed three tracks.

"Wait here for the 12.37 train. I am not going home with you to-night."

They rode in silence to Jersey City, found their way to the tube and to the hovel on 4th Street.

"To-morrow, Pietro?"

"To-morrow, Luigi."

"To-morrow, by the immortal God!"

They started for Jersey City the next day with their knives open in their hip pockets. About ten o'clock they heard Giovanna's laugh; then she whispered; a door was opened softly, closed cautiously; silence; in their rage they repeated a trashy waltz tune five or six times, louder and faster until Emilio snapped his F string; then they stopped and waited and never spoke a word; at 12 Rinaldo came down, told them to pack up and to follow him. They followed him; when they reached the tunnel where only their steps echoed and boomed, one knife sunk into Rinaldo's throat, one into his breast, one into his bowels; then they ran. They ran towards the station beyond the bend of the road where the telegraph wires purred their sing-song; they crossed three tracks, stopped and waited; the 12.37 steamed in, but it stopped seemingly on another track; they felt their way over the many rails and had almost reached the line of cars when a bell rang and the train rattled off over switches; they were retracing their steps back when a rumble was heard in two directions; the raucous toot of a hurrying train answered the raucous toot of another hurrying train; the rumble grew into a thunder.

"Pietro, Luigi, Emilio, Ah!"

One limited whirled past on its eastward course; another whirled past westward bound.