

March 15, 1913

Five Cents

The
New Review

A-WEEKLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

Deeds and Words *H. S.*

The Sunny South and Poverty *Mary White Ovington*

Woodrow Wilson and State Socialism *Wm. English Walling*

Social-Economic Classes in the United States, II. *Isaac Halevy*

Germany and England *J. B. Askew*

Prospects of the Balkan War *M. Pavlovitch*

The Exhibition of the Independents *André Tridon*

The Keen of the Cold *J. William Lloyd*

Book Notices

150 Nassau Street

New York

The New Review

Published Every Week at

150 Nassau Street, New York City

by the

New Review Publishing Association

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

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

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

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

NAMES, PLEASE!

Readers, what do you think of the
NEW REVIEW?

Do you enjoy reading it?

Don't you think that some of your
friends might like to subscribe?

Then, why not let us send specimen
copies to them?

Write us a post card—or a letter—
giving their names and addresses, and
we will do the rest.

Your friends will thank you, and so
will we.

New Review 150 Nassau Street
NEW YORK CITY

The New Review

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

Vol. I.

MARCH 15, 1913

No. 11

Some of the articles to appear in future issues of

THE NEW REVIEW

THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN

By *W. E. Hardenburg*

THE PROBLEM OF NATIONALITIES IN
THE AUSTRIAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

By *Gustav Eckstein*, of Berlin.

STATE SOCIALISM AND THE INDIVIDUAL

By *William English Walling*.

STRIKE TACTICS

By *Phillips Russell*.

SIDELIGHTS ON THE CENSUS OF 1910

By *Benjamin Glassberg*.

THE GRAND JURY SYSTEM

By *Frederick Haller*.

Deeds and Words

The Taft Administration ended in a manner entirely worthy of itself. Its noble and disinterested record of subservience to the rich and powerful was rounded out by the pardon granted in its closing days to Charles R. Heike, formerly secretary of the American Sugar Refining Company, and Ernest W. Gerbracht, formerly superintendent of the Williamsburg refinery of that company. Both of these high officials of the Sugar Trust were convicted of having defrauded the government of the United States of many millions of dollars in the course of several years, and in fact the pardoning President made no attempt to justify his act, which was one of pure mercy and loving kindness. Nevertheless the majesty of the law was completely vindicated by the retention in jail of the six poor checkers who for years carried out the orders of Heike and Gerbracht. Justice may be blind, but in this age of democracy and enlightenment, equality and civilization, even the blind know the difference between a high corporation official with a salary of \$25,000 a year and a comfortable income from judicious investments and honest savings, and a poor devil of a checker, with an income of \$18 a week, who spends his all in riotous living.

Equally characteristic of the outgoing President was his vetoing, on his very last day in the White House, of one of the great supply bills of the government. The Sunary Civil Bill included a provision that no funds could be spent by the government in prosecution of organizations or individuals for "entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours or bettering the conditions of

labor," or for the prosecution of "producers of farm products and associations of farmers who co-operate and organize to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products." This provision was inserted at the demand of the American Federation of Labor. It was intended to be a roundabout and imperfect way of defeating, or at least restricting, the application of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law against the trade unions, and like all efforts of "practical" labor politicians, it sought to bring about a combination or alliance between the wage-workers and the farmers, even when the latter happen to be wealthy and inclined to create little monopolies of their own. This gave Taft an opportunity to pose, not only as the champion of the Constitution, but also as the champion of the poor, and he utilized this rare opportunity to the utmost. Disposing of the provision in its entirety as "class legislation of the most vicious sort," which would undoubtedly be held unconstitutional by the courts, he particularly referred to the farmers' clause as "an act in effect preventing the prosecution of combinations of producers of farm products for the purpose of artificially controlling prices," and "at a time when there is widespread complaint of the high cost of living it certainly would be an anomaly" to put such an act on the statute book. And Taft was certainly not entirely wrong in this contention, for only a few weeks ago a California fruit growers' association was proved guilty of monopolistic practices. Workingmen who rightly complain of an unjust burden should beware of entering into alliance with those who wish to impose unjust burdens on the whole community.

No such justification, however, could be found for "pocket vetoing" the Seamen's Servitude Bill, which was designed to improve the conditions of labor and living in the American merchant marine and to abolish involuntary servitude of seamen. In his short memorandum Mr. Taft took refuge behind a cloud of high-sounding words about "treaty obligations" and "possible friction with the commerce of foreign countries," words that are to us utterly unintelligible. No foreign government could possibly find any ground of complaint against us if we finally made up our minds to soften the harsh conditions of labor on the high seas, although the shipping companies, the domestic even more than the foreign, certainly would. This remarkable memorandum seems to have been conceived in the same facetious vein of humor in which Mr. Taft, in a final chat with the representatives of the press, congratulated himself upon

the undeniable fact that his influence upon the government of the United States by no means ended with his Presidential term of service. Six of the nine justices of the Supreme Court and forty-five per cent. of the entire federal judiciary now in office received their appointments from Mr. Taft, and through them his "dead hand" will weigh upon us for a long time to come.

The outgoing President departed after the performance of weighty deeds the meaning of which no one could doubt or fail to understand. The incoming President entered with a fine oration, which, judging by the press despatches, has received the praise and admiration of both hemispheres, notwithstanding some mild criticisms on the score of vagueness. Well, all programs are necessarily couched in general terms and, therefore, more or less vague, but Wilson's inaugural address suffers from an additional source of vagueness. It shows the new President to have become definitely converted to Progressivism, and there is nothing in politics so vague and mystical, so changeable and intangible as a program of bourgeois Progressivism. The conceptions of Capital and Labor, of Conservative and Socialist are as clear and distinct as the fundamental social facts and tendencies to which they correspond. But the middle-of-the-road Progressive, who tries to reconcile these conflicting elements, has before him a most difficult task, a task that is even more difficult and absurd in logic than it is in practice. What Marx said of the middle class in general, applies to him in particular: he is made up of "on the one hand . . . on the other hand." A social hermaphrodite, he imagines himself a being of a superior order, lifted above the narrowness and selfishness of the contending extremes, and combining in himself the virtues of both. In reality he is only the ephemeral and impotent product of a period of transition and confusion, in which the old order has lost its hold on the minds of men, while the new order has not emerged with sufficient distinctness to be easily recognized. This period is also more trying to the pioneers of the new order, at least in an intellectual aspect, for while they now have a larger following, they also have a larger confusion of ideas to contend with.

The general impotency of bourgeois Progressivism it may take years to establish. But the particular impotency of Woodrow Wilson was established even before he entered on his Presidential duties. While the President-elect was still staying in New Jersey, very likely putting the finishing touches to his inaugural address with its "groans and agony of it all," and its

"solemn, moving undertone coming out of the mines and factories," the police of Paterson, N. J., were clubbing strikers, prohibiting peaceable public meetings, suppressing the local Socialist paper and in general enacting an orgy of lawlessness and crime such as one not acquainted with our peculiar American conditions would have deemed impossible. And in fact, the victims of these outrages, who are mostly foreign-born workers, usually consider them impossible on American soil—they were impossible even in their native countries—until they experience them in their own persons. Then they realize more or less clearly the profound truth of Robert A. Bakeman's words, in his notable article on "Little Falls" which appeared in these pages a few weeks ago, that Lawrence and Grabow and Little Falls and West Virginia and Akron and Paterson furnish "cumulative evidence of the purpose of the capitalists to crush the uprisings of the unskilled workers by the use of the repressive forces," and that "there is no limit beyond which the capitalist will not go, no right so sacred as to be inviolable when he fears separation from his fundamental source of exploitation—the unskilled, unorganized worker," to whom he charges the bill for shorter hours and more pay which he is compelled to grant to the organized skilled workers.

The big city of Paterson furnished the ironical commentary to the fine phrases of Wilson's inaugural, while the little town of Haledon, just a mile beyond the limits of Paterson, showed what Socialist political action was worth—even at the lowest estimate. For the little town of Haledon has a Socialist mayor, and when he learned that in the neighboring big city all constitutional rights were abrogated and displaced by the policeman's club, he invited the strikers to come over and meet in peace and quiet in Haledon. And thither they flocked, in hundreds and in thousands, an impressive sight, and one not devoid of some light as to the course of events in the near future.

The glaring contrast between the words and the deeds of capitalist society was the especial theme of the early Utopian Socialists. With unsurpassed irony they showed up the contradictions between the promises of fraternity, equality, liberty and property held out to everybody in the Rights of Man, and the actual conditions of class conflict, inequality between rich and poor, slavery of the wage-workers, and misery for the masses. Perhaps in no institution of our society does the contrast between words and deeds manifest itself so strikingly as in the case of the police. Avowedly established for the maintenance of law

and order, the simple protection of life and property, it has become a most efficient instrument for the oppression and repression of the struggling masses, while it has failed utterly in its avowed purpose. Its sinister efficiency in Paterson and all the other industrial bastilles stands out most prominently in contrast with its corrupt inefficiency in its dealings with the criminal elements, as demonstrated in the country's Metropolis, and its unwillingness or inability to maintain simple order in the nation's Capital, as demonstrated in the recent suffragists' parade. The two phenomena are undoubtedly closely related. The development of the repressive functions of the police necessarily takes place at the expense of its protective functions. Yet how few of our ruling classes realize the necessary relation of these two phenomena, or realizing it, would care to reverse the process! Not even the great majority of the women paraders who were exposed to all sorts of indignities by the deliberate negligence of the police.

H. S.

The Sunny South and Poverty

By MARY WHITE OVINGTON.

To each of us the pathos of poverty presents itself in a different form. It has never seemed to me, a city dweller, at its worst in the crowded streets. I have spent years in the tenement with its one hundred or two hundred families; I have heard the nightly fretting of sickly children, and the cursing of ugly, tired drunken men and women; and I have seen the daily toiling in the sweat shop. But the city is dominated by a spirit of motion. It shrieks and whistles and rumbles. Its nights show gayer scintillations than those of stars or moon. Its people crowd one upon another, and engage in endless talk. Despite its squalor and ignorance and disease, the city moves.

It was not until I spent four weeks travelling in a leisurely manner through the State of Alabama—and one travels there in leisurely manner whether behind an engine or a mule—that I viewed what to me was the most pathetic poverty. Standing in the doorways of their little cabins, or working half-heartedly in the fields, were the saddest of the nation's poor folk. Sometimes their faces were dark, sometimes pallid; if dark, they were occasionally lightened by humor; if white, they were always dis-

consolate. But whether white or black, I felt the lack of vitality, of movement, in their monotonous world.

These tragic figures I found to be men and women belonging to the class of share tenants. The share tenant system developed after the days of slavery when the landlord for a time was without capital with which to pay wages, and the poor whites and recently emancipated blacks were also without the wherewithal to purchase the land they tilled. So each accepted the other's adversity, and waited for a settlement when the crop should be harvested and when in return for the land and house and tools furnished by the landlord, the tenant gave one-half of the corn and one-half of the cotton that his industry had raised. Not a bad bargain, surely, for the landlord, as his property was not rated high in the market, and his cabins were frequently in need of thorough, hygienic repair.

How well this method worked at first, we do not know. While dozens of uninteresting volumes have been written on the political history of the Southern States, their economic history is a closed book. That many tenants saved enough to buy from their landlords the land that they tilled and to become independent farmers, the census returns through the decades show. But that the lot of the share tenant who remained a share tenant improved, was certainly not always the case. The master class grew more powerful and the tenant class more helpless in many localities. To-day we find a type of landlord who exploits the tenant with merciless skill. He is now a capitalist, and owns or has a share in the country store. He prices his merchandise at almost anything he pleases, and is the creditor of the community. He controls the tools of justice, and a debtor finds him present as his judge when he seeks legal redress. In short, he is a veritable master, and holds the tenant in an estate not far removed from slavery.

The story of one family among these share tenants is typical. I remember, in May, at the end of a long morning drive through the central part of Alabama, stopping at a little cabin that a poor white woman was about to enter. She invited me in, and told me her story while she nursed her sickly, three weeks old baby. The child fretted a good deal as it strove, ineffectually, to get sufficient nourishment. The woman was the color of the underdone biscuit so often served in that land of shocking cooking. She was ragged and dirty and exhausted. She never smiled, and she lifted her voice but once during our talk. This was when, looking at the corn-bread in the ashes, her noon-day meal, she

cried shrilly, "I certainly would like a cup of coffee." Her story was one of sordid exploitation. Her landlord had been kind to her husband and herself when they came to the place over two years ago. He had taken them to his store, urged them to buy not only food, but tobacco, snuff, whiskey, whatever they wanted, and assured them that they need not worry about the payment. So they had lived comfortably until the crop was nearly made, when credit was less abundant. Slices of bacon were cut by the scowling storekeeper as though for microscopic slides, not for the frying pan, and even corn meal was grudgingly bestowed. By summer the family were close to starvation. The scant vegetables in their garden alone kept them alive. And when harvest time came at last, and the cotton was weighed—on the landlord's scales—the tenant's half did not quite equal his indebtedness. "And," the tired woman said, as she laid her baby down and started to go out into the fields, "we ain't out of debt yet and I reckon we never will be. There ain't nothing to do but to get up and trek." I was not surprised later to learn that she and her husband had taken their baby in their arms and done just this, trekked to better soil in the west, owing their landlord, as my informant told me, the whole of thirty-seven dollars. When the Socialist audits this account, what will the landlord owe the tenant?

The share tenants whom I saw in the southern black-belt counties of Alabama were nine-tenths of them Negroes, but their economic status was the same as that of the northern white tenants. They sowed their cotton and corn and their landlords reaped the profits. Their legal status was worse than that of the whites, for justice, when it concerned them in their relations with white men, did not exist. Kindliness was sometimes present, but when this was lacking in the white employing class, brutality might and did run riot. "I'd rather have niggers than whites work for me," one of the sensual, cruel employers said, "for yer can do anything yer want with a nigger." And so this employer did; for he ordered his overseer to drive his men to work at the point of a pistol, and to beat the mother who took her child out of the cotton field and sent him to school.

I used to think, as I travelled over the rough, dreary roads, and saw the impoverished workers, that nowhere could one better realize the folly of allowing a few individuals to gain economic control in a country. Everything that nature gave was being exhausted, the soil, the noble supply of timber, the hearts of the men and women and little children. One never came upon

a pleasant village street with freshly painted houses and trim lawns, one rarely saw a school house. Only a tired land and a tired ignorant people, performing degrading work. Can the Socialist party arouse these workers to rebel against their condition?

I wish they might be given the chance to try; that they might conduct a campaign throughout the state starting with the "Hill Billies" in the north, and moving with unabated zeal to the bottom-lands where one rarely sees a white face. I wish that with simple stories, drawn from the life experiences of those they visit, they might strive to arouse the tired workers to a sense of their power in a class-conscious struggle with their employers. Such a campaign would be worth the cost.

But if our Socialist comrades should do this, I think the first thing they would meet would be a deep distrust of politics. "We have been fooled once," they would hear, "and yer can't fool us again." For the South knew one political movement imbued with democracy, Populism. And Populism, in 1896, was buried in the Democratic party, that graveyard of radical movements. After a hasty funeral, the grand old party of the South showed its democracy by a new state constitution that disfranchised every Negro tenant and nearly every white one. Talk political action to a black tenant, and he will think you are a Rip Van Winkle who went to sleep during the years of reconstruction. Talk it to a white tenant, and he will move the tobacco from one side of his mouth to the other and tell you in graphic language how he has been fooled. "What's the use of voting," he says. "We elected a Populist governor, and the thieves threw our votes into the river. And now they charge a poll tax. Every time you want to vote, you pay a dollar-fifty. You don't have to pay it, no one asks you for it; and if you're wise you keep your money and stay at home."

To persuade these tenants again to seek benefit in political action will be a slow task. And yet it is not difficult to arouse the poorly-fed, weary-hearted white folk. The demagogue does it when he raises the cry of race hatred, and sends them hunting for a Negro who will burn well; whose skin will crack agreeably with the roaring of the fagots and the burning oil; whose bones will make attractive souvenirs. There is power among these people. Why may it not be roused to action against the real enemy—the system that deprives the workman of the best fruits of his labor, leaving him only the dry husks? "Ah, but the way

is so long!" the little cabins are so far apart, and the voices that reach them are so few. It seems sometimes a hopeless task.

But there is one bright spot along these rough southern roads. You see it again and again. It is gaily painted, an impudent, modern spot on the landscape; it tells of the city and the world; it is the Rural Delivery mail box. And more than once I have seen peeping slyly from under its lid that good comrade, the "Appeal to Reason." May this Pandora box increasingly contain its spirit of hope, may it send its messengers abroad to arouse the lethargic workers, and may it succeed in bringing to all who dwell in the South a future that shall be beautiful and humane.

Woodrow Wilson and State Socialism

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING.

Neither Wilson's policy nor that of Roosevelt is at present determined primarily by the menace of a Socialist revolution or even by the nearer menace of the Socialist vote; the non-Socialist voters to whom they are both appealing are at least ten times as numerous as the Socialists. But the relations of the two policies to Socialism are well brought out in Wilson's statement with regard to the Socialist vote and Roosevelt's statement with regard to the Socialist program. Wilson relates that he was told by a Socialist mayor that the vote by which he was elected was "about twenty per cent Socialistic and eighty per cent protest." Wilson proposes, therefore, to bid for that part of the Socialist vote which he supposes (whether rightly or wrongly) to be a protest against trust government, and he is apparently ready to go in for a regular class attack against "plutocracy" in order to get this vote. Roosevelt, on the other hand, is reliably reported to have said that he believed in eighty per cent of the Socialist program. His method is not to make a class attack even against "plutocracy," but to take up those capitalistic social reforms that have been endorsed by Socialists. The striking thing about these two methods of fighting Socialism is that not only can they both be worked together, but that it is almost inevitable that the collectivist and the anti-plutocratic tendencies will be combined into a single movement to institute a government that shall represent, for the first time in history, not only "the whole system of business," to use a phrase of Wilson's, but an organized and united capitalist class.

It now appears from the position taken by Roosevelt since the formation of the Progressive party, and the attitude assumed by Wilson since his election, that both are headed in the same general direction and that the force of circumstances is bound to bring the Democratic progressives and Republican progressives together, even if the leaders should stay apart. Exactly how this comes about, through the absorption of one group by the other, or through the amalgamation of the two groups is of secondary importance. All the progressives are headed towards that State Capitalism, that partnership of capital and government which is loosely called "State Socialism," and the aim of which is the organization of capital and labor by government for the benefit of capital.

In order that this policy may be carried out, it is first necessary that capital itself should be better organized. For the kind of government that is in view must be representative of all, both large and small, so that all capitalists may expect "a square deal." And a square deal from the capitalist standpoint means that all capitalists should receive benefits strictly in proportion to the amount of their capital—or of their abilities to use or to serve capital. Like Louis Brandeis, it regards the nation as composed of "ninety million stock holders"—and the implication is that the amount of "stock in the nation" held by each inhabitant is measured by his capital or by such a wage as would secure from him the maximum of output, *i. e.*, his income as it would be under a government that was thoroughly and equally "representative"—of all kinds of capitalists.

Wilson says he opposes a partnership between government and business. Yet under his policy he hopes that "all friction between business and politics will disappear." If this is not a partnership, it is at least a gentleman's agreement. And obviously such a cordial relation between business and politics requires a considerable degree of harmony in the business world, a need which Wilson expresses in his determination to control special interests only by assigning them "a proper place in the whole system of business." Wilson, in a word, advocates that government which represents "the whole system of business."

As the chief executive of "the whole system of business," Wilson is very far from being a mere individualist. He represents, on the contrary, the *transition* of Capitalism from the individualistic policy that attempts to restore competition to the State Socialist policy that attempts to use the government, far more largely than in the past, for business purposes. In prac-

tical questions Wilson favors individualism as a rule, though there are many instances, as I shall show, in which he either advocates the policies of State Capitalism, or takes pains to leave the door wide open for the subsequent adoption of these policies. In the meanwhile his general declarations of principle have gone far in the State Socialist direction, and the speeches he has made since his election already contain more of State Socialism than they do of Individualism.

Like every thorough-going State Socialist, Wilson believes that government is society. A government in his opinion is not a thing that is set up by the governing class (though he inconsistently admits the existence of governing classes), but by "mankind." It is not the institutions of government, however, that represent "mankind," but apparently something corresponding to Rousseau's "General Will." Both institutions and constitutions, Wilson wisely agrees, exist merely to serve men. Nor do traditional bodies of law constitute the essence of government. Government, he points out, is not a "machine," which is a fortunate admission, but no sooner does Wilson repudiate the Newtonian and mechanical conception of governmental authority than he sets up in its place the far more despotic Darwinian view that government is "a living thing." Even if he confined himself to saying that "society is an organism," leading sociologists would disagree with him. For we cannot admit, as he claims, that society should "obey the laws" even of life itself—if these laws are regarded, as he regards them, as being something outside of or above man. The evolution of life and of society does not consist, as he states, in "accommodation to environment," but in adjusting environment to life and society. Wilson's whole political philosophy consists in the aim to adjust government to present society, as if it were unchangeable, and he has no program whatever of furthering evolution in society itself.

As government represents "society", "mankind" or "the whole system of business," it is logical and inevitable that Wilson should take up the rest of the State Socialist position. And we find that he does indeed realize thoroughly that the present many-sided and radical proposals of social and economic reform are but the small beginning of what is to come in the way of governmental activities as to industry and labor: "We are just upon the threshold of a time when the systematic life of this country will be sustained, or at least supplemented, at every point by governmental activity." He believes that "every one

of the great schemes of social uplift which are now so much debated" are based upon "justice" and thoroughly realizes that we have before us "a great program of governmental assistance in the co-operative life of the nation." His only scruple as to this program is not one of criticism at all but merely of delay, until "the whole system of business" gains control of the government—which means that small capitalists should have as great a voice as Big Business: "We dare not enter upon that program until we have freed the government." The government is to be freed from the exclusive domination of Big Business only, but not from that of "the whole system of business," for "human freedom consists in perfect *adjustment* of human interests and human activities and human energies."

The public already regards Roosevelt as being on the road to State Socialism. Undoubtedly he is still very largely an opportunist, just as Wilson is, but as both tie themselves up to the new policies and these policies become more and more popular, they will both become more thorough State Socialists. As a matter of fact, Roosevelt is no further on the road to Capitalist Collectivism than Wilson is. For the State Capitalist program requires two closely related policies, a constant increase in the power and functions of government on the one hand (the collectivist tendency), and on the other a class struggle between the small capitalists and the large, so that the former, by the use of their superior numbers in politics, will be able to counterbalance the infinitely superior economic power of the big capitalists and force the latter to that compromise which is necessary if the government is to represent "the whole system of business" and is to continue to extend its industrial functions, including labor legislation, for the benefit of capital. Roosevelt is far on the road to a collectivist program, but this program has no chance of being accepted by the small capitalists as long as he continues to oppose a class struggle against the special interests. Conditions, however, are forcing him more and more definitely into the fight against the trusts.

On the other hand, Wilson, with such supporters as Bryan and Brandeis, is very far on the road to a declaration of war between small and big business, though he still hesitates to accept the collectivist program on the main question of government control of the trusts. But just as Roosevelt is being drawn into conflict with the trust magnates in spite of himself, so Wilson is being drawn towards the program of government control. He calls this the regulation of competition and not

the regulation of monopoly, which is a term used by Roosevelt, but the difference, as I shall show, is not so great as appears. And in the meanwhile he is leaving the door wide open, so that he may consistently move further in the collectivist direction. Conditions, in a word, are forcing Roosevelt and Wilson, or rather their small capitalist followers, to an identical policy and an identical program, and even if one or both should attempt to stem the tide it could only result in some other popular leader taking their place.

Already Roosevelt and Wilson have declared an almost identical policy with regard to labor, for on this question all capitalists are much more nearly united. Wilson is as ardently opposed as Roosevelt to any class struggle between capital and labor; all such struggles are to be kept rigidly within the capitalist family, and both are agreed that the collectivist policy, which is so difficult to apply to "the whole system of business," can be very readily applied to labor.

The capitalist attitude to labor has been revolutionized by various new economic factors into which I cannot enter here. Before the present trust era, individualist capitalists regarded labor as a commodity to be bought; now that the capitalist class is approaching a general consolidation in which the small capitalists also expect to be included, labor is coming to be regarded as a commodity to be produced. Formerly capital was only interested in the buying and selling of labor power and in saving labor power in the factory. Now capital is interested in the cost of production of labor and in saving the laboring man from the cradle to the grave—saving him, of course, as a working animal or a working machine, and not as a citizen or human being. A certain kind of efficiency is more and more required in industry, namely speed, so that more may be gotten out of the larger and larger investment in machinery. The labor supply is becoming restricted in many ways, and capitalists are coming to regard with keen disfavor the waste of workingmen's lives, and especially of their children, by other capitalists. As the cost of production of labor is being more and more considered, so also more and more money is being invested privately and publicly in the improvement of the quality as well as the quantity of the labor supply. Wilson and Roosevelt agree that the workingman is to be regarded as the greatest natural resource of the country (the whole system of business), even greater than the land. The comparison is most suggestive. Labor is owned like the other natural resources; the working people, like

the other natural resources, were formerly regarded as part of an unlimited supply, which could be endlessly and cheaply replenished, and must be exploited at once to the last degree. Now the working people of the country are being considered its most valuable property, the greatest asset of the whole system of business. For the first time labor itself has been capitalized and put on the books of capitalism; and this obviously could only take place when the capitalist class was at least sufficiently united to keep books in common.

When we consider the immediate program of Roosevelt and Wilson in regard to labor there appear to be considerable differences, but these differences are only superficial. It is true that Roosevelt favors governmental schemes which will put an end to "involuntary unemployment," that he favors a minimum wage law and the fixing of wages paid by trusts, while Wilson is opposed to plans "made by government with regard to employment and wages." Yet Wilson agrees with Roosevelt that human rights are to be placed above property rights and that "the lives and energies of the people are to be physically safeguarded." For he also is a conservationist as to labor power and pleads with the employers that they ought to give labor at least as much consideration as they do their "machinery." In dealing with Wilson's attitude on the trust question, I shall show that his opposition to government regulation of trust prices does not go so far as it seems, and the same will apply to his attitude as to wages. Moreover, his general position as to labor is almost identical with that of Roosevelt. Compare, for instance, his declarations just mentioned with Roosevelt's statement in his National Progressive Convention speech that the purpose of labor legislation is to maintain "the life, health and efficiency of the working people." It is true, on the other hand, that the opposition of the Democratic party and Wilson to injunctions and the Sherman Law as applied to employes is not yet wholly shared by Roosevelt. But he has been moving rapidly in this direction and will undoubtedly bid for the support of skilled labor by assuming an identical position. And finally, when it comes to a really vital question, like the right of railroad employes or other employes to strike, there is no difference to be detected between the two policies.

It is in his general declarations as to the relation between the classes, however, that we most clearly see Wilson's attitude to labor. For example, when he says: "I have never found any man who was unjust in regard to the interests of the laboring

man, much less jealous of his forming organizations whenever he pleased, for any legitimate purpose." As Wilson has repeatedly stated that he is personally acquainted with many of the magnates of the country, this is equivalent to saying that he shares their views on the labor question.

Moreover, Wilson, like Roosevelt, definitely states that his proposals of labor legislation for the benefit of the masses are largely for the benefit of employers: "To lift up the masses is to help those at the top just as much as those on the bottom." We may take his word that this will be the effect of all the progressive or State Socialist labor reforms. Wilson, like Roosevelt, is also very sensitive to the unpopularity of the proposal to lift those at the bottom, implying as it does that those at the bottom are powerless and dependent upon the benevolence of those at the top. Like Roosevelt, he repeatedly contradicts himself on this question. In opposition to the remark quoted, he says: "We are not proposing to go about with condescension; we are not proposing to go about with the helping hand of those who are stronger to lift up the weaker, but we are going about with the strong hand of government to see that nobody imposes on the weak." Compare these remarks with Roosevelt's equally contradictory speech immediately before the election. After stating that he was not proposing to substitute law for character, Roosevelt said: "We propose to lift the burdens from the lowly and the weary, from the poor and the oppressed. . . . When this purpose can be secured by the collective action of our people through their governmental agencies, we propose so to secure it. . . . But we are for the liberty of the oppressed, and not for the liberty of the oppressor to oppress the weak. . . . Only by the exercise of the government can we exalt the lowly and give heart to the humble and the downtrodden."

Wilson repeatedly asserts that he stands for justice and not for benevolence, yet every time he describes the position of the ruling class his intellectual honesty is sufficient to force him to speak in terms of benevolence: "The man who regards himself as in a class apart is an enemy to the progress of mankind"; and again, "No man's heart is right unless he feels it upon the same level as all the other hearts in God's world." "We mean to try to change men's hearts and so direct and modify men's business, that they will be kind to one another." The emphasis placed by Wilson on the right thinking and feeling of the ruling class, rather than diminishing their power, shows clearly enough that he knows the situation as it is.

Social-Economic Classes In the United States

By ISAAC HALEVY.

II.

The self-supporting population of the United States at the census of 1900 was composed of the following social groups:

Groups	(Number '00,000 omitted)			Per. cent		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Farmers	5,8	5,5	0,3	19.9	23.0	5.8
Agricultural laborers, mem- bers of family.....	2,4	1,9	0,4	8.0	8.0	8.2
Agricultural laborers, hired help	2,1	1,9	0,2	7.1	7.9	4.2
Entrepreneurs	2,1	1,9	0,2	7.2	7.7	4.7
Professional	1,6	1,0	0,5	5.4	4.8	10.1
Agents and Commercial travelers	0,3	0,3	0,0	1.1	1.3	0.2
Salaried employees.....	1,2	0,9	0,3	4.1	3.9	4.7
Selling force	0,6	0,5	0,2	2,1	1,9	3.0
Industrial wage earners....	10,0	8,6	1,4	34.1	35.9	26.0
Servants	1,5	0,2	1,2	5.0	0.9	23.3
Unclassified	1,7	1,2	0,5	6.0	4.7	9.8
Total.....	29,3	24,0	5,3	100.0	100.0	100.0

The preceding table shows that the industrial wage-earners formed only a minority of the self-supporting population of the United States as late as 1900, when American industry had already come under the control of the trusts. The "unclassified" males included a small number of farmers, agricultural laborers, and domestic servants, considerable numbers of salaried men (including many thousands of policemen and detectives) and an unknown proportion of employers of labor (barbers, butchers, expressmen, etc.). If we disregard the farmers and agricultural laborers, and apportion the unclassified among entrepreneurs, professional people, salaried employees, industrial wage-earners, and servants pro rata to the numbers in each class, the proportion of industrial wage-workers will be raised to 39 per cent. of the total of self-supporting males.¹ The proportion of female wage-workers was slightly above one-fourth of all self-supporting women. The "unclassified" women were nearly all housekeepers or laundresses, i. e. mostly domestic servants; the number of industrial wage-workers among them was negligible.

The proportion of industrial wage-workers must have in-

¹ We allow for industrial wage workers two-thirds of the total number of unclassified males, whereas the proportion among the 95.3 per cent. classified was only 35.9 per cent.

creased since 1900, but how much? We can gain an idea of the rate of increase of the wage-working class from the following comparative table showing the class-composition of the population of both sexes from 1870 to 1900:²

Groups	(Number '00,000 omitted)				Per cent.			
	1900	1890	1880	1870	1900	1890	1880	1870
Farmers and planters....	5,8	5,4	4,3	3,0	24.0	24.0	24.9	24.3
Agricultural laborers....	3,8	3,0	3,3	2,9	13.5	13.2	19.1	23.1
Entrepreneurs	2,1	1,8	1,3	0,9	7.3	7.9	7.8	7.2
Professional	1,5	1,0	0,7	0,4	5.2	4.5	4.0	3.5
Agents and Commercial travelers	0,3	0,2	0,1	0,0	1.2	1.0	0.4	0.2
Salaried employees, in- cluding selling force..	1,8	1,1	0,6	0,3	6.3	5.0	3.2	2.6
Industrial wage earners.	9,9	7,4	5,1	3,4	34.8	32.7	29.5	27.4
Servants	1,5	1,5	1,1	1,0	5.1	6.3	6.2	7.8
Unclassified	1,7	1,2	0,9	0,5	6.2	5.3	4.9	3.9
Total	28,5	22,7	17,4	12,5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The increase in the ratio of industrial wage-workers to the total number of breadwinners was very slow, viz.: in 1870-1880, 2.1 per cent.; in 1880-1890, 3.2 per cent.; in 1890-1900, 2.1 per cent. The variation in the percentage of the "unclassified" was too small to affect the comparison. There is no reason to assume that the relative increase of the industrial wage-workers from 1900 to 1910 was more rapid than during the preceding decades. Taking the highest decennial increase (3.2 per cent.), we may accordingly estimate the proportion of industrial wage-workers in 1910 at 38 per cent. of all breadwinners. If we make an additional allowance of one-half of the unclassified of both sexes in favor of industrial wage-workers,³ their proportion in 1910, at the most liberal estimate, could not have exceeded 41.1 per cent. At this rate it will take a generation before the relative number of industrial wage-workers will have reached one-half of all breadwinners. For the present and the near future, we may therefore accept the relative figures of the census of 1900 as representative of the class composition of the American people.

The property-owning class, consisting of business men (entrepreneurs), farmers and their children helping on the home farm, in 1900 numbered 35 per cent. of all breadwinners, the industrial wage-workers (including an allowance for the unclassified) 37.1 per cent., and the transitional groups, 27.9 per cent. It is

² The classification of certain occupations at the censuses of 1870, 1880, and 1890 somewhat varied from that followed at the census of 1900, which accounts for the variations in the classification schemes of this and the preceding table, as well as for the slight variance in numbers and percentages.

³ This proportion would be equivalent to two-thirds of the unclassified males.

evident that the property-owning class was in 1900 nearly as numerous as the industrial wage-working class. In so far as "public opinion" reflected economic class interests, the economic views of the property-owner, i. e. the capitalistic social philosophy, dominated the minds of as many people, as the class-subconsciousness of the industrial wage-worker. The umpire between the two classes was the conglomeration of transitional social groups known in newspaper parlance as "the public," viz. : professional men and women, agents and commercial travelers, salaried people, salesmen and clerks in stores, hired farm help, and domestic servants. As stated in the preceding article, the economic conditions of these groups predispose them toward the middle-class view of industrial relations. It is thus apparent that capitalism rests at present upon the interests, real or fancied, of a majority of the people of the United States.

To be sure, the transitional groups which sway the balance toward the capitalistic side are by far not a homogeneous class. Domestic servants, agricultural laborers, salesmen, and clerks may be aroused by the endeavors of Socialistic missionaries to a feeling of fellowship with the industrial wage-workers. Likewise, the small business man who is driven to the wall by the trusts may turn a sympathetic ear to a Socialistic sermon. On the other hand, however, we have assumed that all industrial wage-workers have an instinctive proletarian class-consciousness. Yet in reality, the industrial wage-workers are not a homogeneous class either. There is a well-understood social division between the aristocracy of the skilled trades and the unskilled laborers. Among the wage-workers in smaller communities there is, furthermore, a hybrid group of "home-owners"; with these model workingmen of the middle-class social reformers, the instinct of the small property-owner is at least as strong as the class-interest of the wage-worker.

In the political field, the relative weight of the industrial wage-workers is further reduced by the presence among them of a large proportion of unnaturalized foreigners. At the census of 1900, 33.8 per cent. of the male industrial wage-workers of voting age were foreign-born, whereas the proportion of foreign-born among farmers was only 13.9 per cent., among professional men 14.8 per cent., among salaried employees 14.7 per cent., among salesmen 16.8 per cent., among agents and commercial travelers 16.9 per cent., and among businessmen 28.1 per cent. Assuming that the proportion of unnaturalized aliens among the bourgeois and semi-bourgeois groups was the same as among

wage-earners, it is evident that the proletarian vote was impaired more than the capitalistic vote.

Those who lay strong emphasis upon the "American" character of the Socialist movement in the United States will do well to reflect upon the fact that in 1900 the industrial wage-workers formed only 27.6 per cent. of the men of voting age among white Americans of native parentage, whereas farmers and businessmen aggregated 43.7 per cent.; on the other hand among the foreign white, 52.8 per cent. were industrial wage-workers (the "unclassified" among Americans of native parentage were 4.7 per cent. and among foreign white 6.1 per cent.). Thus while among the Americans of native stock the industrial proletariat was outnumbered by the propertied classes, the majority of the foreign-born belonged to the industrial wage-working class.

Heretofore we have considered the self-supporting population of the United States at large. It must be borne in mind, however, that the class-composition of the population widely differs by states. In 1900 industrial wage-workers formed a majority of the self-supporting population of both sexes in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and together with hired farm help, in all Atlantic states from New York to Delaware, and also in the Western states of Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona,—in all, in 12 out of 48 states. In the other 36 states, all industrial and agricultural wage-workers combined formed but a minority of the population.

It may be noted in this connection, that class-composition considerably differs by sex; whereas among male breadwinners in the United States the proportion of industrial wage-workers in 1900 was nearly two-fifths, among females it was scarcely above one-fourth.*

Still, since women for the time being are disfranchised in the most populous sections of the United States, our analysis may be confined to male breadwinners, except in those states where women vote. The roll of states with a male proletarian majority will thus be increased by Ohio, Montana, Maine, Maryland, and Nevada. As against these 17 states there are 31 states in which the industrial and agricultural wage-workers are in a minority. The latter states include 13 states in which the farmers and

* Those Socialists who fear the effects of woman suffrage upon the Socialist vote may find support for their views in these figures. To avoid all misunderstanding, I will unhesitatingly say for myself that I hold the rights of women as citizens paramount to the Socialist vote. But this is beside the scope of the present article.

their sons form a majority of the self-supporting male population, viz., all Southern states, except Virginia, Florida, and Louisiana, but including Kentucky, and also Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and the Dakotas: the proportion varies from 50.8 per cent. to 64.9 per cent.

In the Southern states the industrial proletariat has been crippled politically by the disfranchisement of the Negro. Industrial wage-workers in the South are relatively more numerous among Negro than among white male bread-winners. In the following states the Negroes form the majority of all male industrial wage-earners: Mississippi, 64.7 per cent.; Georgia, 58.4 per cent.; Florida, 57.7 per cent.; South Carolina, 55.4 per cent.; Alabama, 54.1 per cent. The disfranchisement of the Negro in those states has reduced the strength of the industrial proletariat at the polls by from one-half to nearly two-thirds. On the other hand, among the white male bread-winners in the states of the Confederacy the percentage of industrial wage-workers varied from 11.1 per cent. in Mississippi (the state of the anti-Negro Socialist alderman, Sumner W. Rose) to 27.2 per cent. in Florida.

In the preceding survey of the states we have considered only the industrial and agricultural wage-workers. Were we to add to them all hired men, the following states would be added to the list of those with a proletarian majority: Vermont, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Utah, and Oregon. In other words, if Capital's hired "retainers"—managers, superintendents, foremen, etc.—were all to become class-conscious "wage-workers," the proletarian vote would form a majority in 24 out of the 48 states. Of course, these figures are based upon the census returns of 1900. At that time, all hired persons formed 49.5 per cent. of the total number of male bread-winners in Idaho, 47.7 per cent. in West Virginia, 47.2 per cent. in Minnesota, and 45.7 per cent. in Missouri. Since that time the proportion of hired men in those states may have reached a majority of the males of voting age. In other states the percentage of all hired men was less than 41.1 per cent., and it would take a generation before they would reach a majority. Granting for the sake of argument that there is harmony of interests between the superintendent of a rolling mill and the mill hands, because their names appear on the same pay roll, statistics show that for many an election to come the class-conscious proletarian vote could carry at most 28 states. This would still be short of the 32 required for amending the Constitution of the United

States. If, however, we strictly adhere to the spirit of Marxian Socialism and base our prognostications upon the evolution of the industrial wage-working proletariat, we must face the fact that the class-conscious proletarian vote alone will for a generation control at best only a few manufacturing and mining states.

While the industrial wage-workers form a majority of the bread-winners engaged in non-agricultural pursuits and could therefore obtain control of municipal governments, it must be borne in mind that in most states the government of the cities is controlled by the state legislature. So long as the property-owning classes, with the support of the transitional groups, can control the legislatures of most states, the power of Socialist municipal governments will be restricted to the administration of municipal affairs under capitalist law.

Germany and England

By I. B. ASKEW (Berlin).

Certainly if anything could illustrate the absurdity of capitalist politics it would be the Anglo-German rivalry which has for the last few years held the whole civilized world in suspense and forms the pivot on which turns the international policy of the great powers in the era of Imperialism.

Anybody who takes seriously the phrases of our bourgeois political parties will indeed find it hard to understand this situation.

Here we have two nations, each of whom is dependent on the other in a thousand ways, who, from the capitalist point of view are absolutely indispensable to each other, since neither of the two nations has a better customer than the other, and yet we have the spectacle afforded to the world that each of these two nations is arming to the teeth against the other. And yet, not only these two nations, but by virtue of their alliances the whole European world, if not the whole world, threatens to be drawn into a bloody struggle, the like of which for magnitude has never been seen.

And that, despite all attempts on the part of those concerned to bring about an understanding. In fact it may be said, if words and good intentions could help, the matter would have been settled long ago. Friendship Committees have been got up and visits arranged and carried out between the two countries. Kings, statesmen, politicians, priests, financiers, scientists, jour-

nalists and goodness knows who else, have all taken a part in this good work. Brotherhood has been sung to the tune of a thousand bands and toasted with buckets full of champagne. And all that without altering the situation in any essential degree.

For the last few months, it is true, we have heard less about the Anglo-German rivalry. It was even said that the governments of the two countries had come to see that their interests in the Balkan crisis and the questions that had arisen in consequence were largely identical. But it would seem that the identity of interest only held good so long as both parties were able to prevent anything from being done at all. That so soon as any serious move was made at all, that elaborate construction known as the solidarity of the great powers would fall to pieces like a pack of cards. Had the Russian government seen fit to take arms against Austria on behalf of Servia, it is pretty clear we should have seen England and France confronting Germany and Italy. And though probably the danger of war with Servia is over for the present, it is quite possible that any moment a new situation may arise which may bring about a similar result. The fact is that despite all talk of friendship, neither the English nor the German government trusts the other over the way. And both are perfectly justified. They at least know what the words of a capitalist government are worth.

Now in what does this Anglo-German rivalry consist? It is in my opinion absurd to say that it rests on trade rivalry or to think that the industrial development of Germany is ruining English industry. No doubt particular industries in England may suffer under German competition, just as they do under American, but the statistics go to show that what is lost in one direction is won in another—and in proportion as German exports to England grow, so do the exports from England to Germany.

As a matter of fact, the investment of capital in foreign countries, such as is made by the capitalists of England, France and, to a lesser extent, Germany and the United States, opens out for the industry of their own countries the most serious competition of all. The interest on these investments is paid indirectly in goods which directly supplant the home industries, and it is just the struggle for such fields of investment—a struggle which arises as a result of the inevitable accumulation of more capital in the various capitalist countries than can find a profitable investment in those countries, that gives rise to the bitterest struggles between the capitalists of the various countries, or

rather, I should say, between various groups of financiers who control this or that government or groups of governments. How international these patriots are was proved by the fact that in the Morocco crisis which, in 1911, brought France and Germany to the brink of war, French interests were represented by French, German and English firms, including a well-known German name like that of Krupp, and German interests by German, French and Portuguese firms. And because these two international groups could not agree, the workers of France and Germany, to say nothing of England and her countries, were to slaughter each other.

For these capitalists and capitalist governments, all talk of national interest is only a blind to mislead the workers and the small bourgeoisie and induce them to support a policy in which they not only have no interest, but one which is directly opposed to their interests, since, were the English capitalists, for instance, to get their own way, England would soon be converted into a nation of wealthy capitalists, living on dividends drawn from the various countries of the world. In this nation there would be no place for the workers except in so far as they served the necessities of the rich as servants, or were engaged in the work of distribution as clerks, shop assistants, railway workers, carmen, etc. And the same holds good in a certain degree of all the capitalist countries, France, Germany, the United States, and so on. But it is just such anti-national interests of the capitalists in question which bring the various nations into danger of war and exhaust the resources of the countries in piling up armaments. Such were the anti-national interests which reduced the governments of England and France to slaves of the Emperor of Russia.

That excellent man, Mr. Norman Angell (author of "The Great Illusion," London, 1910), may write himself black in the face to prove that war serves no national interests, but he won't persuade the capitalists that they have nothing to gain by it. The fact that the German nation can be proved to have gained nothing by the French indemnity paid in 1870, certainly does not prove that the Berlin financiers did not make an enormous profit. The fact that the cost of such a war amounts to more than any possible gains does not trouble the men who understand the art of putting the profits into their own pockets and shoving the burden of taxation on to other shoulders, chiefly by means of indirect taxation. The confusion arises because the man who pockets the profit talks

as if the nation had pocketed it, whereas the nation only does the paying.

I do not mean that capitalism necessarily aims at war. War is a very dangerous resort for capitalists, and one that most of them would be very glad to avoid, if they could, but war panics, although these may easily lead to war, are almost indispensable to them, not only those who are interested in the manufacture of armaments, but the big banks and big financiers generally, to whom a time of crisis brings enormous profits. The chief task of the Socialist is undoubtedly to make clear to the workers the meaning as well as the danger of this little game of their masters. Knowledge is power.

Prospects of the Balkan War

By M. PAVLOVITCH (Paris).

Though there has been much pretended sympathy among the Russians for their Slav brothers in the Balkan-Turkish war, Russia has done little to help the Balkan States when called upon for real financial assistance. The wind of Russia's favor has changed in the last ten years. Bulgaria, once the cherished daughter of Russia's heart, is now treated like a step-daughter, and Russia's official sympathy is more or less avowedly with Servia.

Patriotic Russian papers have been treating the Bulgars with more and more contempt of late, calling them and their press chauvinist and ultra-nationalist. The Bulgars, not to be outdone in a battle of words, have answered back. This has given both Russian and foreign papers a chance to say there is in Bulgaria a current of Russophobia which may prove a very serious affair.

All the feeling which Russia had for the Balkan peoples in their conflict must be explained by other than brotherly ties.

The federation of the Balkan States was hailed by Russian imperialists for two reasons: first, in the new and powerful

Slav empire to be formed Russian patriots saw at the same time a natural ally for Russia and a fervid enemy for Austria and Germany which, together with Italy, constitute the anti-Russian combination. The second reason was that Russia hoped, as a result of the Balkan war, to obtain Constantinople. The Russian government's advice to the King of Bulgaria not to take Constantinople, together with the heavy losses sustained in attempting to get through the fortifications of Tchatalja, alone kept the Bulgarian army away from the capital of Turkey, and prevented the quarrel between the Slavs from becoming fiercer. The too-evident wish of the Bulgars to take Constantinople altered the attitude of Russian Slavophiles toward Bulgaria and afforded a pretext to Russian chauvinists for speaking of "Austrian intrigues in Bulgaria." It was declared that Austria was inciting Bulgaria to enter Constantinople in order to foment Russian jealousy, and make misunderstanding.

But this Russo-Bulgarian quarrel is only a small part of the danger which threatens in the near future the peaceful development of the Balkan peninsula and the tranquility of Europe.

The war with Turkey is still going on. Austria, instead of sending back to their homes the men she called to arms a few months ago, is increasing her armaments every day. All the while she is provoking Servia by nightly demonstrations of her warships before the capital, Belgrade, throwing the light of electric projectors on the defenseless town and surroundings.

Roumania is demanding more and more insistently an answer from Bulgaria. Turkey keeps on strengthening her defenses. The Balkan armies have been waging civil war among themselves. It is said: "Where the Servian mare passes no Bulgarian grass may ever grow nor Bulgarian speech ever be heard." The awful visions of the past, when Bulgars, Serbs and Greeks fiercely slew each other, are so menacing that no journalist, to whatever party he may belong, can honestly remain silent as to that danger.

When the Servian troops entered Uskub, greeted by loud and joyful cries of "Hurrah" on the part of the Bulgars who came to meet them with unfurled Bulgarian flags, a Servian officer responded to the demonstration by saying that in Uskub there could be no room for Bulgarian "Hurrahs" or Bulgarian flags, as in that town there were no Bulgars, only Serbs. The next day the Serbs began to take away Bulgarian flags from the schools, they altered the names of Bulgarian families, making them Servian, and despite protest, insisted upon all official

documents being issued in the altered names. These petty vexations were soon followed by real tragedies. Politicians, teachers and other important men began to disappear. Public rumor accused the Servian authorities of crime in this connection and of intriguing with the ill-famed Turkish hooligans, whom the Servian authorities for some reason or other had left at large.

Things did not get on better in Salonica between Bulgars and Greeks. During the Turkish regime the Bulgars had maintained, at great material and moral sacrifice, two or three newspapers of their own. But from the beginning of the Greco-Bulgarian occupation, when it would seem the Bulgarian press should have more liberty, the newspapers were stifled. The Bulgars resented this and once, at least, an armed conflict resulted. The question arises, What will the Greeks not be capable of when, having made Salonica entirely their own, they have completely under their control the Jews and Turks and other nationalities?

This war, which was fought for the realization of Balkan autonomy, shows a very dark side even to its friends. It is to be feared that this Balkan federation will not be able to secure peace between neighbors, or even blood-related and allied nationalities. History shows the futility of such combinations conceived merely for the purpose of conquest. The Austro-Prussian alliance, concluded in the year 1864, for the purpose of waging war against Denmark, did not prevent Austria and Prussia from taking up arms against each other two years later. The alliance between Roumania and Russia in 1877, for war against Turkey, ended in a way previously unknown to history; Russia appropriated one of Roumania's provinces, Bessarabia. With this Roumania became one of Russia's bitterest enemies and has ever since fostered the hope of revenge.

And even if a Balkan federation could outlive the disastrous state of murder and outrage which characterizes the Balkan-Turkish war to-day, it could not keep the people now engaged in that war from further conflict with each other. For, as long as the present officials, inspired by dynastic interests, remain at the head of the Balkan states, as long as the destinies of these states are controlled by the social groups who were the cause of the war against Turkey, and who insist on keeping alive every subject of misunderstanding between the masses, peace is not possible.

The present war will be no solution of the Eastern problem. I believe it will even make it more complex and perhaps lead

to a further development of militarism, a higher cost of living and a sharpening of the class antagonisms which in late years have spread to every part of the world.

The Exhibition of the Independents

By ANDRE TRIDON.

On February 17, at eight o'clock in the evening, an idiotic time of day for that sort of thing, the Independents opened to the public the doors of their marvelous exhibition, which will not close until March 15. The Independents call themselves now The Association of American Painters and Sculptors, but I liked their old name better.

While the first night mob made it impossible to sight intelligently any of the canvasses, a mere glance here and there was enough to convince the visitors that this exhibition was the greatest artistic event America has witnessed in the ten years this writer has lived on this continent. Every modern tendency, however extreme, however "unpleasant," was represented without any attempt on the part of the broad-minded organizers at hiding anything, or apologizing for anything. Classicists and Cubists, Romanticists and Futurists met on a footing of perfect equality, none being snubbed and none lionized.

The crowd was no longer the sneering, snickering crowd, ready to damn nonconformism, taking its cue from the various Bostonians who debarred Whitman's works from the mails, exiled McMonnies' Bacchante, or damned Tosca as sung by Mary Garden. The crowd smiled now and then, but more frequently the remark was overheard: "I wish someone would teach me to like this as I was taught to like Wagner and Strauss." Hopeful symptom. When people frankly realize their shortcomings instead of condemning whatever they fail to understand, they are preparing their mental salvation. Much as our pick-and-shovel-type of radicals may sneer at this, the attitude of a crowd at an art exhibition gives as clear an indication of the social advance of the day as mass meetings or riots would. When people are broadening artistically they have to broaden in every other way.

Of course, the old spirit is not absolutely dead. To remind us of that fact a stuttering individual, whose appearance on the platform was dignified by a flourish of trumpets as though he were a Wagnerian hero, invited us to give cheers for "the largest art exhibition in the world, not excluding the Paris, Berlin and Rome exhibitions." That was an indecent lie, but the public a public of esthetes, applauded. However, that inaccurate and platitudinous simpleton will die some day. . . .

Barring that ridiculous incident, the first impression of the exhibition was distinctly cheering and encouraging. Another visit only served to deepen that impression. Yes, this is the greatest exhibition of paintings ever held in this country, perhaps not in regard to size, but in regard to quality and inclusiveness.

Some critics who have a shamefaced tenderness for the old Academy had to pretend that it only represented Arthur B. Davies' preferences. Well, never mind. I am not acquainted with Mr. Davies, but when a man's "preferences" run from Whistler to Picabia, from Puvis de Chavannes to Gauguin, from Borglum to Henri, he is worthy of being a leader and his choice (admitting, of course, that every painting was his choice) is more interesting than the dictum of a sluggish, anonymous committee. The exhibitions of the Academy have only shown us thus far the type of art which pontiffs like John W. Alexander, William Chase or Kenyon Cox would either like to produce or to see their disciples produce; "Mr. Davies' show" includes everything that can be called or can call itself art, regardless of what any wiseacres may think of it. And therein resides its immense value to the American world. Would that the system of traveling exhibitions were better developed and that this collection could be exhibited from coast to coast and from the lakes to the Rio Grande.

Every sculpture or painting that reveals a striving towards an ideal, towards something different, has been welcomed. Better yet, the organizers have wisely interspersed the works of the young prophets with those of the dead or the aged, who in their life or youth won insult and, after their death or in their old days, fame for blazing new trails.

We can see how spirit-children were begotten by revolutionary fathers. Well can we measure the new lands discovered when we behold some early Whistler, a Sisley or Monet. And thus we are led gradually to contemplate some of the most daring, unusual, distressing pieces of work from the brush of European artists, things which only the Sunday supplement had re-

vealed to us accompanied by facile jokes from the pen of some ignorant desk writer. There are some hundred exhibits at the Independents which invite cheap cleverness, opprobrious smart-Aleckism, the sneers of the unthinking. In their presence let us remember two things: that very often the homely, the crude, the hideous are forms of beauty to which we are unaccustomed. Bellini once said that Wagner was insane and that only by holding his scores upside down could any one make anything out of them. Since those days we have had Reger, Strauss and Debussy; some of Wagner's "unintelligible" tunes are almost as hackneyed as *Cavalleria Rusticana*. Not one page of his operas is much of a puzzle to the average concert goer.

Secondly, those "wild men," as Gelett Burgess once called them, who wasted their life painting unsalable things, could have done profitable work if they had chosen to do so. Examine Matisse's "horrors", and the technique that man displays here and there will appal you. It was not ignorance of the orthodox tricks which prevented them from winning fame by having as sitters a cardinal, a prince or a sensational actress. No! those men were trying to do something; they were tired of old formulas; they knew that to-morrow's dawn will never break until to-day has died and night has buried it.

Without going into useless details of technique, let us point to a few of the things the "extremists" are trying to do. Take Gauguin for instance, who died very poor and whose talent is only beginning to be recognized. He endeavors to represent the vibrations of light in tropical landscapes, not as he saw them, but as he remembered them. Thus light is living and vibrating as much on his canvasses as in the noon hour under a tropical sky; furthermore, his work has the quality of all human productions that are a true "state of mind," after Taine's definition.

The Cubists are trying to bring out the feature which they think is the main source of harmony in the human form, the parallelism of more or less modified square surfaces. The Futurists are endeavoring to represent in their pictures life in motion, the thing Rodin has tried to express in stone.

Let us admit that the result thus far is far from pleasing; that those attempts are crude, primitive, childish. What does it matter provided this leads to something, for after all the only interesting part of to-day is that in which to-morrow is being prepared, through which it will be ushered in. Furthermore, we need a few unpleasant things in art. We need a few crude things.

Let us not designate as mountebanks the men who are saving

us from the candy diet in art. As I said before, if they were whatever the bourgeois understand by the word mountebank, they would have struck a path less rough and less winding, leading to speedier success and to a more comfortable life. They seem objectionable because they demand too much from our lazy minds. They throw stones into the stagnating pool where our old ideas are rotting. And we resent the effort we must make to formulate, were it only an objection, to their form of endeavor. It is so simple to pick up a magazine cover page and declare the girl's face "cute." Matisse's work is never "cute," and some of us hate him for that reason.

As William Blake once said: "Whoever stagnates, will eventually breed reptiles of the mind." The birth of a new idea, of a new art, is like that of a child accompanied by much suffering. Even the mere cleavage of a cell, without which no new cell can be born, must be accompanied by a tearing of the plasm, which cannot be pleasant. We speak of growing pains. Let's welcome that form of suffering; let us remember that the smart Alecks of thirty years ago passed before Whistler's paintings (to us so simple, so tame) the same ridiculous remarks which smart Alecks of to-day emit while confronted with an Odilon Redon.

The Keen of the Cold

By J. William Lloyd.

Like bells on the snow the runners rang,
 The wheels whined grinding music;
 Like violins in pain they sang—
 And their song,
 Of the tingling tongue,
 That rung,
 Was the sweet, hard song
 Of the pang, the tang, and the eager fang,
 The suffering dree of the cold,
 Its triumph, hunger and wrong;
 The old, old,
 Stinging,
 Singing,
 Keen of the cold.

Book Notices

THE CIVIC THEATRE *

A poet with sound economics is a rare bird in these or in any other days. Such a poet is Percy Mac Kaye, whose recent suggestive book, "The Civic Theatre," dedicated to the reclamation and reorganization of leisure, may be described as expressing the art side of the struggle of Socialism against Capitalism—the essence of that struggle being to capture Time and to fill it with Pleasure for the sake of human Happiness. Mr. MacKaye puts the case in this nutshell:

"In the vocations of modern industry the divorce between joy and labor has become too absolute to reconcile. Therefore increasing cry and protest arise for shorter hours of industrial labor. But to what end? The answer of the foresighted is: Art—the recreative labor of leisure. For by art, freed from industrialism, labor is again reconciled with joy.

"The reorganization of leisure thus becomes stupendously important—the real goal of all the vast strivings of our momentous age, in which countless millions are battling desperately, often blindly, to emancipate the deepest instinct of humanity—the need for happiness."

"The Civic Theatre" is the author's idea of the democratically owned and managed playhouse with which he would equip each community, so that its play hours might be ordered and arranged and filled to the best advantage. He urges the establishment of a Federal Public Amusement Commission at Washington, which would endeavor to wrest from private control the business of amusing the people. This idea has already met with the endorsement of the American Federation of Fine Arts, but, as is usual in such enterprises, lacks funds and bids fair to lack them for some time to come.

Mr. MacKaye's book is frankly not a formal book but a compendium of useful suggestions, thrown together in order to stimulate discussion. This it certainly ought to do, and especially ought all good men of radical tendencies who see the value from the point of view of the welfare of the public of capturing the theatre (that excellent device for disseminating ideas and giving pleasure), to read well the words of this keen-visioned poet.

W. L. S.

* "The Civic Theatre," by Percy MacKaye, Mitchell Kennerley, New York. \$1.25.

A POETIC DRAMA

"The Wife of Marobius"* is the finest bit of dramatic writing yet produced in America and Max Ehrmann must be given rank with Ibsen and Maeterlinck as psychologist, prophet and playwright of the new ideals.

Here is pure literature; poetry exquisite, recalling the first days of the English drama; passion superb; a setting sensuous and colorful, conveying a moral the most modern, advanced, heroic, yet true for the womanhood of all time.

This little one-act play is so coherent and perfectly constructed that it rises before the mental vision as simple, chaste and symmetrical in its lines as a Greek Temple, and in its utterance there is a limpid clarity and directness that might serve as a model, yet in which no whit of beauty is sacrificed in the saying. Never for an instant can you doubt what is meant, yet the boldest revelations of esoteric passion are made in language as irreproachable as esthetically faultless.

It is a story set in the days of old Rome, yet its motive is one that only the feminist present could evolve—the cry of the spiritually rebellious woman against the lustful subjugation of man; the demand of the higher woman that her lover come to her always first and more as spirit than flesh, adoring, reverencing, companioning the purity of her soul before he dare touch the beauty of her body. It is not a refusal of the body or an ascetic revolution against passion, but a demand that the soul be given its rightful priority in the emotional procession, its due rank and precedence in the expression of love.

"Love but my soul, the part of me not flesh,

And you shall see my body run to you."

In that is the spirit and keynote of the whole book.

J. WILLIAM LLOYD.

* "The Wife of Marobius," by Max Ehrmann. Mitchell Kennerley. New York. \$1.00 net.

ERRATA

In our issue of Feb. 22, in the article "The Panama Canal: Its Economic Significance," on page 241, read, "In the same way the distance between European and Australian ports via Suez is shorter than via Panama," instead of "On the other hand the distance between European and Australian ports via Suez is longer than via Panama."

On page 260 of the issue of March 1, read \$139,000,000 and \$21,000,000, instead of \$147,000,000 and \$29,000,000, a reduction of one battleship having been made in the final passage of the naval bill.

On page 299 of the issue of March 8, four lines from the bottom, read "defend" instead of "defeat."