

April 12, 1913

Five Cents

# *The* New Review

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

## CONTENTS

- The New Review a Monthly . . . . .
- Let Us Recall the Recall . . . . . *H. S.*
- The Illinois Vice Commission . . . . . *Caro Lloyd*
- The Grand Jury System . . . . . *Frederick Haller*
- The Pragmatism of Marx and Engels. (*Concluded*) . *Wm. English Walling*
- Concerning Historical Materialism  
III. Vico's Laws of History . . . . . *Paul Lafargue*
- After the Ice-Storm . . . . . *J. William Lloyd*
- My Heroines . . . . . *George Allan England*
- New Tendencies in Drama and Art:  
Little Theatres; A "Wild Man" Explains Himself . *Andre Tridon*

---

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*  
Bertha W. Howe, *Treasurer*  
Robert M. Lackey, *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

## The NEW REVIEW

AS A MONTHLY MAGAZINE  
WILL BE A GREAT SELLER

## The MAY Number

WILL BE OUT ON  
APRIL 25

## Every Literature Agent

Should Order a Supply Now

#### BUNDLE RATES:

6 cents each, non-returnable

Liberal Commissions to Subscription Solicitors

New Review 150 Nassau Street  
NEW YORK CITY

# The New Review

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

Vol. I.

APRIL 12, 1913

No. 15

## The New Review a Monthly.

Beginning with the first of May the NEW REVIEW will be published as a monthly.

During its existence of less than four months the NEW REVIEW has more than satisfied the expectations of its founders. It has received the cordial support of an able, scholarly and brilliant staff of contributors. It has aroused the enthusiasm of a large number of readers, whose warm appreciation has been a great help and encouragement. It has received generous assistance in time and money from an intimate circle of friends.

Judged by an intellectual and moral standard the NEW REVIEW has been an unqualified success. It has, however, assumed a character which makes it better adapted to monthly than weekly publication. Many of its articles require time and leisure to be thoroughly digested and appreciated. Then, too, monthly publication will lessen our expenses. The financial deficit will be reduced in other ways also. Yearly subscriptions at half the price of the weekly will be easier to get, and newsdealers have informed us that a monthly will be marketed much more readily too. We do not need to remind our readers how gravely important the financial question is in the formative period of every Socialist periodical.

All these reasons have determined the change. We mean to establish the NEW REVIEW upon a basis in every way possible beyond danger of discontinuance. This is the last weekly issue. The May number will be published about April 25. It will be twice the size of the weekly, containing 64 pages; the subscription price will be \$1. a year; single copies will sell for ten cents. All unexpired terms of subscription for the weekly will be proportionately extended for the monthly.

We assure you that as a monthly the NEW REVIEW will con-

**STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC.,** of the "New Review," published weekly at New York, N. Y., required by the Act of August 24, 1912. Editor, Herman Simpson, 150 Nassau St., N. Y.; Managing Editor, Herman Simpson, 150 Nassau St., N. Y.; Business Manager, Robert M. Lackey, 150 Nassau St., N. Y.; Publisher, New Review Publishing Association, 150 Nassau St., N. Y.

Owners (holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of stock): Ashley, Jessie, 27 Cedar St., New York; Boudin, Anna P., 477 E. 16th St., Bklyn., N. Y.; Boudin, Louis B., 302 Broadway, New York; Blumlein, Maurice, 103 Water St., New York; Berman, Morris, 1212 Beverly Rd., Bklyn.; Cassile, Willard R., 6248 Market St., Phila., Pa.; Caspe, A., 210 E. Broadway, New York; Dietrich, William, 445 E. 85th St., New York; Fraser, Alexander, 413 First St., Bklyn., N. Y.; Fraser, Bertha, 413 First St., Bklyn., N. Y.; Harris, Henry, 1602 Summer St., Phila., Pa.; Fagnani, Chas. P., 606 W. 122nd St., New York; Howe, Bertha W., Great Killis, S. I., N. Y.; Herrmann, Leo, 1208 49th St., Bklyn.; Kneeland, Louise W., 970 Park Place, Bklyn., N. Y.; Kneeland, Eleanor, 970 Park Place, Bklyn., N. Y.; Liebman, Philip, 302 Broadway, New York; Kuhnert, William, 150 Worth St., New York; Lackey, Robert M., 150 Nassau St., New York; Michailovsky, M., 235 W. 71st St., New York; Michael, Joseph, 123 William St., New York; Oppenheimer, Moses, 301 E. 68th St., New York; Oppenheimer, Mary S., 301 E. 68th St., New York; Oberdorfer, George, 2393 Eighth Ave., New York; Ortman, Isaac, 106 Rivington St., New York; Russell, Charles Edward, 3 E. 27th St., New York; Simpson, Herman, 150 Nassau St., New York; Simpson, Ray, 203 W. 113th St., New York; Stokes, J. G. Phelps, Caritas Island, Stamford, Ct.; Walling, Wm. English, Cedarhurst, L. I., N. Y. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders, holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities: None.

Robert M. Lackey,  
Business Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 31st day of March, 1913.

Abraham Kasman,  
Commissioner of Deeds,  
No. 18, New York City.

(Seal)

(My commission expires July 3rd, 1913.)

tinue to be a source of pride and gratification to every Socialist who wishes to see the Socialist movement of America abreast with the best thought of the age. The *NEW REVIEW* is in the hands of its readers.

NEW REVIEW PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION.

## Let Us Recall the Recall

It is unnecessary to waste words upon the injustice of the procedure by which Haywood was rushed into the Paterson jail, for there was no pretense of justice. Haywood was arrested for walking on the street. He was immediately haled before a police magistrate, charged at one stage of the proceedings with "unlawful assemblage," at another with "disorderly conduct," convicted on one or the other or both charges, and sentenced to six months at hard labor. These are the dry facts of the case.

No greater outrage was ever perpetrated upon the labor movement of this country, the history of which is replete with false accusations, unjust arrests, convictions, imprisonments, and hangings. But in most of the other cases there was at least a pretense of lawful procedure, even if juries had to be packed to make pretense possible. In this case, however, there was not even a farcical pretense of legality. It is a case of "class justice," bold, brazen, defiant, unashamed. There is a strike of 25,000 silk weavers in Paterson. The strikers have found an able and resourceful leader, who is dreaded and hated by all the Gradgrind employers in the land. To deprive the strikers of their general and thus to break the strike, Haywood is arrested and summarily convicted and sentenced.

Even the capitalist press is aware of the enormity of the outrage. Not venturing to defend the utterly indefensible procedure, the capitalist press as a whole resorts to golden silence. But there is one luminous exception. The *New York Tribune* not only gave a full and fair report of this almost unparalleled mockery of justice, but it also published an editorial entitled "Prompting Anarchy," which read as follows:

Putting Haywood, the Industrial Workers of the World leader, in jail was expected to end the strike in the Paterson silk mills. Jailing Ettor and Giovannitti at Lawrence on trumped-up charges didn't end the strike there. And even if locking up Haywood should discourage the present Paterson strikers, it would make Haywood still more dangerous for the future.

Nothing will do so much to prompt violence on the part of workingmen and make acceptable to them the counsels of revolutionary labor

organizations as acts by the authorities which look as if the governmental agencies were in the hand of the employing class. If the police are used to harry and suppress a strike, if courts lend themselves to the putting in jail of strike leaders who are inconvenient to employers, workmen are made to feel that they can only gain their rights by force.

The *Tribune* has no sympathy with Haywood. It regards him as dangerous. It does not want to see him made more dangerous by blundering local governments made up of millowners or their representatives using the police and the courts as if they were their private property in putting down strikes.

When a capitalist organ speaks out thus plainly, is it possible that workingmen, that Socialists should hesitate? The cause of Haywood is now the cause of the entire working class of America. The right of free assemblage is at stake. The right to strike is at stake. Fundamental rights of American citizenship are at stake. It is the cause not only of the working class, but also of all honest and fair-minded men who wish to see the irrepressible class conflict between labor and capital fought out according to the rules of civilized warfare, and not with the ferocity of savage slaughter. The authorities in Paterson, in Trenton, and, if need be, in Washington must be made to understand that the measure of working class patience has been overstepped, that the cup of bitterness is now filled to overflowing.

But above all the other working class organizations, it is the duty of the Socialist party throughout the nation to act in the most decisive and impressive manner.

Let us have the courage to face the facts of the case, all the facts. During the late Lawrence strike the employers and their hirelings hated Haywood with the same implacable hatred as they do now in the Paterson strike, and they would just as readily have jailed him then on trumped-up charges as they jailed Ettor and Giovannitti. But Haywood was then a member of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party, and that served him as a shield against his foes. However, no sooner was the Lawrence strike over, and while the entire capitalist pack was still in full cry after him, than charges were launched against Haywood in the Socialist press, charges of what at worst were nothing more than hasty and indiscreet utterances. How many times have other prominent Socialists sinned in the same way! Yet nothing was made of it. But in this case it was different. There were influential elements in the Socialist party who were determined to get rid of Haywood by hook or by crook, and he—most unwisely, to be sure—gave them the long sought-for pretext by insisting upon the altogether superfluous and absurd use of a French word for an old and common practice of English and American workingmen, and of talking about it in and out of season. Thus Haywood was thrown a victim to

the howling wolves of capitalism, and the entire capitalist press of the country applauded us to the echo. The Paterson police and magistrates were as well informed of what had happened as we ourselves, and they took advantage of the first opportunity to make Haywood feel the full weight of capitalist vengeance.

The fact is undeniable. The twenty thousand members of the Socialist party who voted for the recall of Haywood, unknowingly played into the hands of the capitalists of the land. That grievous error must, if possible, be repaired. This can be done, in the first place, by inaugurating a nation-wide agitation against the monstrous iniquity perpetrated in Paterson. And secondly, can we not show the Paterson authorities and the country at large that, notwithstanding our earlier misunderstanding, we still count Haywood as one of ourselves? Can we not demonstrate the essential solidarity of all the revolutionary elements of the working class movement, political and industrial, by re-electing Haywood to the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party?

This would, indeed, be a most impressive demonstration of working class solidarity. The way is easy, if only we will it, and there need be no disturbance whatever in the party. Let some member of the present National Executive Committee resign, and let the National Committee elect Haywood in his place. Our comrades in European countries have again and again elected to parliament Socialist and labor leaders who have been jailed, thus automatically taking them out of jail. We cannot do the same thing in this case. But can we not, at least, do something equally impressive and—who knows?—possibly, in its effect on public opinion, no less effective.

Let us forget our petty differences and animosities. Let us recall the essential unity that underlies all our minor and temporary divisions. Let us demonstrate, in the most impressive manner possible on this occasion, that solidarity is with us not a phrase but a fact. Let us re-elect Haywood to the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party.

\* \* \*

The above was written on the day preceding the release of Haywood on a writ of habeas corpus by Supreme Court Justice Minturn. But although the urgency of the occasion has passed, a similar situation may again arise at any moment, and our duty would then be precisely the same. Forewarned is forearmed.

H. S.

## The Illinois Vice Commission

By CARO LLOYD.

For several weeks in March the eyes of the country centered on a room in the Hotel La Salle, Chicago, where the Illinois Senatorial Vice Commission was conducting an investigation with Lieutenant-Governor Barratt O'Hara as chairman. The object was to get information on a pending Illinois bill for a minimum weekly wage of \$12 for women. The hearings were public and attracted specialists from all parts of the country. Before them as upon the stage came the persons of this living drama. First the girls, "L. W.", "A. R.", "E. P. B.", telling the senators in whispers between their sobs the stories of their downfall, one of them, a hopeless wreck brought from the hospital, revealing in executive session the ravages of the awful disease which is killing the race at a faster rate than tuberculosis. Six women surprised in a Tenderloin raid were brought in and each one testified that she had been driven to a life of shame because unable to live on her weekly wages of from \$3 to \$5. All of the many prostitute witnesses were women. The tens of thousands of men who had been party to this had long since gone forth again into the city, as free, as unknown as were the fathers of children in the age of barbarism.

Then the commission, evidently composed of sincere inquirers, called the heads of the great department stores. This human exhibit proved no less interesting than the other, and was moreover not without its contemptible features. There was a vice-president of Siegel, Cooper & Co., who believed immorality to be "a state of mind"; the multi-millionaire philanthropic president of Sears, Roebuck & Co., who could not possibly discover any relation between starvation wages and prostitution; the Peoria merchant, who admitted that he could increase the girls' wages without difficulty, "but it is so impractical," he said.

There were many moments when the scene was a dramatization of our recurring problems, when the sheer human sympathy of Chairman O'Hara led him to the heart of our economic injustices. The Sears, Roebuck & Co. philanthropic president was asked whether he believed a girl receiving \$9 a week was as well qualified to resist a white slaver as one receiving \$12.

A. "I don't believe there is any connection between wages and prostitution."

Q. "Now, don't you think it ever has happened that a girl has surrendered the priceless treasure of her virtue because she was starving or sick or because of a crippled brother?"

A. "I don't believe one case has any connection with the other."

Witness having stated that he believed a girl could live honestly on \$8 a week, was asked: "Could you live on that, Mr. Rosenwald?" The very thought amused the philanthropist, for he smiled as he answered, "I don't know. I never tried it." It was the first time that low wages had assumed an amusing aspect. Up to then they had meant anguish, broken hearts, death, but at this mention of them, the millionaire smiled. The figures of the Sears, Roebuck & Co. profits sounded magnificent as he rolled them off, \$7,000,000 in 1911, a surplus of \$12,000,000 at the close of 1912, the company paying 16 per cent. on a capitalization of \$50,000,000. Unfortunately, however, little Emily, a former employe, was now called. She said in substance: "The girls had to do just so much work or leave, the 'scolder' was always speeding us up, and the girls were afraid and crying. We would exchange clothes, for we couldn't each have a complete outfit. The drinking water tasted funny and we had to pay ten cents every two weeks to get good water. I know one girl, less than sixteen, who was trying to support her widowed mother and younger sister. She was receiving \$5 a week. She is down sick now in the hospital and I think they are trying to get her salary for her. She had to keep on her feet all day. Whenever she sat down she would be brought before the 'scolder'. She was crying most of the time."

The philanthropist hastened to explain that this condition existed many years ago.

"Seven months ago," answered brave little Emily.

The head of Montgomery, Ward & Co. came forward and was asked how much it would cost him to pay an \$8 minimum weekly wage.

A. "About \$75,000 a year."

Q. "Were your profits in excess of that?"

A. "They certainly were. For the last fiscal year they were \$2,730,000."

Q. "Put the \$2,730,000 on one side of the table and the \$75,000 on the other," said the human O'Hara, "does that mean anything to you?"

A. "It doesn't mean anything to me because I don't figure it that way."

The theory that wages are nicely adjusted, not to earning power, but to the least amount on which life can be supported, was soon demonstrated to the entire satisfaction of the assembly. The employers all squirmed out of responsibility by declaring that the low wages were paid only to girls living at home. But when told that in most cases the members of the family each received a bare living wage and the deficit still persisted at home, they continued to lay the blame upon the girl's "environment." The relation of wages to dividends on one side and to the consumer on the other was also illustrated when the president of the Marshall, Field Co. said that a minimum wage would probably come out of the public through enhanced prices, although his own testimony and that of others showed that the big corporations could afford to pay the increase out of their profits.

Thus did the Chicago commission turn a flashlight on the tragic problems of our times. We have had other vice investigations. Chicago has not recovered from one in 1911, when the whole city rose in horror against a brazen vice syndicate. As far back as 1888, Massachusetts made startling discoveries of the relation of prostitution to poverty. The International Council of Women, composed of 8,000,000 in all European countries except Russia, and as far off as Persia, Iceland, South Africa, Australia, Argentine, broke through prudery and made a thorough survey through its women physicians. But the recent commission seemed to take a more advanced and radical position. It went beyond an effort to "stamp out" the evil. It did not tinker with effects merely. It spared us any talk of model dance halls as a cure-all. Time and again it surprised radicals by coming so near the basic causes and solutions.

Although it had not as yet heard all of the story, since it has been informed that there are establishments in Chicago and other Illinois cities where women are working hard ten hours a day for \$1.50 a week, the commission packed its suitcase with volumes of testimony and started for Washington to interview the President. Its conclusions, as yet unofficial, were that there exists a combination engaged in wholesale traffic in women, extending over the whole country; that 5,000 fresh girls are demanded every year in all the large cities; that whereas the employers testified that there was no connection between low wages and prostitution, 90 per cent. of the prostitutes gave that as the reason, saying that they went wrong at the beginning period, when they were receiving only \$3.50 and \$4.00 a week; that the majority of the workingwomen were so heroic, so

staunch and clean that they remained firm under temptations, such as no other women had ever been called upon to face, enduring a chronic state of being underfed, underclad, in surroundings of utter ugliness and joylessness. Not less significant was the conclusion that thousands of American men were forced by present conditions to oppress women. Most astounding to the commission itself was the discovery that the so-called philanthropy of the employer in pensions and welfare work was not philanthropy at all; but was contributed from the suffering of the workers in the institution itself. Above all, on its pivotal question of the minimum wage, it endorsed the principle that it should be a living wage for all, living conditions to include some share in the happiness of life. When a mission worker testified that although \$12 was as little as a woman could support herself on, it was not a practical minimum wage since all women were not worth that, Chairman O'Hara answered: "We think a woman is worth saving, regardless of the cost."

This remark of O'Hara's is in line with the important ruling of Judge Gray, when as chairman of the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission he refused to admit testimony of the monopolistic wealth of the coal barons, saying: "We are going to take it for granted that they can pay a living wage. If they cannot, they had better get out of the business." It is also in line with the decision of a New Zealand judge, when the women of a match factory took their grievance to the Board of Arbitration. After investigation he said: "It is impossible for these women to live decently or healthfully on the wages you are now paying. . . . The souls and bodies of the young women of New Zealand are of more importance than your profits, and if you cannot pay living wages it will be better for you to close your factory. It would be better to send the whole match industry to the bottom of the ocean and go back to flints and firesticks, than to drive young girls into the gutter. My award is that you pay what they ask."

In general, the Chicago commission may be said to be representative of the most advanced position to which the progressive but non-Socialist thought of the world has advanced. It stands for capitalistic reform and concession which are to be the characteristic policy of the period upon which we are now entering. It is advisable that such phases of it as we see in this Chicago investigation be watched and studied by the Socialists. Of primal importance is its attitude to the workers. In Chicago this was not antipathetic, but was apparently dictated by a sin-

cere solicitude for their welfare. That was not, however, its whole psychology. When the president of the Marshall, Field Company declined to state its profits, Chairman O'Hara said: "There is unrest among the people. They feel that the rich are getting richer, piling up millions, and the poor getting poorer. If that feeling grows, it will become a menace. We want to get at the facts." Later in Washington, in stating that his reason for coming was to arouse a sentiment in favor of study and legislation concerning conditions which were dragging down the working women, he is reported as saying: "If we do not succeed in this endeavor, the ultra-radicals will do it for us in a way that will go to extremes. We hope to counteract the undercurrent of feeling on this subject through appropriate action before it is too late to stem the tide of resentment that may lead to excesses."

The warning fell unheeded on the ears of his employer-witnesses, nor did the *Chicago Tribune* and the *New York Evening Post* see the point, but on the contrary foamed with indignation. The latter paper said editorially that "the goings-on of the commission have been of the most pernicious character," and also:

"One after another of the heads of colossal business establishments, after having stated his estimate of what is required for the needs of a woman worker—say, \$8 a week—has been asked, 'Could you live on that?' or 'What is your income?' The committee seems quite unaware that if the fact of gross inequality of fortune, the fact that the rich might easily part with their superfluity and give it to the poor, were to be accepted as a reason for compelling such redistribution, the process could not stop with a little thing like a pitiful minimum wage for women. It would necessarily mean a complete reconstruction of the whole economic and social system. With those who deliberately and seriously work for such an end we have no fault to find, (*sic*) but with those who are so soft-headed that they don't know when they are fooling with a great question we confess we have little patience."

But let the workers see the point. Let them realize that back of all the kindness is the distinctly avowed purpose of warding off any attempt on their part to get possession of the industries, to own and operate them for the well-being and joy not only of themselves but of society at large.

Aside from the purely economic point of view, the questions before the commission led to the universal, underlying problem

of sex. "The great taboo" has been raised. When during one session a resort was raided and the women brought before the commission, over one hundred women in the audience elected to remain and hear the testimony. At the Washington session where women were in the majority, a bashful police captain of the Tenderloin district spoke in such low tones that the women called out, "Louder, louder." Men and women are going to study this problem face to face as never before. These vice revelations are the ugly side of the great woman question. New conditions are to-day challenging our old conclusions. In the investigation lies enfolded a problem which cannot be dispelled by unnatural denial of the claims of the body, nor by a license which destroys the beauty of both body and soul and leads to complete thralldom. It cannot be settled by men alone, nor can it be settled by those women who are rushing to legislative lobbies demanding stricter divorce laws. Although economic freedom is an absolute necessity as a basis of settlement, there must at the same time grow in the minds and hearts of the people, the guiding power of uplifting sexual ideals formed in fairness to both sexes, in bravery and honesty. These ideals poor humanity is struggling to construct. Rightly interpreted, then, the tragic sessions at Chicago are linked with great ethnic forces which are evolving a more glorious womanhood and manhood than the world has ever seen.

But our immediate vital concern is with the promised revelation to the nation of the connection between low wages and the appalling destruction of the women of the working class. With a majority of the States already committed to efforts similar to those of Illinois, and with President Wilson considering Chairman O'Hara's suggestion for a national conference, we are likely to be given, even by such meagre accounts as get into the papers, much food for thought in the near future.

## The Grand Jury System

By FREDERICK HALLER.

The Grand Jury System finds its origin in barbarous England of the twelfth century. Pollock and Maitland in their "History of English Law," give the Assize of Clarendon, issued by Henry II. in 1166, as the starting point of this institution. In those days it was the duty of the grand jury to furnish the names of all persons who were defamed by common repute. The grand jurors were neither accusers exactly nor witnesses exactly. They had only to give voice to common reputation. They were obliged to take an oath to present to the itinerant justice the names of reputed offenders against the king's dignity, to the end that flagrant brutality and injustice might be punished. They were sworn to say the truth "and to obey orders."

The itinerant justice always received full information in advance of all matters that the grand jury was expected to make presentation of, and of all suspects to be accused, and woe unto the wights on the grand jury if they omitted to make presentment of all persons under suspicion. The lash of amercement was usually swift and furious. Every member of the grand jury was bent upon saving his own hide. So that body was nothing more or less than a supine and pliant tool of the power that swayed it and the country. The grand jury was designed to be nothing but a tool of the interests in power, and a servilely complaisant tool it was.

In the seven centuries and over that have passed, there has been no change. The institution originated as an engine of oppression in the hands of the ruling class. That class was then the propertied class. The grand jury is to-day an engine of oppression still, and still is in the hands of the ruling class, and the ruling class is still the propertied class.

The outward appearance of the grand jury may be a little different, but the difference is only on the surface. Men were rougher in their methods and language in the twelfth century. We are more subtle now. Things are done under cover, as it were, and by indirection; therefore with less friction, less opposition and more efficaciously. The method now in vogue is the psychological.

To begin with, the members of the grand jury are now told that they represent the body of the county for the purpose of inquiring into all alleged crimes committed within the county. This imbues them with a high sense of their importance. Then an oath is administered to each of them which says: "You shall diligently inquire and true presentment make of all such matters and things as shall be given you in charge; the counsel of the people of this state, your fellows and your own you shall keep secret . . . . . So help you, God." This oath adds to the sense of importance. The suggestion of responsibility, however, soon vanishes when they have once entered the secret chamber provided for them.

The grand jury organizes by choosing a clerk and locking the door. The chairman, called the foreman, is appointed by the judge of the court. His duties are most perfunctory. He administers oaths. He presides. But as the proceedings consist in nothing but saving yes and amen to every intimation of the prosecuting attorney, the proceedings are simple in the extreme. They are likewise informal. Soon after the door is locked, the grand jury learns by suggestion—and suggestion is the most lasting and impressive method—that they are not only the body of the county, but that they are also "in truth and in reality" the people of the sovereign state. All of their accusations are entitled "The People of the State of \_\_\_\_\_ against \_\_\_\_\_." It is extremely difficult for the uninitiated fully to comprehend and weigh the effect of such flattery upon the ordinary run of the mere bossing or shopkeeping mind. This effect is added to and heightened by the flattering attention given to them by the prosecuting attorney. He treats them with the assumption—false as anything can be—that they, of course, understand the machinery and its workings, and that if it were not for them it could not work. This is the oil that keeps the bearings from squeaking. The grand jurors naturally confess their own importance, and esteem the prosecuting attorney highly for his alacrity in recognizing it. The grand jury then find no difficulty in deferring to the judgment of the prosecuting attorney. In fact, the prosecuting attorney is the legally constituted adviser of the grand jury. He is the officer that brings all matters before them, presents the evidence and examines the witness. And if the evidence and testimony of witnesses in any case show that no crime has been committed, it is for the prosecuting attorney so to declare to the grand jury. Unless he tells them they will not know. If the prosecuting attorney does not tell them affirm-

atively that the evidence proves no crime to have been committed, the grand jury will vote and does vote for an indictment.

The power of the prosecuting attorney is truly amazing. The grand jurors are quite content with the honor and dignity of their office; and true to their bossing and shop-keeping habits of exploiting the labor of others, even to the labor of attention and thinking, they are quite content to let the prosecuting attorney do such thinking for them as may be necessary. That is what the prosecuting attorney is paid for.

Now, the prosecuting attorney has interests of his own. He is a practicing lawyer. The most lucrative law business by far comes from the propertied classes. Railroad companies, banks, milling and factory corporations, big store corporations, etc., etc., have business that it is well worth while to get. Their favor and influence is worth money. When the prosecuting attorney comes to be regarded by them as a good fellow, then will his ship slide down the ways all filled with grease.

The prosecuting attorney can have any objectionable character indicted practically whenever interest demands. Property rules everywhere and it rules him. The prosecuting attorney is not required by law to present all the evidence to the grand jury in a given case, and the grand jury is not required to hear it all. Neither the defendant nor his attorney have a right to appear or find fault. So by presenting only half of the truth to the grand jury, or by twisting the facts a little here and giving them a turn there, it is seldom necessary to use even a little perjury. Very, very rarely is it necessary to resort to any more than the least bit of it so as to have the record right. Even then the very small amount of perjury might be so susceptible of explanation as not to be dangerous. The charge of perjury requires what amounts to two witnesses to prove. It need not be "so deep as a well nor so wide as a church door" to be enough to serve. A one-sided hearing is a most clever device.

Between the time an indictment is reported and the day of trial, it often happens that the witnesses who can testify to that part of the truth that was not laid before the grand jury have died, or moved away, or been driven away or intimidated by the bosses of their jobs, or by indictments or the fear of indictments against themselves. Or their memories will for some reason or other fail them. All this works out for the benefit of the powerful propertied class.

It is most natural that when a wreck occurs on a railroad due to a run down or poorly constructed road or inadequate



equipment, that the prosecuting attorney's sympathies will be on the side of the company. His economic interests, actual or prospective, determine his attitude, his judgment, his action. Public opinion must not be permitted to condemn the railroad officials; the public attention must be drawn away and centered on something else. So the engineer is accused of having been drunk at his post and is indicted for manslaughter in the second degree. This is punishable with fifteen years of imprisonment. The dear public is appeased by knowing that the law is after somebody.

Or take the case of some struggling trader, compelled to give up the business ghost and heavily indebted to a bank. The moneyed institution calls on the prosecuting attorney. The bankrupt trader may have kept strictly within the rules of the game. Still, if a criminal prosecution can be framed up, his family and friends may be scared into raising the money, or a part of it, and so save the bank from a loss that it is in business to assume, and for the risk of which it justifies its rates of discount. So the bankrupt trader is indicted of the crime of grand larceny in the first degree. Such an indictment is based on the claim that the bankrupt trader had made false statements to the bank as to his means of paying so as to induce the bank to give him credit. A possible ten years' imprisonment stares the defendant in the face.

Or labor agitators are rendering themselves particularly undesirable. The propertied classes must be reassured that the government still lives—for them. The prosecuting attorney avails himself of the rules of evidence laid down by Mother Goose in the story of the house that Jack built, and an indictment is the result.

In the case of the indicted engineer and that of the bankrupt trader, no capitalistic community of interest is involved, that is, not vitally. Each concerns directly a matter of individual interest only. The railroad company is seeking shelter and the bank is trying to recoup a business loss. If the engineer or the bankrupt trader break down under the weight of the accusations, which often happens, they will plead guilty to the indictment, or upon negotiation of counsel, plead guilty to some other charge "and throw themselves upon the mercy of the court." The prosecuting attorney is vindicated. He can afford to be generous and join in a recommendation of mercy. Sometimes he does. Two characters are thus by their own plea of guilty

besmirched with conviction of a crime where no crime has in fact been committed.

If the engineer or bankrupt trader "are sustained by a clear conscience," refuse to plead guilty to any crime that they did not commit, and are able to give bail and escape from the depressing and devastating influence of jail and jailer, a different situation is presented. The prosecuting attorney now saves himself from exposure very gracefully. He takes the indictments into court and has them dismissed on his own motion on the ground that there was not sufficient evidence before the grand jury to warrant their being presented. That puts the blame—softly—on the grand jury, long since dissolved into its elements, discharged with the "thanks of the court for faithful performance of duty." The heart of the engineer, likewise that of the bankrupt trader, is filled with gratitude, and the news item in the morning paper is commendatory of the high sense of justice of the prosecuting attorney.

The indicted labor agitators usually refuse to plead guilty, refuse to cry quits; they often denounce the indictment as a frame-up and deny the prosecuting attorney any opportunity to escape with all his feathers. They are a "menace to society." Their indictment and incarceration before trial will serve a purpose even though they be not convicted. A dismissal of the indictment by the prosecuting attorney would be a confession that it was a frame-up. When forced to it, the prosecuting attorney tries the case. If he gets convictions, good for him. If the trial jury acquits, he has served the propertied classes to the best of his ability, and that, too, will be good for his interests in the future.

The prosecuting attorneys who have opportunities to render signal services to the propertied classes and avail themselves of such opportunities, always have good things awaiting them.

The world has never seen a more perfect scheme for chicanery than the grand jury system.

---

## The Pragmatism of Marx and Engels

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

(Concluded.)

Marx's and Engels' "materialistic" conception of history is purely pragmatic. I have already indicated that the philosophy of these fathers of Socialist theory is by no means "materialistic" in the ordinary sense. Marx wrote in 1845:

"The materialistic doctrine that men are the products of conditions and education, different men therefore the products of other conditions and changed education, forgets that circumstances are altered by men and that the educator has himself to be educated. . . . The concurrence of a change in conditions and human activity can only be comprehended and rationally understood as revolutionizing practice."

And as late as 1890 Engels explained what he and Marx had meant by their materialist conception of social evolution:

"Marx and I are partly responsible for the fact that the younger men have sometimes laid more stress on the economic side than it deserves. In meeting the attacks of our opponents it was necessary for us to emphasize the dominant principle denied by them, and we did not always have the time, place, or opportunity to let the other factors which were concerned in the mutual action and reaction get their deserts."

The pragmatism of Marx and Engels, however, was much affected by their effort to adapt the Hegelian philosophy to Socialist purposes. Writing at the time they did, it was almost inevitable that this should have been the case. While neither was in any sense a mere disciple of Hegel, both were in so far under his influence that they were in reaction against him, and no man that ever lived was perhaps further from being a pragmatist than was Hegel. James denies the value not alone of Hegel's philosophy, but also his very method of reasoning, his "dialectics," which Marx and Engels were trying to *adapt*—recognizing at the same time the revolutionary and important role he played in the history of philosophy. Of the attitude of the typical Hegelian toward the master, James writes:

"What others feel as the intolerable ambiguity, verbosity, and unscrupulousness of the master's way of deducing things, he will probably ascribe—since divine oracles are notoriously

hard to interpret—to the 'difficulty' that habitually accompanies profundity. For my own part, there seems something grotesque and saugrenu in the pretension of a style so disobedient to the first rule of sound communication between minds to be the authentic mother-tongue of reason, and to keep step more accurately than any other style does with the Absolute's own ways of thinking. I do not therefore take Hegel's technical apparatus seriously at all. I regard him rather as one of those numerous original seers who can never learn how to articulate. His would-be coercive logic counts for nothing in my eyes; but that does not in the least impugn the philosophic importance of his conception of the Absolute if we take it merely hypothetically as one of the great types of cosmic vision."

Neither do pragmatists deny that Hegel saw some things clearly. "What he really worked by," says James, "was his own empirical perceptions which exceeded and overflowed his miserable, insufficient, and illogical categories in every instance of their use." Similarly in so far as the earliest Socialist writers followed Hegel in his antiquated process of reasoning, they may nevertheless have had their eyes all the time on this concrete reality that Hegel saw—so that it is possible that *they* lost nothing by using his dialectical method. It is only *we* that must try to avoid misconception arising out of this obsolete phraseology and dialectics. Not many of us are likely to master Hegel's philosophy sufficiently to understand the early Socialist writers. But fortunately many of the leading Socialists now alive have done so and have reproduced all the best of these old ideas in terms of the thought of our time, as for instance, Kautsky, Mehring, and Lafargue.

Engels explains what he really admired in Hegel's philosophy: "It once for all gave the *coup de grace* to finality of results of human thought and action. Truth lay now in the process of knowledge itself, in the natural historical development of science. . . . In face of it nothing final, absolute or sacred exists . . . save the unbroken process of coming into existence and passing away, the endless passing from the lower to the higher, the mere reflection of which in the brain of the thinker is itself."

It is evident that Engels was attempting to use the Hegelian dialectic in a pragmatic manner, but the question is whether it is possible to do so.

The only important truth we may allow in Hegel's philos-

ophy is its relative advance over what went before, which is very well expressed by Engels:

"As the bourgeoisie through large scale industry, competition, and the world market, destroyed the practical value of all stable and anciently honored institutions, so this dialectic philosophy destroyed all theories of absolute truth, and of an absolute state of humanity corresponding to them."

But we cannot agree, from the point of view of our own generation, that, though Hegel reached "a very tame political conclusion," it was by means of a thoroughly revolutionary method of "reasoning," nor that, while "the conservatism of this philosophical view is relative, its revolutionary character, absolute." The Hegelian dialectic may have been revolutionary in 1840. It may be revolutionary to-day in the minds of some thinkers, but it does not play an important part in modern thinking, and a vast amount of cumbrous and doubtful interpretation would certainly be necessary even to make it acceptable.

An illustration may be taken from the field of history, and it is here, indeed, that some of the most dogmatic and, in the light of present knowledge, some of the most crude of the Marx and Engels parallels were drawn. It is not that we object to the thought that lay at the bottom of their minds, but the questions they put are now so antiquated, that either to accept their answers, or to reject them, would be equally valueless or misleading for the purpose of clear thinking. The historical illustration follows:

"All civilized peoples began with common property in land. Among the peoples which pass beyond a certain primitive stage the common property in land becomes a fetter upon production in the process of agricultural development. It is cast aside, negated, and, after shorter or longer intervening periods, is transformed into private property. But at a higher stage, through the development still further of agriculture, private property becomes in its turn a bar to production, as is to-day the case with both large and small land proprietorship. The next step, to negate it in turn, to transform it into social property, necessarily follows. This advance however does not signify the restoration of the old primitive common property, but the establishment of a far higher, better developed form of communal proprietorship, which, far from being an impediment to production, rather, for the first time, is bound to put an end to its limitations and to give it the full benefit of modern discoveries in chemistry and mechanical inventions."

I shall leave it to the modern reader to add the numerous qualifications which are necessary to get any utility out of such a dogmatic formula as this. Another sociological illustration of dialectic reasoning given by Engels is quoted directly from Marx:

"The capitalistic method of production and method of appropriation, that is to say capitalistic private property, is the first negation of individual private property founded on labor of individuals; the negation of capitalistic production will be self-produced with the necessity of a natural process, etc."

The length to which Engels will go may be seen in the following statement giving us the "kernel of the dialectic view of nature":

"The view is reached under the compulsion of the mass of scientific facts, and one reaches it the more easily by bringing to the *dialectic* character of these facts a consciousness of the laws of *dialectic* thought. At all events, the scope of science is now so great that it no longer escapes the *dialectic* comprehension."

It is certainly evident that modern thought is not following this method, much as it may accord with the general conclusions of Engels' philosophy.

In his "Feuerbach," Engels says that, during the fifteen years before he wrote (1886), "new material of knowledge was furnished in hitherto unheard of measures," and that "the fixing of inter-relations and therewith of order in the chaos of overwhelming discoveries was rendered possible quite lately for the first time."

This principle might be still more aptly applied to-day to almost everything that Marx, Engels, Darwin, Spencer, or Haeckel wrote. Certainly, the rate of scientific discoveries has been ten-fold, if not a hundred-fold more rapid in the last fifteen years than in the period of Engels' writing. If the ordering of the sciences was not possible in Feuerbach's time, it was scarcely more possible, according to our present perspective, at the time of Engels—and, indeed, we have reached the conclusion that "the fixing" of inter-relations is something at which we do not want to aim at all.

Indeed, Engels himself wrote that "the results of the investigation of nature need only be conceived of dialectically, that is, in the sense of their mutual interconnection, to arrive at a system of nature *sufficient for our time*." Here is an entirely satisfactory statement, and one that automatically relegates the

methods of Engels based on the science of his time into the background to-day. These conclusions were founded primarily on the great biological discoveries which were taking place in his day, and were centered mainly around the name of Darwin. As modern scientific psychology had not even appeared on the horizon, the whole field of psychology and logic was still left to the realm of metaphysics. It is at this historic juncture that Engels declared that "all belongs to the positive sciences of nature and history," except logic and dialectics. These Engels proposed to build up on the basis of philosophy—which, all science having been subtracted, can mean only metaphysics. Thus restricted by the knowledge of his time, he deprived philosophy of science and science of philosophy.

It is scarcely to the discredit of the Socialist movement, as the social embodiment of pragmatism, that its early thinkers were unable completely to formulate that philosophy in 1850 or 1875. Not only did these thinkers definitely state that their philosophy was limited by the exigencies of the movement and its theoretical defence, as well as the science of their time, but the later Socialists show every indication of a growing acceptance of the pragmatic spirit and method (which are the whole of pragmatism). Karl Kautsky, for example, in a recent number of *Die Neue Zeit*, attacks certain dogmatic "Marxists" as follows:

"They forget that a theory is an abstraction, not a completed but a simplified picture of life. It is just through this simplification that the theory is able to bring sense and order into the chaos of phenomena and to find its position in this labyrinth. But it remains only an Ariadne's thread through the labyrinth. It never becomes the labyrinth itself, it never becomes identical with reality, but rather requires further and continual observation of it."

As an illustration of this dogmatic tendency of many Marxists, Kautsky gives their narrow interpretation of the class struggle and proposes in its stead his own broader view, which is undoubtedly that of the Socialist movement as a whole. He explains that the purpose of his pamphlet on the class struggles of the French Revolution was to show not only the depth of the insight into history which can be gained from the application of the theory of the class struggle, but also the depth of the *problems which grow out of the class struggle*:

"It (Kautsky's pamphlet) endeavored in this way to counteract not only the simplification of the theory of the class struggle,

but also that of its practice, by showing that Socialist politics can never satisfy itself by merely stating the class opposition between Capital and Labor, that it must investigate the whole social organism in all its details, since underneath this great opposition countless others exist in society, of less importance, but which cannot be overlooked, and the understanding and utilization of which may make proletarian tactics very much easier and more fruitful."

Just as "the class struggle" is the central tenet of the political and economic movement, just as "the materialist conception of history" is the central tenet of its philosophical aspect, so pragmatism is the spirit and method of modern Socialist thought.

## Concerning Historical Materialism

By PAUL LAFARGUE.

(Translated by Richard Perin).

### III. VICO'S LAWS OF HISTORY

Vico, whom the historians, sociologists and philosophers hardly ever read, although here and there in old books they run across his "*Corsi e Ricorsi*" and two or three other propositions of his, which to be sure are interpreted falsely as often as they are misquoted—Vico, in the "*Scienza Nuova*," formulated fundamental laws of history.

Vico stated as the fundamental law of the evolution of human society that all peoples, irrespective of ethnological origin and geographical habitat, travel the same historic roads. Hence, the history of any people is merely a repetition of the history of some other people which has attained to a higher stage of evolution.

He says: "There is an ideal, eternal history, through which the histories of all nations pass from a certain state of savagery, barbarism and blood-lust to the state when men begin to be civilized"—to become sedentary, *ad addimesticarsi*, as Vico calls it (*Lib. II. § II., V.*)\*

\* In Vico's time the word "civilizzare" apparently did not yet exist in the Italian language; in the French it was not made use of until the eighteenth century to designate the upward movement of an advance. This meaning was of such recent date that it was not until 1835 that the French Academy included the word "civilisation" in its dictionary.—Charles Fourier only employs it to designate the modern bourgeois period.

Morgan, to whom Vico was apparently entirely unknown, conceived the same law, but he formulated it with greater definiteness and completeness. The historical uniformity of different peoples, which the Neapolitan philosopher deduced from the idea that they had developed according to a pre-conceived plan, the American anthropologist refers to two causes: the psychical similarity of men and the similarity of the difficulties which they had to overcome in order to develop themselves. Vico also believed in the psychical similarity.

"In the nature of human affairs there must be a mental language common to all nations, which uniformly designates the nature of the things that play an active part in life; and this language has for the various relations of things as many corresponding expressions. We note its existence so plainly in the proverbs, those moral precepts of popular wisdom, which have the same content in all ancient and modern nations, although they are expressed in so many different ways." (*Degli Elem* XXII).\*

Morgan says: "Since the human mind is the same in all individuals; all races and all nations, and the extent of its powers is limited, it works, and it must work, along similar paths with but slight variations. The results to which it attains in the most distant regions and in ages most widely removed from each other, form the link of a continuous logical chain of uniform experiences." (II., Chap. IX.) "Exactly as with the gradual geologic formations, we can imagine the races of the whole of humanity to be superimposed in layers according to their development. If they are thus grouped they reveal fairly exactly the

\* Aristotle thought highly of proverbs, and several ancient writers speak of a collection of proverbs which he had made, but which has been lost. Synesius mentions it in his "Praise of Baldness," in which he says: "Aristotle regarded the proverbs as relics of the philosophy of earlier times. While the philosophy itself was lost in the revolutions which men were obliged to go through, the proverbs were preserved from shipwreck by their pointed form. Hence the proverbs and the ideas expressed by them enjoy the same consideration as the old philosophy which gave them to us and the noble stamp of which they still bear, for in olden times the truth was grasped much better than to-day." As Synesius informs us, the opinion was current in antiquity that man degenerates, instead of advancing. This opinion, contained in Greek mythology and repeated in several places in the "Iliad," was shared by the Egyptian priests, who, according to Herodotus, divided the past time into three periods: the age of the gods, the heroic age, and the human age.

Since man abandoned the communism of the gens, he believed that he was degenerating, that happiness, the paradise on earth, the golden age, belonged to the past. The ideas of the "perfectibility" of man and of progress were formed in the eighteenth century, when the bourgeoisie was approaching power; but like Christianity it banished happiness to heaven. Utopian Socialism fetched it down to earth again. "Paradise lies not behind us, it lies before us," says St. Simon.

complete course of human progress from barbarism to civilization.' (IV., Chap. I); for "the course of evolution moves in almost identical paths" (III., Chap. V.).\* Marx, who had studied the course of economic "evolutions," confirms Morgan's idea. "The industrially developed country," he says in his preface to "Capital," "merely shows to the less developed the picture of its own future."

Thus the "ideal history," which, according to Vico, each of the different peoples of humanity must pass through, is not an historical plan devised by a divine being, but a human plan of historical progress, and the historian who studies the stages passed through by the various peoples, compares them and separates them into groups according to their respective stages of evolution, will perceive this plan.

The researches that for half a century have been conducted concerning savage tribes and the ancient and modern nations have strikingly demonstrated the correctness of Vico's law. They have shown that all men, irrespective of their geographical and ethnological origin, must, in their evolution, pass through the same forms of the family, property and production, as well as the same social and political institutions. The Danish anthropologists were the first to establish this fact, and to divide the prehistoric era into the three epochs—the stone, bronze and iron ages, that is to say, to name them after the material from which the first tools were fashioned. The histories of the nations, whether they belong to the white, black, yellow or red races, and whether they inhabit equatorial or polar regions, differ from one another only by the stage of Vico's ideal history which they have reached, by Morgan's historical stratum which they represent; so much so that—to retain Marx's metaphor—those who stand a step above on the ladder of material and intellectual evolution show to those below what sometime will be their destiny.

Even intellectual activities are subject to Vico's laws. The philologists and grammarians have found that the formation of words and languages has proceeded according to the same rules. The ethnologists have found the same legends among savage and civilized peoples, as Vico found the same proverbs current among them. Many ethnologists do not regard these similar legends and myths as the intellectual production of the peoples which has been retained until to-day by means of oral tradition; on the contrary, they believe that the myths and legends were conceived at a single centre and then were spread over the entire

\* Lewis H. Morgan, "Ancient Society," 1878.

world. But we cannot accept this explanation, since it contradicts everything which has been observed in respect to other products, intellectual as well as social and material.

The history of the idea of the soul and the ideas originating therein, is one of the strongest examples of the remarkable uniformity of the evolution of human intelligence. We find the idea of the soul among all peoples, even among the crudest savages. In order to be rid of the soul of the deceased, by which their superstitious spirit was possessed, they were obliged to discover for it, after the decomposition of the body, a posthumous dwelling place, where it continued its earthly existence under such perfectly happy conditions that it had no desire to return and torment men. Very strongly developed among savage tribes, the idea of the soul became weaker again upon a higher plane of evolution, after it had created the idea of God, the "great spirit," to rise again with new life and new force at another stage of evolution. After the idea of the soul had existed in the heroic age, it was lacking, as the historians report, in the historic Mediterranean peoples; a few centuries before the Christian era it emerged again and has persisted up to our day. The historians limit themselves to the mention of this remarkable fact, without thinking of seeking for its explanation, which, moreover, they would be unable to find within their range of research. For it is only by employing Marx's historical method, only by ascertaining the transformations in the economic environment, that we can ever hope to find the explanation. Likewise the scholars who have investigated the primitive forms of the family, property and political institutions were just as incapable of discovering the causes of their transformations; they furnish descriptive history only, but the science of the social world must be explanatory as well as descriptive.

\* \* \*

Vico considers man to be the unconscious motor of history, and not his virtues but his vices to be the impelling forces. Not unselfishness, generosity, humanity, but "ferocity, greed and ambition, these three vices which rule the race of man, create armies, commerce and political institutions (the estates), and as a further consequence the courage, wealth and wisdom of republics. Thus these three vices, which might have effaced the human race from the earth have brought forth civil happiness." It is not the good side of things and institutions that causes movement, says Marx, but their bad sides.

This result, which we should not overlook, is for Vico

proof of "the existence of a divine providence, the divine being who, by the aid of men's passions, organized civil order, which allows us to live in a human society, while otherwise men, absorbed in their private interests, would dwell in loneliness like the wild beasts" (*Degli Elem.*, VII).

The divine being who guides the passions is a new edition of the popular principle: "Man proposes. God disposes." But who is this divine being, who is this popular god that leads man, unknown to himself; to historic goals?

Popular wisdom and Vico agree in the belief that man furnishes the impelling forces of history. But his passions and his needs are not invariable quantities, and this Vico recognizes; in the course of evolution they continually undergo important transformations. Thus, for instance, maternal love, that heritage from the beasts, without which man in the wild state could not have propagated himself, has diminished under civilization to such an extent that it is moribund among the mothers of the rich classes. These women rid themselves of their children from birth by giving them over into the care of hirelings. Again, others feel so little longing for motherhood that they take a vow of virginity\* (paternal love and sexual jealousy, which could not exist among savage and barbaric tribes—where polyandry prevails, where the man must share the favor of the woman with others, hence, cannot know whether he is the father of the child—are, on the contrary, more highly developed among civilized people). Among savages and barbarians leading the communistic life, the feeling of equality is so lively and so dominant that it is not permitted to the individual to possess even the most insignificant thing that does not belong to the others as well; but from the time that man has lived under the rule of personal property, the poor and the wage-workers accept their social degradation with resignation and as natural fate.

Thus in the course of evolution we see fundamental passions become transformed, diminish and die, while others are born and grow. Should we seek the determining causes of their origin and development solely in man? That would mean to assume that he, although living in nature and in society, is not influenced by the reality surrounding him. Such an assumption could never exist in the head of even the most fantastic

\* We are able to observe this extinction of mother-love among the bees: the queen, the mother of the whole tribe, would kill her daughters if the asexual drones did not save them from the mother's wrath and by means of special nourishment aided them to develop completely their organs of generation.

idealist, for even he would not dare to assert that an unfortunate woman, who earned her bread by prostitution, and a virtuous mother of a family possessed the sense of shame to an equal degree, that a closet scholar and a bank official could reckon equally rapidly, that a ditch-digger and a professional pianist had equal control over their fingers. Hence, it is indisputable that the environment in which a man moves exerts upon him an unconscious but strong influence in a physical and moral respect.

---

### After the Ice-Storm

By J. William Lloyd.

The snow is glass,  
The twigs are lace,  
A fountain is the weeping birch;  
And on the white-oak tree  
The chickadee  
Is living bit of black-and-white.

An azure flower the blue-jay's bloom,  
A dove's breast is the sky,  
The cedar is a jeweled plume,  
And on the chestnut's ghost  
A bird of coal calls thrice and lifts a wing.

Fire! Fire!—enough to melt the snow,  
The redbird's feathers glow;  
The junco's ashes spill  
Upon the iced weeds of the field,  
Where the brown hawk must soar  
Above the hare in form,  
The squeaking mice that thrill.

— — —  
O wild, wild, wild!—the mystery!  
For eyes that see.

### My Heroines

By George Allan England.

O, what sing I? Blood-lusting men who climb,  
Mad with false lures, behind a flag that whips  
Its riddled tatters o'er the crimson slime  
Of the red rampart?

Nay, nor on the ships  
That plunging die, I sing not those who stand  
Watching the boats fill, calm while fear foams up  
In strangling brine about them, stay the hand,  
Nor put from writhen lips the numbing cup  
Of Death . . . .

I sing not martyrs known to men  
(As these are known); such have their certain meed,  
And laurels crown their immortal memories.  
Rather sing I the humble, those whose need  
Unsatisfied, ever re-born again  
With the sad travail of each aching day,  
Torments them with a woe that never dies,  
Transmutes life's meaning to a gasp of pain!

Sing I the heroines of store, of mill!  
The unsung victims of greed-tyranny,  
The sweatshop legion, in whose breasts the still  
Insistent call of motherhood must die;  
Who must not hearken the insistent cry  
Of the Unborn, nor with the Springtide thrill!

Sing I the silent and the all-obscure,  
Unheralded in dull drab lives of toil;  
Dogg'd by the lean, gray wolves of Greed, of Lust,  
Patiently wise, they cheat the glistening lure,  
Fight the long fight and keep the sacred trust,  
Blossoming wanly, blooms o'erchoked with dust!

These be the brave, dumb in the dragon-coil!  
These I salute, invincible and pure!

## New Tendencies in Drama and Art

By ANDRE TRIDON.

### Little Theatres.

Several years ago, while lecturing on Maeterlinck at the University of Rochester, this writer contended that the artistic play of the future would resemble greatly such works as "The Blind," "Interior" or "The Intruder." I also held that our modern theatres were absolutely unsuited for the production of such plays and that the present theatrical technique was hopelessly out of date.

Those who didn't know anything of the productions given at the "Kleines Theater" in Berlin doubted those statements. Yet while experimental performances according to the new technique were organized by the Futurist Society, the papers announced the forthcoming opening of the Little Theatre. This was a year ago. A few weeks ago the organizers of the Princess Theatre made their plans public. While Mr. Ames' little playhouse specialized in works of a more tenuous woof than the Broadway audiences require, the Princess Theatre, which has a capacity of less than 300, will give one-act plays.

Whoever was called a crank for advancing certain ideas and derided for failing to carry them out himself, cannot help feeling elated when his ideas finally prove reasonable and are being carried out. I contended then and contend yet and more than ever that the need of the day is small theatres seating 200 or less, without balcony or boxes, without footlights, headlights or side-lights, presenting brief one-act plays of purely psychological character through a cast which will use no make-up of any sort, will speak in the normal pitch of ordinary conversation, and will omit all gesticulation of the, let us say, Delsarte type. I do not say that the gigantic playhouses should be torn down. Many people there are whose interest will be aroused by the spectacular type of play, for instance, magnificent pageants like *Joseph and His Brethren*, which cannot unroll themselves on a stage smaller than that of the Century Theatre.

On the other hand, there are the people of a reflective turn of mind, who are more easily reached through the auditive than through the optic sense, and who consider the theatre not as a mild dissipation or a first help to slow digestion, but as an artistic

sharpenener for their wits. This class, a growing one, of playgoers are more interested in the visualization of what Maeterlinck termed the "daily pathos" than in slap stick antics or in blood and murder stories.

Maeterlinck, another lost leader, who left us, not "for a handful of silver," but for the gold of Georgette Leblanc's hair, was one of the pioneers of this movement. Before wasting his genius on profitable piffle such as *Mona Vanna*, *the Blue Bird* or *Pelleas and Melisande*, he had formulated a recipe for "static dramas" and he had written several of them. Those small plays, based upon tragic incidents of the daily life of average individuals and in which words count for much less than what the Germans call "Stimmung," mood, could not be given on the ordinary stage. Neither could some of the strong little scenes written by Strindberg, who was really the originator of the new technique and formulated it almost twenty-five years ago. Take his play, "The Stronger." A wife, whispering across the table in a tea room, to the other woman, who remains stolidly silent, her hatred and her scorn. Such a play is bound to prove ridiculous and incredible if given on a large stage.

Take Wedekind's *Der Kammersänger*, or *Mit allen Hunden Gehetzt*. Take Bataille's *The Dream of a Night of Love*. Take the many short dialogues written by Tristan Bernard, or in this country by Edith Wharton. Gripping little tales without any outward action, in which the characters suffer and do not reveal their suffering through any gesticulation, but through a word, a syllable, a facial contraction. What would become of those plays on a huge stage seventy feet wide, gaping on to an auditorium half a block deep? No subtlety, no fine delineation will get across the footlights of such an absurd showhouse. Everything must be reiterated, magnified, made obvious. Gestures must underscore certain thoughts, certain words, or the gallery gods will be left behind in the race. Allowances must be made for the dull bourgeois or the listless giggler with fluffy hair. Bourgeois and fluffy angels should be given the dramatic entertainment they need and like. The discerning few, however, are crushed under tons of brooding ennui at such performances. The man who appreciates Whistler in painting cannot very well stomach Charles Klein's melodramas; whoever has reached the Rodin level in sculpture, the Strauss level in music, cannot sit through any of the tommyrot supplied by Augustus Thomas, Paul Armstrong and other manufacturers of theatrical goods.



This is why side by side with the playhouse seating 2,000 people we must have the playhouse seating 200.

Progress in art and in science assumes, to quote the great esthetician Kandinsky, the form of a pyramid. Pioneers and pioneer art are at the apex of the pyramid, the mob is at the base. Nor are the pioneers in touch with the mob. When a scientist discovers a new metal, little good would be accomplished by proclaiming his discovery on the market place. He informs a handful of his peers in science of the existence of the new body, and they in turn pass it on to the practical men who translate the discovery into terms of general usefulness.

The theatrical art is a backward art, or at least has remained a backward one, for the reason that the only element considered by producers is the mob. If chemists only discovered things the mob can readily buy, if painters or sculptors worked only for the mob, progress would have to wait until the mob has had a chance to raise its esthetic level. While the mob will eventually insist on either being given that chance or on taking it, there is no reason why art should impose upon itself limitations which are imposed arbitrarily upon the mass of human beings by capitalism. These masses, once freed of their fetters, will catch up with the most daring innovators. In the meanwhile progress must be brought about by a minority, or by minorities, and the small theatre will serve several ends. It will give the advanced minority the intellectual diet it requires, and it will facilitate certain experiments from which the majority will derive much intellectual benefit. Finally the small theatre is the only key to intellectual stage realism, the only legitimate form of dramatic art for the pioneers and those in touch with the pioneers.

#### A "Wild Man" Explains Himself.

There was at the exhibition of the Independents a canvass signed Wassily Kandinsky, which more than any Cubist or Futurist work distressed the visitor. It represents nothing in particular. Daubs of color, green, grey, pink. Something in the center of the painting had a remote likeness to either an umbrella's frame or a watermelon. And it was entitled "Improvisation." Fortunately Kandinsky is not only a painter but a forceful, lucid writer, and his book, "Das Geistige in der Kunst," gives us a key to the recondite meaning of his pictorial work.

If the viewing of "Improvisation" justified the hasty in doubting Kandinsky's good faith, the perusal of his book on the intel-

lectual element in art suffices to reveal one of the most painstaking, conscientious estheticians of the present day.

This generation is not likely to understand, or rather to feel, Kandinsky's canvasses, for he has forged too far ahead of us. He realizes the fact and begs us to be patient. I cited in a previous article the pitiful case of Bellini doubting Wagner's sanity and honesty. Kandinsky reminds us in a foot note of Weber's unfortunate attitude to Beethoven. To the author of *Der Freischütz*, the Master's Seventh Symphony was proof of his dementia. "Beethoven is now ripe for the madhouse," he wrote.

If I insist on examples drawn from the musical art it is because music has advanced further than painting, though in the same direction. There was a time when almost every composition affected the form of a dance tune. Italian operas (remember *Il Trovatore*) were built on polkas, waltzes, mazurkas, etc. The French school introduced the plain melodic phrase; Wagner, his leitmotifs and their symphonic combinations; the modern school, Debussy, Reger, Strauss have discarded dance tunes, melodies and leitmotifs. These composers express nothing but successions of moods through sound combinations as seemingly unrelated and fleeting as moods are. Their only principle is a blind obedience to what Kandinsky calls "die innere Notwendigkeit," the inner urge. The musical composition of to-day is designated nowadays, owing to our insufficient vocabulary, as a tone poem, we say it is full of color, certain phrases have a clear relief or are clean cut. The terminology of poetry, painting, sculpture, engraving is drawn upon; a clear symptom that the arts can hardly ever be separated. In fact, we have no definite word to designate a modern musical composition.

Kandinsky now proposes that painters discard all the traditional forms and the traditional technique of painting, even as musicians have discarded the traditional types of composition and traditional harmony. They must obey "the inner urge," whatever its promptings may be, and only transfer to the canvas the colors and color schemes they feel, regardless of what the result is to be.

After all, isn't this the origin of every powerful painting, from the "Night Watch" to Matisse's "Red Panel"? The artist remembers primarily a striking combination of colors and nuances, and to communicate his feeling to the layman plays off those colors on some scene, full of human figures and action in the case of an older painter, indicated by sober, simple lines in the case of a modern. As progress in all arts has made for the

elimination of detail (we no longer write Iliads but note subtle moods in twenty lines, we no longer write Pamelas in seven volumes but sketches of life in ten pages), can we not foresee the day when suggestion will be all in painting, as it is now in music, as it almost is in poetry?

What we appreciate most in a work of art is powerful self-expression, personality. Kandinsky's theory offers to the pictorial ego a free field. Will not the artist's personality, expressed through such a medium, remain a closed book to the beholder? By no means! No concert-goer could mistake a Debussy motive for a Strauss motive. One element in painting is eternal: the intrinsic significance of colors. Yellow will always remain the warm, luminous, earthy color; blue the restful color which in its deeper shades may express a superhuman woe, in its lighter, indifference and coldness; red the irritating violent color, etc. We shall also have the lines of motion, centripetal and centrifugal, color contrasts as between white and black, yellow and blue, evident to all in their primary meaning.

Have we ever pondered over what constitutes the beauty of a sunset, especially after the sun has sunk under the horizon? If the sky be cloudless and the landscape between us and the horizon unobstructed by any natural objects, what have we to behold but a series of color layers running from red to green and grey above the horizon, from red to brown and grey below the horizon.

For thousands of years the world has been admiring the kind of painting Kandinsky wishes us to produce. Only Nature painted it, and we have grown so abnormal that we cannot even recognize in man's handiwork the beauty which stares at us from everywhere in the physical world.

---

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

The Lyric Year, a collection of one hundred poems submitted in competition for \$1,000 in cash prizes offered by Ferdinand Earle; 316 pp. Mitchell Kennerley, New York. \$2.00.

Antor: Pannekeok, Marxism and Darwinism, translated by Nathan Weiser; 58 pp. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. Ten cents.

Joseph E. Cohen, Socialism For Students; 153 pp. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. Fifty cents.

T. Everett Harre, The Eternal Maiden; 279 pp. Mitchell Kennerley, New York. \$1.20.

Louise Stevens Bryant, School Feeding—Its History and Practice at Home and Abroad; 345 pp. J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia and London. \$1.50.