JULY 1920

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

"PROFITEERS"

W. JETT LAUCK

THE DEPARTMENT OF "LAW AND ORDER"

WHAT ABOUT HUNGARY?

LABOR CONVENTIONS

ITALIAN SOCIALISM

Contents

"PROFITEERS"
W. Jett Lauck.....Page 49

WHAT ABOUT HUNGARY?
Eugene S. Bagger.....Page 53

EXILES
Ida O'Neil.....Page 57

"THE INDUSTRY IS OURS"
Evans Clark.....Page 59

ITALIAN SOCIALISM
C. M. Panunzio.....Page 62

EDITORIAL NOTES
The Department of "Law and Order." H. W. L.....Page 66
The Governor's Veto.
W. H. C. .....Page 72
The Candidate in Denim.
W. H. C. .....Page 73
Kate Richards O'Hare.
W. H. C. .....Page 74
Early German Returns.
H. W. L. .....Page 75

"JIM-CROWED"
William C. Pickens.....Page 75

PENN. LABOR FORGES AHEAD
A. Epstein .....Page 77

BOOK REVIEW
Hands off Mexico by John Kenneth Turner .....Page 81

Our Contributors

EUGENE S. BAGGER. Of the N. Y. *Tribune;* contributor to *The Nation,* etc.

EVANS CLARK. Director of The Labor Bureau; formerly instructor in government at Princeton University. First Vice-President of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society.

A. EPSTEIN. Member of the Pennsylvania Commission on Old Age Pensions; author of books on this subject and on the negro problem in Pittsburgh. Secretary of Educational Committee of the Penn. Federation of Labor.

W. JETT LAUCK. Economic expert for the Railway Brotherhoods; associate professor of Political Economy, Washington and Lee University 1905-1908. Managing expert and consulting statistician, Commission on Industrial Relations 1913-1915. Member of staff of Moody's Analyses of Railroad Investments and Manual of Public Finance 1915. Co-author of *Conditions of Labor in American Industries,* etc.

IDA O'NEIL. Assistant professor of Romance Languages, Western Reserve University.

C. M. PANUNZIO. Director of the Immigration Bureau, Interchurch World Movement.

WILLIAM C. PICKENS. Field secretary. Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. IX. JULY 1920 No. 2

"Profiteers"

W. Jett Lauck

LEXICOGRAPHERS tell us that some fifteen hundred words have been coined and added to the English language as a result of the world war. One of these new words stands before the American people, at this juncture, emblazoned in letters of fire. It is both a noun and a verb. Everybody is using it. We apply it, or its derivatives, to the individual with a bit of envy, perhaps, but with more of contempt and not a little of bitterness and hatred. Not infrequently we couple with it an expletive. Occasionally it becomes a fighting word. Everybody knows just what it means, but as yet an authoritative definition is lacking.

It is the word, "profiteer."

One of these days, in the fulness of time and in the wisdom of the Congress of these United States, we may have an exact legal definition of this word. Meanwhile, and until the men who make the dictionaries catch up with their job, we can only struggle along, using the word according to our own lights and with due regard to the consequences, secure, however, in the certainty that there is such a thing as a profiteer, that there are men and corporations who do profiteer, and that profiteering has been and is rampant in the land.

For that is the inevitable and undeniable conclusion arrived at after an inquiry into the causes of the abnormal economic conditions now prevailing in this country. Industrial and social unrest permeate the national organism. There is a stress and strain in the daily life of a vast majority of the people that is almost unendurable. At the bottom of this situation—as the fundamental cause of all the economic ills that plague us—we find high prices, and for these high prices there is one outstanding cause—the greed of the profiteer, individual and corporate, that will not be satisfied with normal, legitimate returns on capital investment and business enterprise, but demands and exacts profits which President Wilson has characterized as "unconscionable." A few weeks ago a Senator from a Western State told the Senate and the country that the United States had become a veritable "robbers' roost" for the profiteers, and more recently a New England Senator, speaking of the same question, declared:

"Conditions have grown worse and it seems that a band of robbers infest the land. Combines and trusts, by tacit if not actual agreement, hold their products for constantly increasing gain and ruthlessly exploit the buyers."

One of these Senators is a Republican; the other is a Democrat. Probably the only thing they have in common is their opinion of profiteers and profiteering, and their realization of the immediate and acute cause of what one of them terms, "this spirit of unrest, discontent, and dissatisfaction, this growing conviction of the alleged incompetency of our institutions to eradicate the notorious abuses that have grown up under the cover of the doctrine of the equality of opportunity, which exists in the ranks of all classes."

A Survey of Industries

A survey of essential industries and commodities, together with supporting data and

exhibits, recently submitted to the Railway Labor Board, covered several thousand typewritten pages. Obviously the limitations of a magazine article preclude anything but a résumé of that study and a presentation of its more striking features. At the outset it should be stated that all the evidence contained in the survey is of an entirely authoritative character, predicated on the financial statements of the corporations themselves; on the Federal Income Tax returns; on the investigations of governmental bodies, such as the Tariff Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; on various reports, statements, and studies by official agencies and economists closely in touch with public and corporate affairs, and on the financial manuals of Poor and Moody. The major points developed by this survey are:

That the combined corporations of the country earned in net profits approximately $4,800,000,000 more per year during the years 1916-1917-1918 than during the corresponding three-year pre-war period.

That this excess of profit over and above what these corporations were satisfied with during the pre-war years *constitutes a profiteering tax of $240 per year for every family in the country.*

That for the four years 1916-17-18-19, corporate excess profits, not inclusive of royalties, rents, excessive salaries, stock dividends or any other form of compensation, cost each family a total of $1,500, or more than one-fifth of the average total income of those families for that period.

That in two industries alone, namely iron and steel and coal, two billion dollars of net profit in excess of the pre-war average were exacted during the three war years, constituting virtually a levy of $20 upon every man, woman, and child in the United States;

That 2,030 corporations earned in net profits over 100 per cent per year on their capital stock during the three war years, that 5,724 showed net profits of more than 50 per cent, and that 20,000 earned from 20 to 30 per cent;

That the average profits during the three war years of all the corporations in the United States with net incomes of $1,000,000 or more approximated 24 per cent per year on their capital stock;

That these increased profits, not due to increased production, meant that this great group of corporations, controlling products essential to daily life, made profits sufficient to replace the entire value of their capital stock within a period of slightly over four years;

That the above disclosures do not reveal completely the extent of corporate profiteering, since corporations have been, and are, utilizing various devices to conceal the full measure of their earnings, such as excessive deductions for depletion and depreciation, payment of astoundingly excessive salaries and grossly fictitious royalties and rents;

That with respect to coal, the financial statements of the coal corporations themselves show a clear profit of more than one billion dollars during 1916-17-18-19, the profit margin to the operator showing a larger proportional increase than any other item in the price of coal paid by the consumer.

That since the armistice the only change has been an abatement in the gigantic sums accruing to corporations which monopolize the military requirements of the country at war, such as iron and steel, coal, copper, metal products, and meats; but since the cessation of the demand for war supplies, industries engaged in the production of clothing, food, household supplies, and other staple necessaries of life have exploited the public to an extent even greater than during the years 1916-17-18; that the added toll of profiteering in absolute necessities since the armistice, reckoned in terms of net profits over and above the extortionate profits exacted in the war years, has amounted to at least twenty per cent in those industries for which profit figures for 1919 are now available; that first-hand evidence or profiteering is accentuated by the huge undivided profits which are flowing out in surplus stock dividends following the recent Supreme Court

decision. This indicates that profiteering already revealed is only a fraction of the real extent of profiteering since profits were held in reserve for a favorable moment of distribution.

Examples of Profiteering

Passing from the general to the specific, we find in the cotton industry, for example, that in the staple commodity gray sheeting, which is a basic fabric, the war-time profits of the manufacturers were increased 748 per cent over the pre-war mill margin, while the retailer's war profit was 464 per cent greater than his former margin. In the case of blue denim, which supplies the overall uniform of labor, the profits of the manufacturers during the war years were six and one-half times as large as in 1910. In producing the material, making and marketing the overall, the mill profit increased 557 per cent, the manufacturer's profit increased 250 per cent, and the retailer's 233 per cent.

Take the ordinary suit of clothes, made of medium priced wool that sold for $25 in 1910 and now retails for $65, and we find that profits are absorbing $27.64 of the price paid by the consumer. The mill profit on the cloth has increased 365 per cent, the manufacturer's profit on making the suit, 255 per cent, and the retailer's profit, 141 per cent. The largest woolen manufacturing company in America increased its annual net income from an average of $1,600,000 in the pre-war years to an average of nearly $9,000,000 during 1916-17-18. *The Department of Justice recently charged that this corporation's profits for the first quarter of the present year, 1920, were within one-twentieth of its entire capital stock.*

Similar data on men's shoes disclose that the packer's profits on hides increased 475 per cent, the tanner's profit, 221 per cent, the shoe manufacturer's profit, 54.2 per cent, and the retailer's, 102.2 per cent.

Turning from something to wear to something to eat, we find our attention arrested immediately by the situation with respect to sugar. My investigation shows that the tribute exacted from the American people this year by the sugar profiteers will exceed $600,000,000, at the most conservative estimate. Other investigators have placed the figure at over $1,000,000,000, and if the price of sugar continues to soar, as predicted, and reaches 30 cents, or even 35 to 40 cents per pound, the larger estimate will be too small by half. This means that every family in the United States this year will pay a tax of from $30 to $50, or conceivably $100, over and above a legitimate profit to everybody concerned for this one food essential. *Sugar which has been selling at from 22 to 25 cents per pound could be sold at 11½ cents if the producer and retailer were satisfied with reasonable profits.* Such were the figures arrived at in my investigation, and it is interesting to note that Mr. Herbert Hoover, former Food Administrator, in his testimony before the Congressional Committee investigating the sugar problem, stated it as his opinion that a fair price for sugar at this time would not exceed 12 cents per pound.

Beet sugar producers made excess profits, and income tax returns in 1917 showed that they had earned 52.28 per cent on their capital stock, 59.92 per cent on their capital actually invested, and 45.53 per cent on their capital actually invested *after all taxes had been deducted.* The corresponding figures for cane sugar producers were 27.28 per cent, 238.84 per cent, and 191.04 per cent. These amazing earnings were made when the wholesale price of sugar was 7.7 cents and the producer's margin ranged from .9 of one cent to 2.2 cents per pound. One grows dizzy in contemplation of what their earnings must be at present sugar prices!

Labor Not the Cause

Now, resting the case as to the existence of profiteers and profiteering on the foregoing presentation, we come to another phase of the problem. Have high prices been due to and necessitated by increased labor costs? The plain, unvarnished facts are these: Wage increases have been a result and not a cause of high prices; wage increases have not kept pace with price increases; price increases

have been out of all proportion to wage increases, and labor, save in isolated instances, has not profiteered either during or since the war. It is indubitably true that increased labor cost has been the ever-ready alibi of the profiteer, and it is equally true that wage advances have affected prices to a certain degree, but it is the ascertained fact so invariably as to constitute it a rule that *labor cost increases are multiplied four or five times by the profiteer in passing them on to the public.* Take an instance so recent and so glaring as to convince the most skeptical. Bituminous coal miners were given a wage increase of 27 per cent, effective April 1. This amounted to 40 cents per ton. Immediately the price of coal at the pit-heads in the Virginia field which had been $2.35 and $2.75 was jumped to $4.35 and $4.75—an increase exactly five times the added labor cost!

Take the blue denim in labor's overalls. While the mill profit was increasing 557 per cent, the manufacturer's profit 250 per cent, and the retailer's profit 233 per cent, the mill labor cost advanced only 100 per cent and the manufacturing labor cost 133 per cent. The increased labor cost in a pound of sugar is not to exceed 2 cents. Labor gets 15 cents of the increased price of a pair of shoes selling at $8.50, while the profits of manufacturers and merchants absorb $2.75 of the additional cost to the consumer. And so we might continue through every essential industry always with the same result.

"But," protests the public, "what about this vicious circle—raise wages and you have higher prices, and then you have to raise wages again, only to get still higher prices, and so on, heaven help us?"

The vicious-circle illustration is not half bad, but an examination of the evidence discloses the fact that the circle begins and ends with the profiteer. When the United States entered the war, production of all commodities except war munitions immediately fell off. This was due to the conversion of mills and plants into factories to turn out essential war equipment and supplies, and to the removal of workers from their peace-time occupations either to the munition mills or to the ranks of our fighting forces. At once the law of supply and demand got in its work, and producers and middlemen raised prices because there was a reduced and limited supply of the necessaries of life.

Wage earners, as soon as they could make their economic demands felt, thereupon received wage increases so that they might in a measure cope with the advance in the cost of living. This meant increased labor costs to the producers and middlemen, and they instantly advanced prices again. Almost without exception, these price advances were out of all proportion to the increase in labor costs. This necessitated further wage increases to labor, and we find the vicious circle established, with the profiteers invariably in command of the situation.

As soon as the government could get around to it, war-time agencies such as the War Industries Board and the Fuel and Food Administrations were created and were able to regulate prices to an appreciable degree, but upon the signing of the armistice "big business" began a concerted campaign against the continuance of these regulatory agencies, with the result that they were speedily discontinued and the public was left completely at the mercy of organized capital.

The man who cries "Fire!" is not always to be denounced as an alarmist. Not infrequently his warning serves to avert a disastrous conflagration. Surely, therefore, in the light of easily obtainable evidence which marks the present situation as the gravest crisis the nation has confronted since the Union was threatened in 1860, an admonitory word is permissible. Indeed, this warning as to the machinations and evil practices of the profiteers, which has corrected much of misinformation and misapprehension in the public mind, has already produced beneficent results as evidenced by recent price-cutting movements by producers and middlemen in all parts of the country.

However, the public, once aroused, should not be lulled to security by what is manifestly but a spasm of reform on the part of

the profiteers, superinduced by a fear that their ill-gotten gains may be taken away from them, and should see to it that drastic legislation be enacted to regulate and control prices so that the world may never again witness such a sorry spectacle as that presented by the orgy of war-time and post-war profit pyramiding.

What About Hungary?

Eugene S. Bagger

IS there, or is there not, a White Terror in Hungary?

The question is more practically relevant than it seems. It is not one of mere nomenclature. There is a vital difference from the point of view of democracy (I almost feel I ought to apologize for reharnessing the poor worked-to-death word) whether the Horthy regime in Hungary represents merely a constitutional reaction, such as is enjoyed by other countries, or whether it is a murderous counter-revolutionary military dictatorship like the recent rule of General Mannerheim in Finland. One might argue that the Hungarians ought to be left to themselves to work out their own brand of salvation. The doctrine of non-intervention in Hungary still seems to have its adherents among enlightened people who refuse to be embarrassed even by the coincidence of their position with that of the Lloyd George government and the *Morning Post*. But in private life even a doctrinaire liberal is likely to draw the line between a family quarrel and a family massacre. The policy of *laissez-faire* has its beauties, but it ought to stop short at murder.

Reaction or Terror?

In other words, the theoretical question: Is the present Hungarian government just "plain" reaction, or is it a "White Terror"? resolves itself into the practical alternative: Shall the forces of democracy—liberals, radicals, socialists, labor—approve of a policy of non-interference in Hungarian affairs, or shall they urge drastic action—diplomatic, economic, even—*horribile dictu*—military, to stop a condition that must be stopped whatever the cost?

I believe if a canvass were taken as it should be taken among the Hungarian refugees in Vienna, where reside most of the still unassassinated leaders of Magyar radicalism and social democracy, the decision would favor intervention. Nor would this decision be reached because men like Kunfi, Garami, Boehm, Ronai, Buchinger, Weltner—all old-time leaders of Hungarian trade unionism and social democracy, engineers of the revolution of October, 1918, and moderators of the communist upheaval in March, 1919—have any illusions left about the Entente Powers, who alone could effect such intervention. But even the most punctilious seventeenth-century Puritan, if attacked by a mad dog, would hardly stop to interrogate his prospective rescuer as to his views on transubstantiation. The thing needful is to kill the mad dog of Magyar junker terrorism. Discussion may—and would—be resumed afterwards.

So much for the Magyar socialist point of view. Americans and Englishmen who begin to tremble violently at the very sound of the word intervention, might well take their cue from Commander Kenworthy, Liberal M. P. from Central Hull, who, on March 22 last, urged in the Commons drastic action at Budapest "in view of the fact that the British government is responsible for the setting up of the present regime."

I am aware that the initial question: Is there a White Terror in Hungary? is answered in the negative by several high authorities. As first of these I shall mention Mr. Cecil Harmsworth, Under-Secretary of Foreign Affairs in the Lloyd George government. On March 22 Mr. J. C. Wedgwood,

Labor member for Newcastle-under-Lyme, asked the Prime Minister in the Commons:

"Whether he had yet received any information as to the trial of former ministers of the late Soviet government in Hungary on charges of murder and forgery; whether every member of the former Soviet government is charged with murder in 200 cases, which is the number said to have been killed or executed under the Soviet government; whether they are charged with forgery for printing paper money; whether some of these ministers only held purely technical and scientific posts and had no say in general policy; and whether the government would take any steps to save the lives of these men."

Mr. Harmsworth replied for the government as follows:

"Under the Soviet government in Hungary there were no regular ministers, the administration being carried on by so-called people's commissaries of whom there were upwards of fifty. According to the reports received from the British High Commissioner at Budapest the principal commissaries escaped. Of the remainder some fourteen were in prison. They are charged with murder, robbery, forgery, extortion by threat, sedition, teaching immorality in schools, and other crimes. The number and nature of the charges in each case varies with the information in possession of the authorities. The prisoners are all charged with forging paper money, which I am advised is a true and legal charge. While some of them may have held purely technical and scientific posts, I am not in a position to form an opinion as to the weight which any particular people's commissary may or may not have had in general policy. As regards the last part of the question, I can only say once more that the British High Commissioner in Budapest has instructions to exercise a moderating influence, and is doing so, but that it is no part of his functions to interfere with the ordinary course of judicial proceedings in Hungary, and, indeed, the Hungarian government are themselves debarred by the constitution from interfering directly with the administration of justice."

It does not take much penetration to see that Mr. Harmsworth's answer contains (1) admission that the charges implied by Mr. Wedgwood are true; (2) a plea for non-interference in the internal affairs of Hungary. What the answer, on the other hand, does not contain is a list of the few hundred instances in which the British and other Allied representatives in Budapest interfered with judicial proceedings and other governmental functions under the communist regime.

Under the Soviets

According to the statement of the White Attorney-General, the number of persons killed in Hungary in the Soviet period was 224. Of these ten to fifteen were innocent victims of individual Red officials and soldiers. Twenty to twenty-five were sentenced to death by revolutionary tribunals, some of them for counter-revolutionary activities, most of them for ordinary crimes. But the total of "murdered" victims also includes the sixty-two peasants who fell in battle near Dunapataj, where a counter-revolutionary force of 3,000 men, armed with cannon and machine guns, was defeated by Red troops. On June 24, 1919, a group of armed counter-revolutionaries succeeded in occupying the central telephone exchange in Budapest. Soviet troops attacked them. A regular battle ensued, with casualties on both sides. The nine White soldiers who fell in the engagement are now put down in the official White statistics as "murdered," and each of the people's commissaries is held responsible.

The White Terror

This is the way the charge of murder works in the courts of Horthyfied Hungary. Charges of robbery are brought against every official who participated in the socialization of theaters, museums, newspapers, or industrial enterprises. Thus Bela Reinitz, one of the best musical critics and composers of Young Hungary, an artist and idealist of the highest order, has been sentenced for robbery to ten months' imprisonment. He was active in the socialization of the Royal Opera House. Louis Magyar, a prominent journalist, was sentenced to ten years for incitement to sedition and robbery. In his case the robbery charge was based on his participation in socializing the assets of Budapest newspapers. It should be added that Mr. Charles Huszar, head of the government that prosecuted Magyar for this "robbery," had received from the communist government a monthly salary

of 2,000 crowns out of the very funds socialized by Magyar and his associates. This sort of thing is described by Mr. Harmsworth as "the ordinary course of judicial proceedings."

Admiral Horthy

The notion that there is a White Terror in Hungary is indignantly denied by Admiral Nicholas Horthy, elected by the National Assembly to the position of Regent of Hungary.[1] No day is considered well spent by him unless a denial or two of the White Terror is issued. To mention a specific instance: early in March he declared before the representative of the *Chicago Tribune* that there was no White Terror in Hungary.

Just one word, in passing, as to his record in the World War. He was the Austrian admiral who, on July 21, 1918, issued a statement urging the destruction of Venice by bombardment. Ships and airplanes under his orders actually shelled Italian coast cities. He also had ordered scores of malcontent Jugoslav sailors of the Austrian navy massacred at Cattaro. Nevertheless, his name does not appear on the list of war criminals whose surrender was demanded by the Allies, though plain chicken thieves and table silver expropriators are so listed.

Here are three well-authenticated statements of Horthy. When he entered Budapest in last November at the head of his troops, he declared: "As to the social democrats and trade unionists, I shall have no negotiations with them. I order, and they obey." He also declared: "I shall clean this city of the Jews." Not long ago he was told that Cservenka, a secretary of the Social Democratic party, was kidnapped by White officers. The gentleman in Horthy could not help exclaiming: "Well, what of it, he was just a rotten communist!"

Murder of Editor

On or about February 15 Bela Somogyi, editor-in-chief of the social democratic daily *Nepszava*, a bitterly anti-communist paper, said to a friend: "I know I shall die an unnatural death, and I no longer trouble about that. The terrible thing is to know that my eyes will be knocked out, my head smashed, and my body full of wounds caused by stabs and shots." These were not the bad dreams of a hypochondriac. They were the explicit threats received by Somogyi in a letter notifying him that the White officers had marked him for destruction.

On the evening of February 17 Somogyi, accompanied by his assistant editor, Bela Bacso, was going from the *Nepszava* office to his home a few hundred yards away. Around the corner the "death-car" was waiting. It was nine o'clock at night (says the Budapest correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*) when they kidnapped and carried him to the Danube. There the murderers carried out their work. Stones were put into his pocket. Next day the body was found in a shallow part of the river. The corpse of Somogyi's companion, Bacso, also was recovered.

The news of the murder horrified Budapest. There was consternation in the circles of the Huszar government. There was no telling to what length the terrorists might go. Premier Huszar rose in the Assembly, deathly pale, and declared that he would resign unless the assassins were apprehended within twenty-four hours.

The assassins were not apprehended within twenty-four hours, and Premier Huszar did not resign on that account. But Regent Horthy ordered a strict inquiry. Two officers connected with the so-called Ostenburg detachment of the White army were arrested under suspicion. The next day they were set free. A few days later the governmental papers issued a communique to the effect that "the assassination of Somogyi and Bacso can be traced to communist circles." Why should the communists have Somogyi murdered? Because he advocated social-democratic cooperation in national reconstruction.

This allegation was published on February 29 in the *Budapesti Hirlap*, among other

[1] As to the election of the National Assembly and the legal background of the Horthy government in general, see my article on "Admiral Horthy, Dictator," in the *New Republic* for March 17.

papers. The *Budapesti Hirlap,* however, and the other Budapest newspapers have failed, to date, to publish the following document brought to light on March 6 by Frank Göndör, editor of *Az Ember,* the Vienna organ of exiled Hungarian social democrats. The document is an order from the Hungarian High Command (Admiral Horthy's headquarters) to the Ostenburg detachment, also known as the Hungarian Rifle Detachment. It runs:

"Strictly Confidential
319/VI.b.F.V.

"To Hungarian Rifle Detachment Headquarters.

"It has come to the notice of the High Command that the leaders of trade unions and the editors and editorial and business employes of the *Nepszava* are in close touch with Vienna circles.

"This detachment is ordered to maintain a stricter control of these individuals, and in case of necessity (to procure documents, etc.) to take the most appropriate action.

"Budapest, February 13, 1920.

"Janki HARTMANN."

This order was issued on February 13 from Horthy's headquarters. On February 15 Somogyi received the letter announcing the prospective fact and manner of his death. On February 17 Somogyi was murdered—as all Budapest knows, by the officers of the self-same Ostenburg detachment which had been ordered by Admiral Horthy to take "in case of necessity" the "most appropriate action."

Other Massacres

One Charles Tormasi, commander of a Red battalion under communism, was imprisoned at Siofok when Admiral Horthy had his headquarters there, prior to his entry to Budapest. Tormasi himself missed execution by a narrow chance. Later he escaped. He publishes his experiences in the March 6 number of *Az Ember.* Among other things he relates:

"From Veszprem 41 men were escorted to Siofok and here taken over by Lieutenant Leszay. The sergeant in charge of the transport obtained a receipt from Leszay as follows:

"'41 prisoners received and forwarded.

"'Leszay, Lieut.'

"Across the receipt was written in blue pencil:

"'Approved: Horthy.'

"I saw this receipt with my own eyes. All the 41 men were stabbed to death by Leszay and two gendarmes in the Csirkes forest. The victims were compelled to lick each other's blood. We other prisoners had to dig their grave. While we were doing this, Admiral Horthy arrived on horseback and spat and swore at the prisoners. Many of the victims were still alive when swept into the grave.

"There was another massacre in the Csirkes forest. 112 men were mown down by machine gun fire, after they had been compelled to dig their own graves. From the nearby cornfields the dogs dragged human legs to the villages. The White officers murdered 567 men at Siofok."[2]

Az Ember publishes, still in the March 6 number, an Order of the Day, issued "strictly confidential" by Admiral Horthy's headquarters, "to be read before the reliable Christian officers of the armed force." These are called upon "to prevent the agitation of the destructive elements, encouraged by the victories of the Russian Bolsheviki, and to take undelayed and vigorous action as demanded by the emergency." Then the order proceeds:

"As soon as the riot alarm is sounded, the officers' detachments must turn out with the greatest possible speed and must, at the first command, use their firearms. The customary shot in the air must be omitted, and the volley must be fired straight into the crowd.

"The firing must continue ruthlessly, the heap of corpses should not deter anybody. You must fire away in the knowledge that you are confronted, not by human beings, but by wild beasts.

"Commanders must enforce this order ruthlessly. Whoever hesitates in or refuses its execution, must be cut to pieces."

Drawing the Sword

Is there a White Terror in Hungary, justifying a demand, on the part of liberals, radicals, and socialists in America and Western Europe, that action of some sort be taken at once to save the human and cultural values that still can be saved?

The above documents (the series could easily be trebled in length) should be helpful in forming an opinion. But probably the question of intervention will soon be solved by the Hungarian White government itself. General mobilization is quietly going on, men

[2] Further revelations of the Siofok horrors, and other White Terror documents, are published in *The Nation* for April 3.

from twenty to fifty are called to the colors, the "war of liberation" against the victorious neighbors is being prepared for. The mad terrorists of Budapest have deliberately drawn the sword; they seem insistent on the fulfilment of the Gospel's warning.

Exiles

Ida O'Neil

ABOVE stairs at the Café Royal . . . alive again after the years of war like some dreadful resurrection of the flesh; alive again in its forced and awful gaiety—the cheap, dragging music, champagne (not so cheap, 60 francs a bottle), the usual Americans, noisily drunk, the horde of women—women à la Toulouse-Lautrec, dark eyes in a mask of paint, pathetically old, pathetically young.

Our Russians enter in a whirlwind; the big banker—pockets still abulge with hundred-franc notes, despite the lost millions; his sister (as organizer of the coöperatives she is still tolerated by the government of soviets) now on her way to England with the Russian commission; a Kerensky minister with the beard and stoop of a Lincoln; a little man in spectacles who goes by the pseudonym of Odanin even when in France.

A cold, bright wind—from the steppes, perhaps, or the north seas?, or merely from the open door?—sweeps through the low room, scattering the fog, almost palpable . . . mingled odors of scent, tobacco, and flesh. The orchestra abandons the *joli rève d'amour* for the savage rhythm of a Georgian chant. They play with enthusiasm. The banker keeps time with an energetic hand.

"I taught them myself . . . it took two whole nights," he explains proudly.

The little man is my neighbor at the table. His pale near-sighted eyes protrude slightly behind the pince-nez. He might be of any nation—even American. He is carefully groomed. His hands are exquisite but quite evidently have not been washed since his arrival this morning from London.

His French is careful . . . his English only a trifle less labored. . . . "Money is important. However, we must not exaggerate . . . or we forget other things. I forgot. . . . I used to make collections—beautiful things, for myself—tapestries, editions, miniatures, porcelains; precious stones even, though these were not art. They interested me less. I had specialists from France, from England, from China, to help me. I loved my collections.

"I was like Job. I was happy, but, you see, I did not think. Bolshevism took my collections, my money, everything. Bolshevism taught me to think. I have learned . . . there is a larger life here on earth. And afterward . . . this gold on your hand, this gold upon your arm . . . you cannot take them with you. Even here—what can you carry in your hands? So little! Only the thought of beautiful things . . . in your heart. So all men are rich. Today, too, you are rich only to be alive. So I say, I have lost the beautiful things that were mine. But I live. I can begin again. I can begin a new life. It is like being born. I am happy.

"Only . . . here in Paris, I cannot go into the shops. I see jade. I see porcelain. I say, 'I had such a one, and such—' You see, I loved my collections. Here in this world, it is hard to say, 'I had—and I have not. . . .'

"In life we need two things—religion, a religion, and art. In England, in your country, here in France, art is for the élite. It is the luxury of the grand seigneur. Your art, your artist, is the young woman entretenue by an old millionaire. In Russia, art is born of the people; it lives for the people. To us, the artist is everything. He is the

leader. We are at his feet. We do not say, 'Yesterday there dined with us a Rothschild, a Denisoff"; we say—'Think! we had with us a Gorki, a Strawinsky, a Stanislowsky, a Bloch!' Even now in Russia life is everywhere made easy for the artist—easier than for the workman. . . .

"Now I stay in England. There, I know, I am a 'poor foreigner,' a barbarian. But I understand my country. I feel, you will pardon me, like a prince among savages. I would like to be of help to *them!*

"Let me tell you in other words. This is excellent wine we are drinking. It is bottled wine. In Russia, we have wonderful wine, but no bottles. In England, in Germany, in France, there are bottles. I do not speak of their wine. It is good wine, but above all, they have botttles. I say, give us bottles. Of what use is good wine without bottles? We have the best wine in the world, but it is in the streets!

"Eighty-seven per cent of my people are illiterate. . . .

"I worked for fifteen years to build up a great museum, a great gallery of art. It was my only real creation. It has gone down with the other things that were mine. The work must all be done again. I am ready. But it cannot be the same. There must be education first. Can you indulge your love for Monet, for Picasso, for Cézanne, when the man beside you is ignorant of everything?

"Bolshevism? I will tell you. Up there in the sky, the stars are very beautiful. They are also very high. To reach them we have only our eyes, and the poor instruments made by our hands. The stars of bolshevism are beautiful. They, too, are very high. . . .

"Lenin is a great man, a very great genius. But he is often very much alone. . . . The past has often used doubtful means to accomplish great ends. I do not despair. If you know my people, you can understand bolshevism. It is an extreme—but its source is in the people. It did not come from outside. It was born within the people. It is an ancient voice today articulate. Read Dostöiewsky. He is like a prophecy. . . .

"There are many who do not understand. These may be excellent technicians. They may know cows, pigs, hens, and how animals live under the sea. But they do not know men. They say, 'a religious awakening? amazing, incomprehensible!—a social revolution? extraordinary, impossible!' They do not look before events; they will not look behind. They close their eyes. They do not wish to see. These men never will learn.

"We are living again the first years of Christianity. Society, not the Church, has brought us back to the teachings of Jesus. We meet intolerance, we meet hatred, we meet force and repression. We have our martyrs and our saints. . . .

"Today, even words are actions. The idea is important; numbers are not essential. Two apostles of a thought are much. Four is mighty as a regiment. Christ Himself had only twelve and one was a traitor. . . .

"I was always an idealist in some things. Now I am wholly so. It is a new life. . . . Before I left Russia, twice I was to be shot. Yet I live. I tell you it is wonderful. . . .

"Do you hear the toast of our friend L.? Like myself, he is an exile.

" 'To our return home, not to the old Russia, but to the new—To the day when we, too, may have a share in the work to be done!'

"For we shall return. We still have a country. And you will see, there will be work for all of us . . . for you, too, and not only in Russia, but everywhere in the world!"

Correction

In the June issue of *The Socialist Review*, on page 24, the name of the delegate from Indiana who moved the nomination of Eugene Victor Debs for President on the Socialist Party ticket was erroneously given as *Edward* Henry. It should, of course, have read William H. Henry. A similar error was made on page 85 in the list of the newly elected N. E. C.

"The Industry is Ours"

Evans Clark

"THE industry is ours," said Joseph Schlossberg, Secretary-Treasurer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, addressing their Fourth Biennial Convention, held in Boston from May 5th to 10th.

This phrase marks a new epoch in the American labor movement. It caught the spirit of the Amalgamated convention. A similar spirit characterized the Fifteenth Biennial Convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union held in Chicago at the same time—May 3rd to 15th. The sense of proprietorship in the industry dominated both gatherings.

These two conventions represented some 400,000 workers who make most of the men's and women's clothes manufactured in the United States. What these people think and plan today will constitute the history of the industry tomorrow.

In the case of the Amalgamated this sense of proprietorship in the industry has resulted in a feeling new among American workers: a sense of responsibility for the industry.

"I do not consider labor as outside of industry," said the Amalgamated's president, Sydney Hillman, on one occasion. "It has been kept out, it is true. It has been thrown out by the Garys and others, but sooner or later it will come into its own." Here is expressed the sense of the inherent right and expectation of labor to control industry.

"It is our business to set things straight in the industry," said Secretary Schlossberg, in the same discussion. "It is now our responsibility to establish order in the industry in the place of the chaos created by the employers when they had things their own way. . . . We could not if we would, and we would not if we could, escape responsibility for the industry. The employers will not bring order into it. They had their opportunity for many decades and have not availed themselves of it. . . . We, the organized workers, are a collective body with a oneness of interest that is perfect and complete. Within the past few years we have brought into the industry a degree of order for so short a time that is amazing. Whatever constructive work there is still to be done must be done by us, by our organization." Here is the sense of obligation that, for better or for worse, always comes with proprietorship.

The product of this state of mind was as unique in American labor history as is the state of mind itself. It is expressed in the following resolution which passed the convention after a long and somewhat stormy session.

"Whereas, the two prevailing systems of work in the clothing industry today are piece work and week work, and

"Whereas, the piece work system carries with it overspeeding, which is injurious to the health of the workers and penalizes them for inefficient management, while the week work system permits normal effort and preserves the health of the workers, and

"Whereas, the employers oppose the week work system on the ground that it discourages production, and

"Whereas, the attitude of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America is well known; we oppose over-speeding as well as restraint of output; we advocate normal production and cannot permit the abuse of the protection afforded by the organization for intentional restriction of production below normal, and

"Whereas, the remedy for the situation is a week work system based upon reasonable standards of production; the former will conserve the health of the workers, which is our first consideration, and the latter will regulate output; be it, therefore

"Resolved, that we recommend the week work system with standards of production, and be it further

"Resolved, that the General Executive Board be empowered to inaugurate this system as soon as possible, to determine standards as conditions may require."

Here is one of the most powerful labor organizations in the United States deliberately voting to increase production. It is no won-

der that the foregoing proposal met with opposition on the floor of the convention. The opposition, however, fell to naught before the arguments of Hillman, Schlossberg and the others. The gist of these arguments —their spirit if not their actual expression— was this. The industry is ours: it gives us our livelihood, we depend upon it for our existence, some day we will control it. It would be suicidal to kill the thing on which our lives and hopes depend. We should rather nurse and develop it. Standards of production forced upon us by the bosses for their own advantage are one thing; but standards of production voluntarily established by us to fit ourselves for management and to preserve the industry that we may enjoy the fruits thereof—those are "something else again."

The argument was effective. The resolution was passed by acclamation. The rank and file, as is the custom in the Amalgamated, approved a general principle and left it to the responsible officials to work out the concrete details of its application. The General Executive Board has a task of considerable magnitude before it.

The I. L. G. W. U.

At the International's gathering in Chicago the same sense of the "industry is ours" became articulate in another way. Resolution No. 32, introduced by the delegates from Locals Number 45, 48, 80 and 89, all of New York city, as amended upon recommendation of the Resolutions Committee and passed by the convention, reads as follows:

"Resolved, that in all future agreements the officers of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union should strive to incorporate, if possible, a clause that will provide for a voice of labor in the management of our industry."

Having decreed that the union shall begin to share in the management of the industry, it was appropriate that the union should prepare itself to undertake this management and convince its members and the world that it could do so with efficiency and economy, as well as democracy. A special committee reported to the convention in favor of establishing union-owned factories and retail stores, "in any branch of our industry and in any locality which the General Executive Board shall deem advisable." Among the advantages of this proposal cited by the committee were the following:

"1. Practical knowledge of operating factories in our industries will help us considerably in our disputes with manufacturers in the various contentions with regard to wages, hours, etc., based on practical experience attained through the operation of such shops. . . .

"3. Union-owned shops will supply the market with merchandise required in time of strikes against arbitrary employers, and will give employment to a great number of our workers in times of lock-outs. . . .

"6. The union-owned shop will be the first step towards collective ownership.

"7. Union-owned shops will enable the workers to take part in the management of such shops. . . .

"9. The union shop will demonstrate to the working class and the entire world that the producers themselves can, and logically should, take the place of the present so-called captains of industry in our system."

A Coöperative Bank

The Amalgamated, as well as the International, considered the proposal of coöperative action, but along other lines. One of the high spots of the convention was the debate precipitated by delegate Miller's report of the Committee on Coöperatives. The committee endorsed the action of the General Executive Board in participating in the work of the coöperative movement. (Hillman and Schlossberg attended the Farmer-Labor-Cooperative Conference in Chicago last November, were elected to the committee that arranged the All-American Congress last February, attended that conference and were active in its work.) The committee recommended that the convention direct the General Executive Board "to continue the promotion of coöperative effort as it may see fit," the general understanding being that a cooperative bank should be the first venture in the new field.

Schlossberg made an incisive speech in favor of the report. "It might be a bourgeois view, it might be unrevolutionary, or anything else you might choose to call it, but we

have reached a point where we are dealing with problems that confront us. . . . The point is that every average workingman has some money in the bank. That money is being used by other people. It may be used to finance and fight strikes . . . it may be used in any way that will bring in machinery through which a fight against the organization might be carried on." The committee's recommendations were approved with an ovation.

"One Big Union"

There were other signs of the new epoch at Boston and Chicago than a sense of power and responsibility. There was a great wave of sentiment in both conventions for the One Big Union idea. It is one thing when a small, struggling, revolutionary, propaganda organization talks about industrial unionism. It is quite another matter when two of the largest, most powerful and firmly entrenched labor unions in the country act on the subject of One Big Union, and act along the same lines on the same proposal.

The report of the General Executive Committee to the Boston convention says: "The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America has always stood for one international organization for all the workers in what is commonly known as the needle trades. We are more firmly committed to this principle now than ever before." In a speech before the convention, Hillman said: "The welfare of the workers in every industry and the welfare of the industries themselves demand that they be organized along industrial lines."

These sentiments were crystallized in the following resolution which passed the convention amid great enthusiasm:

"In the matter of the movement inaugurated by organizations of the needle trades for closer affiliation of all organizations involved in those trades, this convention declares that it goes on record as favoring one international for all branches of the needle trades, including the Textile Workers.

"We believe that the situation calls for such a compact organization and hope that it will materialize before long.

"We welcome every move in that direction and direct the General Executive Board to coöperate in the promotion of such movement.

"With reference to the Textile Workers in particular, the General Executive Board shall immediately appoint a committee to meet with a like committee of the Amalgamated Textile Workers in advisory capacity for the purpose of bringing about closer relations between the two organizations, in the hope thereby of being of greater service to the Textile Workers and contributing towards the consummation of one international in the sense above stated."

The report of the I. L. G. W. U. to the Chicago convention came to much the same general conclusion, although it favored a less compact and inclusive organization. "We believe," it reads, "that we have reached the logical stage in our development when it is incumbent on us to take the initial steps for the formation of an alliance of all the unions in the garment trades of America."

The convention unanimously endorsed these views by instructing "the incoming General Executive Board to proceed, immediately after the convention, with the formation of an alliance of all unions of men's and women's garment and cloth-hat gear workers: our International, the Amalgamated, Journeymen Tailors, United Cloth-Hat and Cap Makers, Furriers, Neckwear Workers, and other kindred organizations; each union to reserve its autonomy as before; none of the component parts of this alliance are to interfere in the internal affairs of the others, but they are all to stand together when circumstances should require. The fight of one union should at once become the fight of all the other component organizations."

Both conventions passed resolutions demanding the lifting of the blockade against Soviet Russia and the immediate resumption of trade with the Russian people; and further resolutions demanding the immediate release of political prisoners and condemning the exclusion of the Socialist assemblymen at Albany. Both conventions, amid great enthusiasm, endorsed Eugene V. Debs for the next President of the United States, while the International expressed its "sympathy" with the American Labor Party.

Unemployment Fund

Both conventions passed a large number of resolutions dealing with their respective industries, their organization and management. The Amalgamated declared in favor of an unemployment fund to be raised by a tax on the employers: "the weekly payment by the employers of a given percentage of the payroll of our members, which shall not be deducted from the payroll, but paid into the fund in addition to the payroll," as the resolution expressed it. The report of the committee which submitted the resolution stated that "there is no reason why the industry, which pays a permanent tax to the various insurance companies in order to indemnify the employer in case of an emergency, should not likewise have a permanent fund for indemnification for lack of work."

The 40-Hour Week

The International declared in favor of the 40-hour week. The Amalgamated passed a resolution directing the General Executive Board to consider the matter with power to act and also to work for the establishment of a guaranteed 48-week year in the industry in order to guard the clothing workers from long periods of unemployment due to the seasonal character of the industry. Both meetings passed a long series of resolutions extending the campaign for organization among hitherto unorganized parts of the needle industry from coast to coast and from Canada to the Gulf and in support of local organizations which are conducting struggles against certain employers for better working conditions. The Amalgamated authorized the establishment of "educational machinery in every industrial center," not confined "to economic and industrial instruction," but including "art, science and culture generally." The International authorized the continuation and extension of its educational department and the creation of a new research department.

Profiteering

The International directly charged the high price of clothing to the profiteering of the employers. In a resolution which passed without a dissenting vote the convention declared that "the element of profiteering is the principal one responsible for the abnormal rise in prices; that the jobbing and speculating evil has never before been so rampant in the woolen and garment-making market, and that manufacturers and jobbers have never made as high profits as they are making now;" and, further, the convention demanded that "Congress start an investigation of this deplorable condition of the women's garment market."

Both conventions proved the financial soundness of the organizations, as well as their devotion to the cause of freedom for labor by making large donations to various working class and beneficent organizations.

Italian Socialism[1]

C. M. Panunzio

ITALIAN socialism thus steadily developed until the year 1914. Then came the great war, the first phase of which produced in Italy, as in the rest of the world, a sense of bewilderment. Italian socialism, however, was on the alert. Socialist deputies quickly met in Milan and decided on a *modus operandi*. This was followed by meetings throughout Italy, at which their members were asked not to be stunned by the sudden apparent collapse of international socialism, but rather to solidify their ranks and to stand to the last for neutrality.

All this was accomplished by the end of August, 1914. In one way Italian socialists had an advantage over their European brothers; Italy had just emerged from the

[1] The second of two articles on Italian socialism. The first article, appearing in the April issue, dealt with the rise of Italian socialism up until the world war.

Tripolitan War. That made their arguments overwhelmingly powerful. Was not the smell of blood, the sight of murder still fresh in the memory of the Italians? Had they forgotten what Tripoli—the aggressive war in Tripoli—had meant in added poverty, taxation, and loss of life? Why then plunge into another *aggressive* war? The Triple Alliance? That was a defensive, not an offensive pact; and even then it was not entered into with the consent of the Italian people. Moreover, what Italian could possibly fight shoulder to shoulder with an Austrian? German socialists claimed to have been forced into the war in defense of their country. Could Italian socialists claim that?

Should Italy enter the war, what would be the end of it all? Trieste? Trent? Perhaps! But who would share the blessings of that conquest should it come? And who but workingmen must furnish the millions of soldiers, pay the bills, be burdened with endless taxes in the future? Was it not so in the case of Tripoli? Was it not always thus in every war? Keep class consciousness, was their cry; keep alive the hatred for war, at least so long as the country was not forced into a war of defense. With these arguments, promptly delivered, Italian socialists consolidated their ranks and marshaled the masses, and by the end of August the government was forced to declare itself for neutrality.

Then Italian socialists set themselves to the task of defining and defending neutrality. "We insist upon neutrality," they said, "not alone because we hate war, but because we thereby wish to declare the sovereignty of the people above that of the state; because we desire to keep alive our sense of solidarity and our conception of the rights of the people." Some ventured a step further—and very significantly—when they said: "In declaring ourselves for neutrality we sound a warning that neutrality become not a dogma. If events should indicate that it were for the benefit of the proletarians to act differently, Italian socialists must not be obsessed by that dogma."

Others became more specific when they declared that this was *the* opportunity for "all workingmen in all countries to save humanity from the folly, the cruelty, the bestiality of the governing classes, and as war no longer finds grace before the proletarians of the world let us declare war on war." In some quarters utterances became even more daring.

War Against War

There were those who stood for war against war, for a revolution. Mussolini, then editor of *Avanti,* wrote: "In order to prevent the war it is necessary to defeat, in a revolutionary way, the powers of the state." A general strike was also discussed, but it did not materialize; only sporadic outbursts took place here and there in industrial cities.

Finally, it was decided that in the event of war, it would not be a good expedient to have a general strike. In November, 1914, Mussolini resigned the editorship of *Avanti.* He and his group representing the revolutionary wing became disgusted with the right wing of Italian socialism for its lukewarmness and indifference in the face of the real issues of the day.

The Coming of War

So much for the first phase of the war as it affected Italy. But the beginning of 1915, however, it became evident that Italy would be forced into the war. That seemed inevitable, not so much on account of the attitude of the government, as on account of the popular outcry for the completion of that national unity which would bring to Italy Triest and Trent. Italian socialists were Italians after all; and although they did not approve of war even for the conquest of the "unredeemed provinces," still they could not blind themselves to the sentiment which had gathered such momentum during the last few months. As the storm gained strength, therefore, Italian socialism was forced to change its methods.

It was now the end of May, 1915. Italy had declared war against Austria. As I write, before me lie copies of *Avanti,* the of-

ficial daily, and of the *Critica Sociale,* the semi-official bi-weekly of the Italian Socialist Party. Whole columns of the one and half pages of the other are blank. In the center of each blank space is the word *Censura.* And now *Avanti* disappeared altogether. It was the war; it was "silence" forced upon Italian socialism.

War Program

Enforced silence is often more eloquent and convincing than freedom of expression. Italian socialism faced the inevitable *and* the war. In the first days there were some signs of indecision, but this gave way to a program of action. The methods of socialists changed, their principles remained intact. In this they showed their virility. "We have done all in our power," they said, "to keep the country out of war. Now that war is here we will face the activities and make the best of them. We refuse, however, actively to participate in the conflict. We will definitely set ourselves to bring immediate peace. During the war we will devote ourselves to internal effort; to help the soldiers and their families; to cooperate with every existing agency; to organize new means of assistance. Above all, we will keep close to the proletarian; we will keep alive the sentiment of solidarity; we will ward off and face all calumnies. We stand first and last for the freedom of the press and against the censorship of political news. We will labor incessantly in behalf of political offenders; we will fight for the best interests of the people themselves above the interests of the state. We will not sabotage the war. We love our country more than others because our love of country is based upon our love for its citizens." With this spirit Italian socialism moved on, and while coöperating in every way possible with existing agencies in rendering material assistance to those in need, it still remained unmoved in its fundamental principles.

Caporetto to the Armistice

In the summer of 1917, the socialists and the labor groups jointly adopted a most significant program.[1] Early in the fall of the same year, the Italian military disaster, known as Caporetto, took place, a disaster attributed in part to socialist propaganda. There were, of course, other factors involved in this defeat. If it were true, however, that socialism had been, in a measure, responsible for the state of mind which demonstrated the futility of war and which demanded immediate peace, then even in war, socialism was a more potent factor than many realized, especially as it had been forced, for now two years, to be practically silent.

From Caporetto (1917) to the signing of the armistice (1918), Italian socialism was forced to become ever more cautious in its utterances. But in so doing, it remained as forceful. Its influence was seen everywhere. In the front line trenches soldier and officer gave much honest thought to fundamental issues. Although bitterly persecuted, Italian socialism maintained its original position throughout the period of hostilities. A few of its leaders were arrested, and yet, all in all, there were few places where socialists were as free to express their opinions as in Italy.

Socialism in Italy, therefore, emerged from the war with its ranks practically intact and with greater strength than it had ever before possessed. A year passed between the armistice and the general election on November 16, 1919.

The 1919 Election

It was my good fortune to be in Italy on election day. Outwardly, all was as quiet and orderly as the day was calm and beautiful. Only here and there was there even the slightest sign of disturbance. In Turin some minor uprisings occurred. In Milan troops and carabinieri were kept busy at the polls. In Genoa a parade marched through the streets exhibiting red banners. The police had been ordered not to interfere. It moved on unmolested, and in time dispersed. In Sicily there were some minor uprisings among the peasants.

[1] For an excellent summary, See Laidler, *Socialism in Thought and Action,* pp. 427-428.

While all was peaceful outwardly, however, beneath the surface important decisions were being made by the people of Italy. The masses showed a keener interest in the elections than had been seen for many a day. To some, this was an ill omen. At Naples a Baron complained to me of *queste bestie* (those beasts) who are gaining control of things in the country. A judge of the Supreme Tribunal in Rome, in an entirely different spirit, discussing the peasant uprisings in Sicily, said, "I see what we are heading for, but I am willing to divide my land with the peasants down there providing I can be sure that someone else will not grab it away from them; and I am certain that thousands of men throughout Italy feel the same way as I do."

The electoral conflict was fought out on fundamental grounds. It was remarkable, however, that, previous to the election, the party gave little publicity through the general press to its program. For the most part it carried its program to the people themselves by word of mouth. Socialist propagandists bitterly attacked the government's war policies, its imperialistic program, and its attitude toward Russia. They denounced the Peace Conference at Versailles and the war profiteers. They demanded thoroughgoing investigations of expenditures. They clamored for speedy demobilization of the army, for the proper care and relief of the soldiers and families, for the relief of suffering, and for the reduction of the cost of living. Above all, they stood for the rights of the people above the rights of the governments.

They found a nation with a listening ear. In the elections approximately 60 per cent of the voters of Italy cast their vote. In the north, especially in the industrial cities, the percentage of votes cast was higher than in central and southern Italy. And when the votes were counted, the official Socialist Party alone had polled over 3,000,000 votes out of 11,000,000, and had elected 156 deputies out of a total of 501.

When to this are added the votes of the Reformist Socialists and those of the Liberals, who were elected either independently or in connection with some other party, it is found that nearly 50 per cent of the entire vote of Italy went to the socialists and to the labor groups who only thirty years before had seen their first sign of organization.

Parliamentary Influence

The election over, Italian socialists immediately set themselves to the task of working out their program, especially through legislative channels. As is their custom, they absented themselves at the opening of the Parliament in December, but in doing this they made it clear that it was not an act of affront or insult to the King whose liberal tendencies they frankly acknowledged. They stand for the overthrow of the monarchy, and for the establishment of some form of democratic government, preferably the Soviet form. They advocate the socialization of the means of production and transportation, the democratization of industry, the extension of the coöperative movement, disarmament, and other reforms calculated to bring greater happiness to the people on a national and international scale. They aim to bring this about, peacefully if possible, or by a revolution if necessary.

They have not as yet the majority. Nevertheless they are already greatly influencing political events. Nitti's appeal to the nations to recognize Soviet Russia; the appropriation of large sums of money for the erection of workingmen's houses; the transfer of a number of factories in northern Italy to workingmen's control with the consent of the government after employers refused the government's request to arbitrate—these and other events must be regarded in the light of the growing influence of socialism.

"Our socialists . . .," said Nitti recently, "point onward to a grand industrial democracy now in the course of foundation." All groups are acknowledging that there is now a power in Italy that cannot be ignored —that power is socialism.

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Published Monthly by the

INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Room 914, Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

The Department of "Law and Order"

"FOR more than six months we, the undersigned lawyers, whose sworn duty it is to uphold the constitution and laws of the United States, have seen with growing apprehension the continued violation of that Constitution and breaking of those laws by the Department of Justice of the United States government."

With this stinging condemnation of the law department of the United States government, twelve prominent lawyers of the United States—including, among others, three Harvard professors—Roscoe Pound, Felix Frankfurter, and Zachariah Chafee, Jr.; Dean Tyrrell Williams of Washington University Law School, Ernest Freund of Chicago University, Francis Fisher Kane, formerly United States District Attorney, Frank P. Walsh and Jackson H. Ralston—began their now famous report of May 28, 1920, to the American people on the activities of A. Mitchell Palmer and his agents.

These prominent members of the bar contend that, under the guise of a campaign for the suppression of radical activities, the office of the Attorney General, acting through its local agents throughout the country, giving express instructions from Washington, has committed continual illegal acts; that it has (1) inflicted punishments of the utmost cruelty and heretofore unthinkable in America; (2) that it has made wholesale arrests; has (3) entered homes and offices of those suspected of radical tendencies "without warrants or pretense of warrants"; (4) that it has introduced provocative agents into the radical movement; (5) that it has compelled persons to be witnesses against themselves; and (6) that the Attorney General has gone into the field of propaganda against radicals, thus misusing his office and squandering funds entrusted to him. "American institutions have not in fact been protected by the Attorney General's ruthless suppression. On the contrary those institutions have been seriously undermined, and revolutionary unrest has been vastly intensified."

Some Bridgeport Workers

These accusations were accompanied by 19 exhibits. Of a startling character is Exhibit 1, dealing with the jail situation in Hartford, Conn., in part as follows:

"In Bridgeport, Conn., on November 8, 1919, various workingmen had come together to discuss ways and means for buying an automobile to be employed for instruction purposes. The meeting was raided and 63 men arrested without warrants by agents of the Department of Justice and taken to the police station. A day or two later, 16 of these were released. The remaining 47, after being held three days in the police station, where they slept on iron bunks without cover or mattress, and where they were fed little or nothing, were transferred by the Department of Justice to the Hartford jail. Other persons who were arrested in this way or who had applied at the Hartford jail for permission to see their friends, were also taken up and confined in the jail. There were finally 97 men held for deportation. Most of them were questioned by Department of Justice agents; some were beaten or threatened with hanging or suffocation in order to obtain answers from them. Warrants of arrest for these men were requested and obtained from the Department of Labor by the Department of Justice. Most of the 97 prisoners remained in practically

solitary confinement until the end of April—five months. When the facts finally came to the attention of Mr. Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of Labor, he ordered the men all transferred to the Immigrant Station at Deer Island, Boston.

"These Hartford prisoners were practically buried alive for five months, being even denied the privilege of seeing their relatives or friends, who made constant attempts to communicate with them. Only after a lawyer had finally succeeded in gaining access to the jail, were the conditions at all ameliorated and the men ultimately moved to Deer Island. That there were no substantial charges against at least ten of them is shown by the fact that, after being held in $10,000 bail for two months and a half, those ten were released without bail on January 24th. It seems probable that at least a majority had no political views of any special nature, but were simply workingmen of Russian nationality, speaking little or no English."

Russian People's House

Following the Hartford case comes a description of the raid on the Russian People's House in New York City by agents of the Department of Justice on November 8, 1919. During this raid, according to the report, Department of Justice agents

" . . . broke up and destroyed most of the furniture in the place, including desks and typewriting machines. They 'beat up' the persons in the place, amounting to several hundred, with blackjacks and stair rails, broke up all the classes then in session and herded the students to the stairways, beating them as they went, shoving them from the landing on to the stairway so that many fell and rolled down the stairs and were trampled upon by those who were shoved after them.

"After this raid several hundred prisoners were taken to the office of the Department of Justice, at 18 Park Row, and there put through the third degree of inquisition. Less than one-fifth of them were held for deportation charges and all the remainder were released to go about their business as being innocent of any wrongdoing. . . . All these facts were immediately put before the Attorney General in detail. . . . No answer was ever made to this letter, nor was its receipt acknowledged."

In Exhibit 3, Albert De Silver describes the wreckage in the office of the *Novy Mir*, a Russian paper of New York, following the raid of the agents of the Department of Justice.

Exhibit 4 gives the cause of Andrea Salsedo, secretly confined in the 14th floor of the Park Row Building by the Department of Justice, and who, on May 4, after a confinement of approximately eight weeks, jumped or fell to his death on May 4.

In Detroit

The arrest of 800 men in Detroit, made in a "supreme effort to break the back of radicalism" in that city, was recorded in Exhibit 6. According to Frederick R. Barkley (*The Nation*, January 21 and April 10, 1920), these men and boys "seized without warrant while attending dances and classes in physical geography and similar subjects," were "imprisoned for from three to six days in a dark, windowless, narrow corridor running around the big central areaway of the city's antiquated Federal Building. They slept on the bare stone floor at night. . . . They were compelled to stand in long lines for access to the solitary drinking fountain and one toilet; they were denied all food for twenty hours, and after that were fed on what their families brought in; and they were refused all communication with relatives or with attorneys. These 800 men, so closely packed that they had to step over one another's bodies to move about at all, included in their number citizens and aliens, college graduates and laborers, skilled mechanics making $15 a day and boys not yet out of short trousers." The article states that more than 380 American citizens or aliens who could prove conclusively that they did not have even "a cursory interest in radicalism," were afterwards released. Hundreds were subsequently kept for months at army forts under atrocious conditions.

"Undercover Agents"

A new departure in governmental activities in this country—the employment of *agents provocateurs* to ferret out, if not to encourage, radical activities—was noted in Exhibit 6. The simple story of this new phase of departmental activity as given in the Exhibit is as follows:

"Miss Julia Pratt was a teacher of drawing in the public schools of Buffalo. In January, 1920, she was suspended by the Board of Education, and hearings were had before the Board on January 27, and March 16. At the first hearing one Herman Bernhard appeared as witness against Miss Pratt, and testified that he was a secret agent of the Department of Justice; that as such agent he had joined the Communist Party, Buffalo branch, and became recording secretary of the branch. He produced the books which he kept as secretary of the organization and identified the enrollment of Miss Pratt as a member of the party, and the dates on which she paid her dues. He also testified to other alleged activities of Miss Pratt.

"Miss Pratt was dismissed by the Board of Education and her contract with the city cancelled on April 19, 1920, on the ground of her membership in the Communist Party.

"A statement made by Miss Pratt April 21, 1920, contains the following:

"'On July 19, 1919, Miss Harris invited me to her home to meet some "interesting intellectual friends of hers," as she put it. I went out to Kenmore. Herman Bernhard came in with two women friends of his. He constantly injected overdrawn statements against the Government into the conversation, and outlined in glowing terms the work the Communist Party would perform in emancipating the oppressed and exploited. . . . Bernhard later came to my house with others of the same group, ate at my table and I played the harp for him. It is on the testimony of this *agent provocateur* that the Board has dismissed me.'"

Exhibits 7 and 8 describe further activities of such agents.

Forgery

In substantiation of their claim that forgery was employed in attempts to deport aliens was the affidavit of Walter Nelles, lawyer for Gaspare Cannone. According to this statement, Cannone was seized at his home in Brooklyn on March 30, without charge or warrant by agents of the Department of Justice; was beaten and kicked by one of the agents in the Park Row Building, and was urged to give evidence implicating three persons unknown to him in the Washington bomb explosions of last year. Failing to get anything out of him, the agents told him he would be deported.

"He was held by the Department of Justice, and denied communication with anyone outside, from noon on March 30th to noon on April 2nd, when he was taken to Ellis Island," receiving there five meals in four days, it was alleged. On his last appearance in the Park Row office, a typewritten statement was placed before him, which asked if he was an anarchist, opposed to any organized government, and if he believed in force or violence to overthrow this form of government, each question being answered in the affirmative.

Cannone refused to sign his name on the ground that it was not a correct record of what he had said, and "a forged signature of 'Gaspare Cannone' was subscribed" to the paper. The inspectors afterwards refused to permit these statements given in a hearing before agents of the Department of Justice by Cannone to remain on the record.

Further Inside Agents

The existence of confidential informants, whose whereabouts should be kept a secret by the special agents of the Department of Justice, is admitted in the letter of Director Flynn of the Bureau of Investigation.

Following these exhibits, come several letters of instruction from the Department of Justice to their agents. The first (Exhibit 11) is the famous "strictly confidential" communication to George E. Kelleher of Boston, from the Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, containing this significant paragraph:

"If possible you should arrange with your under-cover informants to have meetings of the Communist Party and the Communist Labor Party held on the night set. I have been informed by some of the bureau officers that such arrangements will be made. This, of course, would facilitate the making of the arrests. In cases where arrests are made of persons not covered by warrants, the letter continues, you should at once request the local immigration authorities for warrants." (Italics Editor's.)

The signers call attention to the fact that this letter from the Department of Justice, dated December 27, 1919, and urging the arrest and subsequent deportation of members of the Communist and Communist Labor

Parties for mere membership in such organizations, was issued nearly a month before the Secretary of Labor—"on whom alone the duty fell of deciding the question"—had proclaimed the Communist Party illegal, and five months before the Communist Labor Party (May 5, 1920) was declared legal.

Further instructions to agents are contained in Exhibit 13. Paragraph 5 of one set of these instructions significantly reads:

"5. Person or persons taken into custody not to be permitted to communicate with any outside person until after examination by this office and until permission is given by this office."

Judge Anderson on the Department

"A more lawless proceeding," declared Judge Anderson of the District Court of the United States, in Boston [Exhibit 14] in the habeas corpus proceedings brought by Mr. and Mrs. William T. Colyer, British subjects, "it is hard for anybody to conceive. Talk about Americanization! What we need is to Americanize people who are carrying on such proceedings as this."

The judge continued that "we shall forget everything we ever learned about American constitutional liberty if we were to justify such proceedings" as that under consideration, namely, the arrest, without warrant in a large majority of cases, of several hundred aliens on the night of January 2-3, 1920.

Speaking of the instructions given to the agents for the arrest of these aliens, the judge declared that "it is the business of any American citizen who knows anything about Americanism to resign if given such instructions." The report contends that "men and women were taken wholesale at meetings, on the streets, or at their homes. Equally without search warrants the offices and homes of the prisoners were entered and ransacked, and writings, books and other property carried away. These several hundred citizens and aliens were then handcuffed, bundled into motor-cars, and taken to police stations, jails or any convenient place of detention, there to await the slow process of inquisition (without counsel), and classification." Many were "finally imprisoned on Deer Island, without sanitary conveniences, without blankets or mattresses, and exposed to cold from broken windows. After the arrests and imprisonment, warrants of arrests were asked, and obtained, from the Department of Labor in Washington. Bail was fixed in such amount, up to $10,000, as would reasonably insure the impossibility of raising it."

Justice Holmes and Judge Bourquin

The twelve lawyers in the 14th Exhibit give excerpts from the decision of Justice Holmes of the United States Supreme Court condemning the Department of Justice for entering the offices of a lumber company, and, "without the shadow of authority," making "a clean sweep of all the books, papers and documents found there." The court in this case refused to allow the government to use the knowledge it had gained through the illegal raid.

No less sweeping was Judge Bourquin's condemnation of the methods employed by federal authority in the arrest of members of the Industrial Workers of the World. "These [employers' agents, federal agents and soldiers duly officered, acting by federal authority and without warrant], armed, forcibly entered [the I. W. W. hall]; broke and destroyed property; searched effects and papers; seized papers and documents; cursed, insulted, beat, dispersed, and bayonetted members by order of the captain commanding; . . . and in general . . . perpetrated an orgy of terror, violence and crime against citizens and aliens in public assemblage, whose only offense seems to have been peaceable insistence upon an exercise of a clear legal right," declared the judge of the U. S. District Court of the District of Montana.

"If evidence of the alien's evil advocacy and teaching is so wanting that it exists in only that herein and as secured herein," declares the judge in his concluding paragraphs, "he is a far less danger to this country than are the parties who in violation of law and order, of humanity and justice, have brought him to deportation. They are the spirit of intolerance incarnate, and the most alarming manifestation in America today."

Louis Post's Opinion

Exhibit 16 is the statement of Louis Post, Assistant Secretary of Labor, in which he defined conditions under which alien members of the Communist Party could be held for deportation.

"As a rule," declared Secretary Post, "the hearings show the aliens arrested to be workingmen of good character who have never been arrested before, who are not anarchists or revolutionists, nor politically or otherwise dangerous in any sense. Many of them, as in this case, have American born children. It is pitiful to consider the hardships to which they and their families have been subjected during the past three or four months by arbitrary arrest, long detention in default of bail beyond the means of hard working wage earners to give, for nothing more dangerous than affiliating with friends of their own race, country and language, and without the slightest indication of sinister motive, or any unlawful act within their knowledge or intention."

Propaganda

The final exhibits set forth the propaganda sheets of the Department of Justice sent to the editors of the newspapers of the country which characterized the sympathizers of the communist movement in this country as "composed chiefly of criminals, mistaken idealists, social bigots, and many unfortunate men and women suffering with various kinds of hyperesthesia."

Mr. Palmer Replies

Mr. Palmer's defense before the House Rules Committee consisted chiefly in discrediting the standing of the "twelve gentlemen, said to be lawyers," in casting aspersions on the statements of alien signers of affidavits, and in lauding the work of the agents of the Department of Justice. He admitted that he was unable to answer as yet the charge of forgery in the case of Gaspare Cannone, or to deny the affidavit of one Mitchel Lavrowsky. The latter teacher alleged that he had been taken out of a class-room on the night of November 7, 1919, by an agent of the Department of Justice, had been kicked and beaten, and had sustained a "fracture of the head, left shoulder, and right side." Lavrowsky had afterwards been questioned and released.

Mr. Palmer defended his propaganda among the country's press as a means of informing the country of "the people's case." He denied that there were "hot cells" in the Hartford jail, and stated that he had no control over general jail conditions in that city. Jackson Ralston expressed his readiness to call an immigration inspector to testify regarding these "hot cells."

The destruction of furniture in the Russian People's House the Attorney General attributed to the work of "small boys." He eulogized the "splendid men" in the Department of Justice, and declared that their word should be taken in preference to that of aliens. He supported his subordinates in demanding "excessive bails," and defended the former practice in alien deportation cases of refusing counsel to the alien in the first stages of deportation proceedings, on the ground that newly arrived immigrants were not permitted counsel.

In the course of the hearing the Attorney General also stated as his belief that the Communist Party had financed the "outlaw strike" on the railroads, adding:

"The Communist Party Defence Fund Stamp, sold at 25 cents to obtain funds to defend Communists under arrest, is the means of raising money for the outlaw strikers, I believe. . . .

"The stamp sold for 25 cents is but a receipt, and is disposed of by the Civil Liberties Bureau of New York."

Albert De Silver, Director of the Bureau, afterwards denied all knowledge of such a stamp.

On June 4, Mr. Palmer sent a telegram to Professors Frankfurter and Chafee, declaring that the "charges had as their only foundation statements made by aliens after their arrests, which were palpably false upon their face and the allegations of which, as you know, were denied by the responsible sworn

officers of the government whose conduct these aliens sought to impeach. . . .

"I produced before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives conclusive proof of the falsity of these charges. . . . You owe it to yourself as well as to the Department of Justice publicly to retract them."

Refusing to retract, the two Harvard professors returned the following reply to the Attorney General:

"We filed the report of the illegal practices of the Department of Justice partly because the facts not within our personal knowledge were vouched for by lawyers of responsible character and ability, but chiefly because of our personal knowledge of the Colyer cases. The testimony of your agents and the official instructions issued to them from Washington proved beyond question that large numbers of people, including citizens, were arrested by your agents without warrants, that searches and seizures were made without warrants in direct violation of the Federal Constitution, and that this was done under specific instructions from the Department of Justice.

"We are prepared to submit these allegations and have so advised Chairman Campbell of the Rules Committee. We are prepared to do the same before a committee of the American Bar Association consisting, we suggest, of the ex-Attorneys General of the United States."

Mr. Palmer, unfortunately, has not as yet requested Messrs. Frankfurter and Chafee to submit their evidence before these bodies.

Louis Fraina

Following close on the heels of these allegations, Santeri Nuorteva, secretary of the Soviet Bureau, told a story of the activities of Louis Fraina, at one time editor of the official organ of the Communist Party, which appeared to connect Fraina with the Department of Justice as an "undercover agent."

Mr. Nuorteva stated that, on several occasions, he had been told that Fraina was employed by the Department of Justice, but that he had laughed the suggestion out of court.

A few months after the formation of the Communist Party, Fraina appeared in the Soviet Bureau, stated that he was going to Russia, and asked for letters of introduction to Russia officials. "A few days later," declared Nuorteva, "we found that certain information regarding communication with Moscow, conveyed to Fraina, which could not have been in the possession of anyone else outside of our office, became known to the agents of the Department of Justice."

Shortly thereafter Fraina announced to Nuorteva that his plan for going to Russia had been postponed. He disappeared and returned about the end of November, 1919. He asked for letters of introduction, but these Mr. Martens refused to give until Fraina explained away suspicions against him in a satisfactory manner.

It was then that Nuorteva began to investigate the activities of Fraina, and particularly the story that Fraina had received and indorsed pay checks signed by George Lamb, superintendent of the Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice. "Many facts came to my attention," continued Nuorteva, "which made us really suspect Fraina."

The communist editor was thereupon confronted by a Mr. Peterson, a Finn who had been employed by the Department of Justice, and who had given Nuorteva information concerning Fraina's alleged connections with the Department. Fraina denied Peterson's allegations, but Peterson repeated "his stories under severe cross-examination in most details. . . . While this 'trial' failed to convince Fraina's friends of the charges brought against him, it also failed to convince the members of our bureau of Fraina's innocence."

"It is . . . an indisputable fact that while other members of Fraina's group were being arrested at that time nothing happened to Fraina himself, and while Fraina . . . asserted that it was due to his ability to keep himself in hiding there seems to be no doubt that the Department of

Justice agents very well knew Mr. Fraina's movements at the time he left the country."

Mr. Nuorteva alleged that Fraina left the country in company "with one Nosovitzky, a Russian doctor in the employ of a British steamship line and obviously a police agent." Dr. Nosovitzky brought personally to Mr. Martens a letter from Mr. Rutgers, a communist of Holland, which criticized Martens for not being connected with the revolutionary movement in the United States. The bearer of the letter stated that Fraina knew its contents. Strangely enough the letter got into the hands of the Department of Justice and was published by it. "This letter could not have been copied by anyone," according to Nuorteva, "except Mr. Rutgers, Mr. Fraina, Dr. Nosovitzky, or Mr. Martens himself."

"It is therefore obvious that the letter could only have gotten into Mr. Palmer's hands through Mr. Fraina or Dr. Nosovitzky. The supposition that on its way to Mr. Martens it might have been copied by somebody else and delivered to Mr. Palmer's agents is altogether excluded, considering the fact that Mr. S. Rutgers' name was not attached to the letter and nobody else could have known from whom it came."

Other facts alleged concerning Dr. Nosovitzky by Mr. Nuorteva are that, at the time he took Fraina abroad he was in the employ of a British institution; that he had freely traveled back and forth under his own name without encountering difficulties; that he attended the Amsterdam Conference of the Third International, and that Mr. Palmer, according to his own statement, is in possession of all of the reports of that Conference.

"I have found that at that Conference, which was supposed to have been a secret one," declares Nuorteva, "no one from America was present except Fraina and Nosovitzky. A British delegate protested against Nosovitzky's presence, but he was permitted to remain, Fraina having vouched for him!

"These facts should be considered in the light of additional fact that this man Nosovitzky was one of those present at the 'trial' of Fraina, that his name is mentioned in Mr. Palmer's report, and that Nosovitzky at the 'trial' not only was one of the most ardent defenders of Fraina, but appeared there as Fraina's personal representative, cross-examined Peterson with an astounding astuteness which any prosecuting attorney of a police department might have envied.

"Thus no one will wonder that this whole affair has left in our mind an indelible impression that there is 'something rotten in Denmark,' which Mr. Palmer's statement before the Senate Committee, far from explaining away, makes so much more apparent."

Peterson was discharged from the Department of Justice, arrested and kept in jail for a week on account of his attempt to get documentary evidence against Fraina, was harassed in many ways, and, at the end of February, left the city, ostensibly to testify in Washington, and has since been completely lost to view.

Is the Department of Justice in the United States planning to copy the legal procedure of the old Czarist regime? H. W. L.

The Governor's Veto

ON Wednesday, May 19, Governor Smith of New York used his veto upon the three Lusk-Martin bills and the two Walters-Fearon bills that had both been passed by overwhelming votes in both houses at Albany.[1] In vetoing the Walters-Fearon bill, which empowered the State Attorney General to take a political party off the ballot upon judgment by the Appellate Division of the third department, Governor Smith declared against the "despotic power to strike from the ballot the candidates of any party." The bill would confer upon the Appellate Division, "this small body of men, perhaps all of one political faith, the absolute power to disfranchise hundreds of thousands of voters. . . . without ever hearing a witness." "Law, in a democracy," added the Governor, "means the protection of the rights and liberties of the minority."

The Lusk bill, aimed at the Rand School, was condemned by the Governor as vicious in its fundamental principle. "Its avowed

[1] See Winthrop D. Lane on *The "New Freedom" in N. Y. State* in the May issue of *The Socialist Review*.

purpose is to safeguard the institutions and traditions of the country. In effect, it strikes at the foundation of . . . the fundamental right of the people to enjoy full liberty in the domain of idea and speech. It is unthinkable that in a representative democracy there should be delegated to any body of men the absolute power to prohibit the teaching of any subject of which it may disapprove."

Showing that under the bill the Board of Regents could prohibit instruction on child labor, single tax or minimum wage laws, Governor Smith asserted:

"The clash of conflicting opinions, from which progress arises more than from any other source, would be abolished by law, tolerance and intellectual freedom destroyed and an intellectual autocracy imposed upon the people.

"The safety of this Government and its institutions rests upon the reasoned and devoted loyalty of its people. It does not need for its defenses a system of intellectual tyranny, which, in the endeavor to check error by force, must of necessity crush truth as well."

The bill establishing a bureau of secret police was vetoed as far overstepping the need of peace-time administration of the law.

"The traditional abhorrence of a free people of all kinds of spies and secret police is valid and justified."

Finally, the teachers' loyalty bill was put out of court by the Governor because it

" . . . permits one man [Commissioner of Education] to place upon any teacher the stigma of disloyalty, and this without even a hearing or trial. No man is so omniscient or wise as to have entrusted to him such arbitrary and complete power, not only to condemn any individual teacher, but to decree what belief or opinion he deems to be opposed to the institutions of the country. . . . the bill limits the teaching staff of the public schools to those only who lack the courage or the mind to exercise their legal right to just criticism of existing institutions."

Thus was the peril to democratic institutions in the Empire State averted temporarily by the courageous action of one man. Algernon Lee, director of the Rand School, comments thus upon the Governor's veto:

"The killing of these infamous bills greatly lessens the danger of blind, desperate, and chaotic revolt, which the Bourbons have been trying to provoke. But . . . But the danger which has been averted may recur next winter, if those who have rallied against Bourbonism should relax their efforts." W. H. C.

The Candidate in Denim

ON Saturday, May 29, Eugene Victor Debs, clad in the symbolic blue denim of Atlanta prison, received the committee appointed by the preceding socialist convention in New York city to inform him of his unanimous nomination for presidential candidate on the Socialist Party ticket. The committee consisted of Seymour Stedman, candidate on the same ticket for vice president; James Oneal, associate editor of the New York *Call;* Otto Branstetter, national secretary of the party; Julius Gerber, state secretary for New York, and Dr. Madge Patton Stephens, of Indiana, all old friends of the candidate.

James Oneal read the nomination to Debs, while the warden stood in the doorway and prison guards passed back and forth. Eugene Debs, in reply, declared that on account of prison rules he could not make any formal acceptance of the nomination. He declared himself deeply touched by the extraordinary expression of confidence given him by the party and continued in part as follows (according to *The Federated Press*):

"I must be perfectly frank with you. I have read the platform adopted by the convention, and I wish I might say that it has my unqualified approval. It is a masterly piece of writing, and it states the essential principles of the Socialist movement, but I believe that it could have been made more effective if it had stressed the class struggle more prominently, and if more emphasis had been laid on industrial organization.

"However, a platform is not so very important after all. We can breathe the breath of revolution into any platform.

"We are in politics, not to get votes, but to develop power to emancipate the working class. I would never do or say anything to catch a vote for the sake of the vote. Our duty is to tell exactly what we seek to accomplish, so that those who come to us do so with no misunderstanding.

"Before serving time here, I made a series of addresses, supporting the Russian Revolution, which I consider the greatest single achievement

in all history. I said at that time that I was a Bolshevik. I still am a Bolshevik, but not a Russian Bolshevik in America. I regret that the convention did not see its way to affiliate with the Third International without qualification.

"There was some difficulty about the unfortunate phrase, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. A Dictatorship does not imply what we mean. It is a misnomer. Dictatorship is autocracy. There is no autocracy in the rule of the masses. In the transition period, the revolution must protect itself. The French Socialists, in their recent Congress, took what I believe is the correct attitude, that everyone believes in the dictatorship as a thesis. It is an unfortunate term, and leads to misrepresentation. I am sorry that it had been used.

"I am opposed to dictatorship in every form. We are for freedom and equal rights. When we say that we are for the dictatorship, we give the capitalist press an opportunity to attack us. Phrases do not make a revolution.

"I am glad that the platform has been written in clean American terms. The trouble with our platforms in the past is that we have not made ourselves understood." W. H. C.

Kate Richards O'Hare

ON May 29 the President commuted the sentence upon Mrs. Kate Richards O'Hare of St. Louis, sentenced by a North Dakota federal judge on April 14, 1919, to five years in Jefferson City penitentiary for alleged violation of the Espionage Act.

George E. Roewer, Jr., Boston attorney and member of the Socialist Party National Executive Committee, investigated her case at the request of the N. E. C. and returned from the West with affidavits alleging that the whole case was a "frame up" against Mrs. O'Hare and that several witnesses had perjured themselves at the trial, in that they were not within hearing distance of Mrs. O'Hare when she made her alleged seditious speech. Copies of these affidavits were delivered to Attorney-General Palmer and Secretary Tumulty on May 15, 1920.

According to the Federated Press the government does not recede from its belief that she was justly convicted. If she employs her freedom in a "lawful" manner and does not make "wild speeches" the President may some day restore her full civil rights by granting pardon instead of mere commutation of sentence.

Mrs. O'Hare in a statement upon release declared in part:

"While I am free today there are hundreds of men and women political prisoners no more guilty of wrongdoing than I, just as loyal to their convictions of right and truth and human justice as I, who are still shut behind the stone walls and steel bars for the crime of being true to their ideals." W. H. C.

Labor and Republicanism

"THE nomination of Harding and Coolidge, following the adoption of the cold-blooded Republican platform, completes the party's repudiation of progress and its defiance of the right, interest and welfare of the great masses of our men and women who do the useful, constructive work of the country."

Thus runs the comment of Samuel Gompers following the nomination of the Republican ticket on Saturday, June 12th.

The American Federation of Labor had asked for planks opposing the use of injunctions to put down strikes, favoring the Seamen's Act, compensation laws, the eight-hour law in civil departments of the Government, laws to prevent the Federal courts from declaring laws unconstitutional, and laws for the election of judges. The Republican platform ignored all of these demands. The Federation protested against compulsory arbitration. The platform contained a plank denying to the workers the right "to strike against the Government" and for the erection of governmental tribunals to settle strikes.

The Federation urged a plank favoring non-intervention in Mexico. The Republicans made a declaration which many feel makes intervention practically inevitable.

The platform was silent on the right to organize, and it endorsed the Esch-Cummins railroad law—despite the opposition of organized labor—as "a most constructive legislative achievement of the Republicans." It ignored, flatly denied, or gave but lip service to numerous other demands of labor.

Early German Returns

AT present writing it is too early to judge the full results and significance of the German elections of June 6. Early reports indicated that the Majority Socialists, while losing more than 70 seats, still kept the lead of the German parties, with a representation in the Reichstag of some 86. The Independent Socialists were credited with 57 seats, a gain of some 33—more than 100 per cent. They polled the largest vote of any of the parties in Berlin, and registered the greatest gain of any party. The Communists, on the other hand, sent but one or two representatives to Parliament. The Centrists, with 43 votes, and the Democrats, with 27 votes—coalition parties—were distinct losers. The principal coalition parties, in fact, lost nearly 200 representatives all told, their majority being reduced to the narrowest limit.

The People's Party and the German National Party, chauvinist groups, made slight gains of 19 and 7 seats respectively. Following the election the members of the Coalition Cabinet tendered their resignations, but President Ebert induced them to remain in office until complete election results were ascertained.

Commenting on the election, the New York *Call* declares:

"All things considered, the returns so far show a drift to the 'left' and a drift to the 'right,' with a big margin in favor of the former. For, while the reactionaries have a gain of 26 seats, the Independent Socialists and Communists have gained 35. The middle-class parties have suffered heavy losses.

"If this drift of opinion continues in Germany, the future struggle will tend to develop into a clear contest between the supporters of the old regime and the Independent Socialists. This is much to be desired, as the Majority Socialists have from the beginning failed to comply with the demands of the working masses and one by one have bartered what remnants of socialist principles they professed." H. W. L.

"Jim-Crowed"

William Pickens

WHY do I write the facts which I shall write here? Why do the doctors in their medical books present drawings and photographs that illustrate the ravages of terrible diseases on the human body? They do not give these pictures as beautiful works of art. Neither do I.

Occasionally we hear honest-minded white people say that they "did not know that the thing was as bad as that." Even Southern white people sometimes make this confession. How shall white Americans ever know what it is to be Jim-Crowed, unless they be told by colored Americans?

I heard one of those confessions recently in Portsmouth, Virginia. White and colored men were met together in conference to discuss inter-racial relations and to endeavor to avoid "Washington and Chicago." The regrettable and famous battles of Washington and Chicago are causing us to get our heads together quietly before they come together violently. In this Portsmouth conference, when the question of the pay of colored teachers was brought up, one of the wealthiest, most influential, and most intelligent white merchants of the city confessed with astonishment that he had never known that white and colored teachers were not receiving the same pay for the same work; that there could be no justice in such a difference; and that the matter ought to be taken up and corrected at once. With puzzled brow he asked: "Do they not take the same examination and do the same amount of work as the white teachers?" He might have added: Do they not pay the same price for beefsteaks and the same rate of taxes? And some of the colored men present were also astonished—to find that there was a white man in Portsmouth who did not know of this discrimination and who did not approve of it.

Right there we have the point, so let us nail it; the colored people of Portsmouth have not been doing their duty, else every intelligent white man of the city would have known long ago of this discrimination and the thousand others. They have lacked an agitator.

And there are honest white people in the United States who do not know what Jim-Crowism really is. They think that the proper name is just *separation;* they do not believe that it is identical with limitation and degradation. I will present it as it really is.

I am now on a Jim Crow car from Norfolk to Lynchburg. I retired after midnight in Norfolk, awoke this morning at six, breakfasted at seven, and took this train at eight. I have had meetings and late hours for a week, trying to make life more congenial between white and black people in Virginia. This morning a colored physician of Norfolk brought me from his beautiful clean home in a handsome car to the station. I saw chair cars and a diner in the rear. I asked him simply: "Are they civilized enough here for me to get a parlor-car seat to Lynchburg?" And he replied just as simply: "No; you could not get a berth to sleep in at night, let alone a chair to rest in by day."

This meant also that I could not get a bite to eat in the dining car. I ate my usual light breakfast at seven and will not reach my destination before three. There are no sanitary drinking cups in this car, I am gruffly informed by the trainmen, so I cannot drink water.

And to put the finishing touches, here we are at Petersburg towards noon, and our train has stopped for fifteen or twenty minutes so that the "passengers" can get food from the station lunch room. *But* this lunch room service is for white people only, for the benefit of those white passengers who are too stingy to pay the dining car prices and the tips.

As if fate had conspired with the devil, the Jim Crow car has stopped right in front of this lunch room, so that the starving colored traveller can see the white passengers go in and out and observe their backs as they sit at the counter and drink their hot teas and cold milk and eat their warm food. And they are being served by black hands from behind the counter. They can eat food out of black hands; but cannot eat their own food out of their own hands if a black man at the other end of the counter is eating his own food out of his own hands.

And as if that were not enough, a few minutes before the train is to start, a Negro servant is sent out from the lunch room with a basketful of cold food, which could never be sold to white customers, in an endeavor to get rid of it among the colored passengers, —and to add indigestion to insult. For seventy-five cents he offers you the quarter of an impenetrable hen fried day-before-yesterday, old bread, and a slice of musty pie actually cut days ago. The white passengers in the lunch room may get a hot drink or a warm egg sandwich for a few cents. If you ask for a knife or a glass of milk or a cup of tea—"No"; he is not allowed to bring dishes into the Jim Crow car.

Such is the "equal accommodation" and the pretended safeguard of "racial integrity" about which we hear so much in Congress and elsewhere.

Books Received.

La Lueur dans l'Abîme. By Henri Barbusse. Paris: Clarté. 1920. 153 pp.

What the Workers Want. By Arthur Gleason. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 1920. 518 pp.

Principles of Sociology. By Professor Edward Allsworth Ross. N. Y.: The Century Company. 1920. 700 pp.

Jehovah (A Poem). By Clement Wood. N. Y.: Dutton. 1920. 116 pp.

The New Germany. By George Young. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 1920. 325 pp.

New Italy. By Helen Zimmern and Antonio Agresti. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 1920. 267 pp.

The Last Thirty Days of Christ. By Sadakichi Hartmann. N. Y. (Privately published.) 1920.

A Short History of the American Labor Movement. By Mary Beard. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 1920.

Sanity in Sex. By Wm. J. Fielding. N. Y.: Dodd Mead & Co. 1920.

Chords and Discords. By Walter Everette Hawkins. Boston: Richard G. Badger. 1920.

The Passing of the County Jail. By Stuart Alfred Queen, Ph.D. Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Pub. Co. 1920.

Russian-American Relations. March, 1917—March, 1920. Edited by C. K. Cumming and Walter W. Pettit for the League of Free Nations Assoc., New York. Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 1920. 862 pp.

Pennsylvania Labor Forges Ahead

A. Epstein

THE convention of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, held in Altoona on May 11 to 14, stands unparalleled in the annals of labor gatherings in this country. Of the 400 delegates who attended this convention, representing some 500,000 organized workers, ninety-five per cent went directly from the mines, the steel mills, the machine and railroad shops, the building trades and the textile mills. Their decisions are of the utmost significance to observers of the newer forces and alignments in the labor movement.

The meeting place of the convention was in a manner symbolic of the changed conditions in the American labor movement. Three years ago Altoona, said to be the home of the largest repair shops in the world, was regarded as the worst "scab town" in the state. Labor organizers, before leaving for Altoona, were wont to bid farewell to wives and relatives. Few were able even to enter the city. Strikebreakers were sent from this city to nearby towns in special Pullmans, known as the "Hotel de Altoona."

But the now famous General Order No. 8, permitting railroad men to organize, issued by McAdoo, led to marked changes, and at the convention we found that the headquarters of the convention—the Leroy Hotel—was owned and managed by labor unions of Altoona. Every employe from manager to maid and bell boy, furthermore, was a good trade unionist. Altoona is now regarded as the organized center in the state, and at the last election elected a labor mayor, two or three county commissioners, and several union labor officials. It also has a flourishing coöperative movement.

James H. Maurer Speaks

President Maurer's opening address to the convention was indicative of the spirit and challenge of Pennsylvania labor. He declared that rarely before had "the demands and complaints of organized labor been treated with more indifference, scorn, and contempt than during the past year." He denounced the administration for its persecution of the radicals, its action against the miners, and its failure to enforce laws against profiteering.

But he was not content with mere denunciation. Maurer presented a remarkable program of reconstruction. He advocated independent political action and expressed the hope that the delegates would straddle this issue no longer. He pointed out the futility of the policy of "rewarding friends and punishing enemies" in the two old parties, making no reference, however, in regard to the party with which labor should affiliate. The rank and file, he felt, should make this decision without influence or suggestion on his part. He also set forth definite plans for the daily labor paper, soon to start in Pennsylvania, and outlined a complete program for labor education in the state, urging the delegates to establish labor schools. Nor did he ignore the coöperative movement, community councils, and the rehabilitation of industrial workers.

The Convention Responds

The delegates followed the lead of President Maurer. They denounced the activities of the Attorney General. They asked for the impeachment of the governor and the sheriff of Allegheny County, but sent fraternal greetings to "our brother in prison, Eugene V. Debs." They sent telegrams to the men arrested a few days before in Duquesne and indorsed the attitude of Louis Post, assistant secretary of labor, toward alien radicals. They unanimously reelected James H. Maurer, president of the Federation for the ninth time, to serve for a term of two years, amidst ringing applause and wild cheering, and this despite the persecutions and denunciations heaped upon Maurer during the past year. They also reelected C. F. Quinn, their faithful secretary-treasurer, for the nine-

teenth time, and ironically sent telegrams to Governor Sproul and Attorney-General Palmer to this effect.

The Labor Party is Born

Nor did the delegates travel the length and breadth of Pennsylvania merely to denounce and pay tribute. They journeyed there to seek means for the creation of a new and better world. The means they sought for the amelioration of their sufferings were legitimate and practicable. That was perhaps one of the reasons why the press of Pennsylvania carried no news of the convention. The delegates knew both old political parties and agreed with Duncan McDonald that there was "no better friend of labor than labor itself." Not one spoke in favor of the Gompers' nonpartisan plan, and only three delegates voted against the formation of a labor party. In order not to delay the organization of such a party any longer, they called a special session in the evening, worked until midnight, and refused to leave the hall until they had formally organized. They accepted the platform of the American Labor Party as their own and elected Charles Kutz, of Altoona, and Frieda S. Miller, the secretary of the Women's Trade Union League of Philadelphia, as president and secretary-treasurer respectively. In order to get the labor party into immediate working order, the delegates contributed several hundred dollars from their own pockets.

A Labor Daily

Young and old delegates from the large cities and from the remotest villages were unanimous at the convention in their denunciations of "the kept press," and in their demand for a press of their own. The Federation Publishing Company had been incorporated a few weeks before to publish a labor daily and a board of directors, headed by President Maurer, had been elected. The convention furthered this program by formulating definite plans for raising several hundred thousand dollars in order to start a "truth-telling" newspaper.

Workers' Education

In his opening address, President Maurer told the delegates that "underlying all evils is the lack of fundamental education on the part of the workers." The delegates decided that they were not going home until they had worked out some sort of a labor educational plan. No public call for an educational conference was made but some fifty delegates from all parts of the state gave up their lunch hour and packed the largest available room in order to plan something definite along this line. As a result, they organized the Pennsylvania Labor Education Committee and elected J. R. Copenhaver, machinist, from Harrisburg, as its president, while the writer of this article was made general secretary. An Executive Committee of forty-five was also elected consisting of the most prominent labor leaders scattered throughout the state.

The interest displayed by the delegates in educational problems was remarkable. A brief speech on industrial education by a representative of the State Department of Public Instruction immediately brought a score of delegates to their feet and gave rise to many expressions of distrust as to the educational methods employed by state officials. They even expressed resentment against the teachers, most of whom, they claimed, taught the children that strikes were un-American, and that unions were useless. They bitterly referred to the recent instances when students of high schools and colleges acted as strike breakers. While not laying the full blame on the teachers and sympathizing with them in their demands for increased wages, they were unwilling to give the teaching profession their full support until the latter was more fully organized and more courageous.

The delegates similarly distrusted the present Constitutional Revision Commission of Pennsylvania appointed by Governor Sproul. Of 27 members of the Commission, the delegates claimed, only one was a labor man, the Commission being "made up chiefly of lawyers—a group of gentlemen seldom troubled with great thoughts." It was al-

leged that not one of the suggestions submitted by the Labor Federation was even considered.

The American Legion was even more strongly denounced following the report of a committee appointed especially to investigate this organization. Several speakers characterized the Legion "as a strike-breaking agency created by the bosses" and no delegate arose to defend it. Upon request, the convention did endorse the Rank and File Veterans Association, and the Soldiers, Sailors and Marines Organization.

Prohibition Discussed

The decisions of this convention, with few exceptions, disclosed an appreciation of fundamentals and a breadth of point of view on the part of the rank and file of labor rarely before witnessed at labor gatherings. As one instance may be cited the resolution asking the convention's endorsement of an amendment to the Volstead Act, which would permit three and one-half per cent beer and light wines. Certainly, after listening to Mr. Gompers, one would have supposed that the Eighteenth Amendment constituted one of the chief reasons of the present unrest. Has one forgotten the "no beer, no work" slogan? However, at this convention this presumably popular resolution was tabled, after a long and intelligent debate, by a vote of 160 to 95. No argument it appeared was more irritating to the majority of the delegates than that appealing to them as "brothers" to protect the jobs of the men employed in the liquor industry. The opposition to the resolution was based largely on the grounds that union membership and attendance of union meetings had greatly increased in both quantity and quality of intelligence since the coming of prohibition.

Labor's Martyr

The delegates also gave an interesting indication of the psychology of the newer progressive labor groups when they stood in silence for one minute in memory of Mrs. Fanny Sellins—killed on August 26 last in West Natrona, Pa.—but refused to give the same tribute to a former president of the Federation and late commissioner of immigration of Philadelphia. The reason advanced for this discrimination was that thousands of the rank and file die annually, no special mention being made, and that officers dying a natural death deserve no greater honor than do the rank and file. On the other hand, Mrs. Sellins was "a martyr of the cause of labor."

Pittsburgh and Western Pennsylvania supplied the dramatic events of the Pennsylvania Labor Convention. James Oats told of the Mrs. Sellins tragedy, and of the speaker's arrest and threatened indictment for alleged inciting to riot, in an attempt to silence him. Nine months had elapsed, the speaker contended, since Mrs. Sellins' death, and not one person had been brought to trial. "You could not convict a gunman in Allegheny County even if the Lord himself had appeared to testify against him," he concluded. President Maurer stated that telegrams had been sent to President Wilson and the governor of the state informing them of the outrageous treatment of the body of Fanny Sellins after the murder.

Duquesne

Another moment of dramatic nature was supplied by the address of J. G. Brown, William Z. Foster's successor. Brown told of "the free speech war zone—Duquesne." He declared that the Duquesne ordinance prohibiting free speech had been "originally suggested by the 10-cent despot, James S. Crawford, banker of Duquesne. It was then introduced by James S. Crawford, councilman of Duquesne, and later signed by James S. Crawford, president of the council of Duquesne. The ordinance was thereupon approved by James S. Crawford, burgess of Duquesne; was enforced by James S. Crawford, commissioner of public safety of Duquesne; and, when an appeal was made regarding its constitutionality, was interpreted by James S. Crawford, police magistrate of Duquesne." Enthusiastic applause followed his reference to Rev. William M. Fincke,

who was arrested while endeavoring to address a meeting in Duquesne, and who refused to be released on bail until all of the labor leaders were similarly released. Fincke was described as a "member of the minister's union and a regular fellow."

Impeachment of Governor Urged

One of the more important resolutions adopted by the convention was one passed without a dissenting vote "pledging all candidates for the state legislature to bring about the impeachment and removal from office of Governor Sproul for his failure to consider and relieve the many complaints and abuses of power on the part of the state constabulary in the steel strike."

A resolution requesting the governor to call a special session of the legislature in order to pass laws against profiteering was unanimously defeated, on the ground that it was a waste of time and energy. Another resolution demanded the removal of the state constabulary from various cities and towns as "a menace to morality."

One resolution urged trade union officials responsible for the editing of certain labor journals, "to stop promoting the capitalist's game, whether intentionally or unintentionally, and instead to utilize the valuable space of the trade union journals for purposes of education and true trade unionism." A delegate cited in a recent number of an international trade journal two articles entitled "In Praise of Lilacs," "A Trip to the Moon," and a third one which attacked the Russian soviet government on account of "its disfranchisement of the clergy and its alleged nationalization of women." "Is this education or bunk that we are being fed with?" inquired the speaker.

The Demand of Rank and File

The convention demanded amnesty for all political, religious, and labor prisoners; the recognition of the Irish republic, the establishment of industrial courts, of an old age pension system in Pennsylvania, and of a minimum wage commission, and the enactment of a statute providing for a legal eight-hour day for women workers. It also favored proportional representation. These measures were the demand of the rank and file, not the result of a stampede caused by able leaders. The rank and file were, in fact, so determined to inaugurate the new era of labor that they did not attempt to conceal their indignation at the executive council of the State Federation for not carrying out the instructions of last year's convention to call a special convention for the purpose of creating a labor party. Even President Maurer, whom they all love and trust, did not escape blame. The delegates showed their resentment later by defeating John A. Phillips, typographical union, Philadelphia, for the first vice-presidency, a position which he had held for several years, because it was rumored that he was opposed to the labor party.

Labor's Underworld

The real spirit of the awakened labor movement manifested in the convention was tested especially during the session devoted to the adoption of the constitution and platform of the Labor Party and to its election of officers. This session indicated something of the terrific struggle of Maurer and others in ridding the Pennsylvania labor movement of its parasitic groups. Late that afternoon the worst elements of labor's political underworld began to arrive in Altoona from Pittsburgh and Philadelphia with suit cases full of liquor. In the absence of a sergeant-at-arms at the door, these gang leaders, led by a few who were not even delegates, managed to gain access to the hall, and later annoyed the meeting by cat-calls and by inducing intoxicated delegates to interrupt the proceedings. Failing to make headway by this method, they attempted to have the election postponed until the next day, but were opposed by delegate after delegate who arose to condemn in the bitterest terms the tactics of the black forces.

"This night," declared Robert McCoy, molder, of Pittsburgh, "is as important and as solemn as the night when the fathers of

this country gathered in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, and drew up the Declaration of Independence. We are here to draw up labor's new Declaration of Independence and we shall never permit ourselves to be interfered with by the enemies of labor in our most sacred work, even if we have to remain in session till sun rise and sun set." Silence followed this new declaration of labor, and the dark forces submerged again into their fathomless political underworld.

The Case for Mexico

Hands Off Mexico. By John Kenneth Turner. N. Y.: The Rand School of Social Science. 74 pp.

This little book by the author of "Barbarous Mexico" is an admirable statement of the case against intervention. It is more concise and more to the point than L. J. DeBekker's "The Plot Against Mexico," and yet an invaluable complement to such propagandist literature as Louis P. Lochner's pamphlet, "Mexico—Whose War?" or Arthur Thomson's "The Conspiracy Against Mexico."

The author speaks as a competent authority on the very complex tangle in relations between the United States and its southern neighbor. He traces the history of the political tension between both countries from its very beginning and lays bare the incredible inability and inefficacy of the Wilson administration in dealing with Mexico. "The best things that can be said of the Wilson Mexican policy are chiefly of a negative character," he concludes. And in summing up the able presentation of his argument he justly warns:

"Intervention is not defensible on any ground. It is bad democracy. For all of us except a handful, it is bad business. It is impossible to exaggerate the probable disaster to both countries. Not only would the Mexican people pay, but the American people would pay—in blood, taxes, higher living costs, in the friendship of our neighbors, in the constitutional liberties of which peoples are invariably robbed in war-time, in our own character, in all elements that make for a higher civilization and for world peace."

There is no doubt in my mind that the anti-Mexican propaganda in this country is not only conducted and supported by those financiers and concessionnaires who hope to profit through the political control by the United States of the oil lands of Mexico, but that it is also a conscious policy of those forces in this country who are anxious to oppose organized labor and the radical movement with the well-known "Prussian" methods of war-scares, militarism, and, finally, war itself. The sooner the socialists and other friends of liberty realize that there can be no permanent hope for social advance in any field, unless society is freed from international wars and threats of war, the better for us all. It is, therefore, doubly imperative that we watch what happens in the international field, and it is to be hoped that Turner's courageous exposure of American dealings with Mexico may be widely read, and that it may lead to a saner and more stable policy towards a hard struggling people who even today look upon the people of this country as their friends rather than their future oppressors!

JOHN MEZ.

SUMMER

All changes of address must reach the office by the 15th of the month in order to ensure correct delivery of the magazine.

BOSTON COMRADES should drop in at the Socialist Party State headquarters at 530 Tremont Street. Hospitable welcome to all *Socialist Review* readers.

FILMS TO FIGHT

THE motion picture industry, with its tremendous influence on the American mind, is today threatened with complete absorption and control by moneyed interests and reactionary forces. Not content with usurpation of the press the predatory powers employ the insidious methods of yellow journalism in the film. Their autocratic dictation is becoming more and more evident in misrepresentations and attacks against the exponents of economic, social, and political progress.

Labor and its allies have not so far availed themselves of the method by which this propaganda may be answered in kind. Truth is desecrated, and economic and political slavery is enshrined—*unopposed*—in an unending series of films manufactured and distributed by corporations completely controlled by capitalists. What are the enlightened men and women of America going to do about it?

One solution is at hand. The Labor Film Service is organized essentially to cope with this problem. It has at command the plans and services of a group of qualified and far-sighted persons imbued with the ideal of motion pictures dedicated to the cause of Human Betterment. They will make films that FIGHT FOR LABOR.

FOR LABOR

Films to Be Produced

(1) INDUSTRIAL FILMS: the work and growth of unions, organizations, leagues and institutions, they paying the cost of production.

(2) ANIMATED LABOR REVIEW: News reels, pictorials, travelogues, and scenics depicting the worker's life in the mines, in the slums, on farms, railroads, the picket line, etc.

(3) LECTURE LYCEUM: Films, slides and textual data for labor forum lectures.

(4) LABOR and RECONSTRUCTION SERIES: Dramas, based on the writings of iconoclasts, to stimulate sociological, literary, and artistic interest, thus laying the foundation for a great cultural work.

Organization

The Labor Film Service, designed to make the movies a true forum of the people, is a corporation of New York State with an authorized capital of $50,000 in shares of $10 each. No majority stockholders will control, as all individual holdings are limited to $1,000. The executive staff of expert workers will be governed by an advisory council of Labor and Liberal leaders.

The Labor Film Service is organized primarily to serve the supreme ideal of helping human progress through the effective utilization of the motion picture. But it can not be gainsaid that some profits will accrue, which will take the form of regularly declared dividends or be turned back into the sinking fund, according to the decision of the shareholders.

Dr. NORMAN THOMAS, Editor of "The World To-Morrow," says: "Just as truly as labor needs its own press it needs its own film service. I believe you ought to rally to you strong support from labor circles and from those liberals who realize the seriousness of the present situation. I for one heartily endorse your idea and trust you will be able to make it wholly successful."

Dr. JUDAH L. MAGNES, renowned Liberal Leader: "Replying to your letter of May 21st, permit me to say that your idea of using motion pictures in the advancement of labor's interests appears to me to be a very sound one. Kindly accept my best wishes for the success of your venture."

SCOTT NEARING: "My attention has been called to the fact that the Labor Film Service is planning to supply the American Labor Movement with motion pictures. It is said that fifty million Americans attend movie shows each week. If that is so it is vitally important to have them watching films that speak the message of industrial self-government and economic freedom. I wish you every success."

Distribution

The innumerable labor and liberal forums are a market ready and waiting for these films. Afterward there are the 18,000 movie theatres. Films, unlike printed matter, are not at the mercy of post office officials; regular circulation is assured.

Endorsed by the Central Federated Union of New York Representing 500,000 Workers

JOSEPH D. CANNON, Field Organizer

Labor Film Service, Inc. 31 Union Sq., New York

Tear off coupon—Subscribe today

— — — — — — — — — — TEAR OUT HERE — — — — — — — — — — —

IMPORTANT

The enterprise can not succeed without money and moral support. An immediate stock subscription is most vital of all. But ask us for further information if needful. Inquiries and indeed all communications are exceedingly welcome. But enable us to know who our friends are by some sign—TODAY.

LABOR FILM SERVICE, Inc., 31 Union Sq., New York

LABOR FILM SERVICE, Inc., 31 Union Sq., New York.

Gentlemen:—Enclosed find $..... as my subscription for ..... shares at $10 each.

Name .....

Address .....

.....

The Appeal to Reason's Latest Book List

On the Threshold of Sex, 25c

One of the most important needs of these days is a candid yet careful treatment of the overshadowing problems of sex. Modesty becomes a mockery when it is founded upon total ignorance. The facts of sex should be frankly communicated, in order that modesty and purity may be glorified and guarded by intelligence. This book, by an English writer, is one of the best for this purpose.

How to Be an Orator, 25c

This is not an ordinary manual, which simply lays down certain mechanical rules of practice and perfection. This is a sincere and inspiring work from the pen of one who was himself a great orator and friend of the people—John P. Altgeld, one-time governor of Illinois, a friend of 'Gene Debs, and the man who pardoned the Chicago anarchists.

From Terror to Triumph, 25c

Under this strikingly apt title is given the military history of the Russian Soviet Republic, an amazing story of a working-class revolution defended heroically and successfully, upon many different fronts, against the forces of world capitalism. This book also contains the Russian Code of Labor Laws, a most valuable document.

Hugo's Oration on Voltaire, 25c

One immortal soldier of progress—Victor Hugo—pays tribute to the memory of another—Voltaire—who has fought his splendid fight and become a part of history. This is one of the most eloquent pieces of rhetoric and idealism in all of Hugo's career.

Ballad of Reading Jail, 25c

The Ballad of Reading Jail is not only one of the greatest poems in the English language, but a terrific and unforgettable exposure of the hell of prison existence. This is the most deeply sincere thing Oscar Wilde ever wrote. He lived through the cruel, soul-torturing experiences which he portrays so vividly.

Did Jesus Ever Live? 25c

Did this sad figure of martyrdom ever really live upon the earth? If he was a real person, did he perform the wonderful miracles attributed to him? Was he just a common agitator or a world savior? These questions are debated in this book.

From Monkey to Man, 25c

This book written by a high authority sets down in brief and simple language the theory of evolution and tells how Man, in long ages of painful progress, came up from the Monkey.

Soul of Man Under Socialism, 25c

In "The Soul of Man Under Socialism," Oscar Wilde shows that Socialism is really the only path to true and perfect individualism. It will free man from social fetters that are artificial and that are forged by injustice.

Rhyming Dictionary, 25c

The difficulty in writing poetry is in getting the right words to fit in rhyme. The People's Rhyming Dictionary is simply compiled and will immediately provide you with exactly the right words.

On Going to Church, 25c

As usual, Bernard Shaw treats this subject in an original manner that is refreshing and diverting. It is Shaw at his best. Also contains "Useless Work," by William Morris.

Voltaire's Toleration, 25c

"Toleration" is an apt title for a book by Voltaire, for it was in the cause of toleration of thought that Voltaire waged a heroic life-long battle against the forces of oppression and superstition of his day. It is a powerful appeal for liberty of thought.

You can have any book listed above for only 25 cents; five for a dollar; or you can have all of them—eleven in all—for only $1.50. Postage prepaid.

APPEAL TO REASON, Girard, Kansas