

hended almost from the moment of the return of the men to work. If it should occur, the government which intervened, although in the name of a private citizen, will simply have demonstrated its weakness, and will have brought contempt upon its authority. If it should not occur, the happy result will be due to the conduct, directed by self-interest, of the parties themselves, and not at all to the authority of the government.

The situation in the anthracite region illustrates, perhaps it may be said to demonstrate, the incapacity of the government to deal with the labor problem. Not only are the politicians who may, for the time, be in control of the government, almost inevitably bound to consider the relative voting powers of the controversialists, but they must interfere with the right of contract, the freedom of the individual, and they must enter with restraining and directing power into the domain of private business. Moreover, if the politicians are to bring labor controversies to a close, government must be clothed with authority to enforce its decrees, or, rather, to inflict punishment, or to impose penalties for disobedience. An order that the anthracite miners go to work for three years on the terms imposed is absurd, and the power which makes the order cannot punish for contempt of it, nor can it inflict a penalty for disobedience.

If the labor unions were incorporated, a penalty might indeed be collected, but the government which should undertake to enforce its labor decrees under present conditions, even if it ought to be entrusted with the delicate duty of making such decrees, must often have its labor for its pains. It can depend only upon the good-will of the parties, of capital and of labor; in other words—obedience to a government recommendation is and must remain merely the keeping of an agreement. If, to return to the anthracite illustration, the operators and the miners go on peaceably, it will be because each side keeps its agreement, and an agreement between the two may be reached without involving the government, involvement of government being dangerous to it, because it always implies a possible disregard or disobedience of judgments or of recommendations. The concentration of interested public opinion in the issue of responsibility for a strike is a different question.

The conclusion which we reach is that as between strikers and their employers, the President's recent intervention has not changed the fact that capital and labor must adjust their grievances by mutual agreement. If the operators and miners have really come together—of which there is some doubt—it is because of the preliminary agreement to abide by the findings of the commission. Not only has the commission's report been disregarded by all labor unions other than the United Mine Workers, but Mr. Mitchell's organization has betrayed unmistakable signs of ignoring all the criticisms of its own methods. The methods of the modern strike were severely condemned by the commission, and yet, since the decision, there has been an epidemic of strikes, and, in many instances, resort has been had to the methods condemned. The conclusion to be drawn from this is one not to be escaped. The so-called settlement of the anthracite-coal strike has not affected the general relations between capital and labor. Union men in the anthracite regions refused to go to work at the time agreed upon. Members of building trades have struck because of the employment of non-union men. The carpenters of one union in the city of New York struck, without a direct or personal grievance, for the pur-

pose of driving a rival union out of the city. The motormen of Waterbury marked their strike by violence, riot, and murder. The question has been raised by organized labor as to its relations to government, and, in more than one instance, it has been decided that a union man, in a conflict with the law, must be disloyal to the State—a malefactor, in short—if he is to remain loyal to the union. The spinners of Lowell went on strike for higher wages after an authoritative announcement by impartial investigators that the mills could not afford to pay the advance demanded. The unions in many places, in widely different parts of the country, have insisted on the boycott, on the payment of the same wages to the inefficient as to the efficient, on the sympathetic strike, and on interference with the business of the employers. Against all these evil practices, so far as they obtained in the anthracite-coal strike, the commission remonstrated, but with no effect; the government report made no impression upon the minds of wage-earners except those whose pay was increased by way of compromise. The wrongdoing which was condemned continued, because those who had obtained control of the unions held that methods of violence were essential in what they called the war between capital and labor.

While the government, acting through a powerless commission, has demonstrated its inability to solve the labor problem, the problem shows signs of working itself out, in the building trades in the East, in the bituminous fields of the West. Among all employers of labor in the West, employers' unions have been formed for the purpose of bringing matters to a settlement, for the purpose, in other words, of putting an end to war and of establishing peace. The first object is to eliminate from the controversy those excessive demands of organized labor which are the inventions of the radical and irresponsible persons who have come to the front during the "state of war." Employers are ready to deal with the organizations of their own trades or businesses, and when labor unions accept this principle it is because the reasonable and better men are coming to the front. Whenever we see strikers hesitating in the present struggle, it is a sign that the efficient working-men have grown weary of the rule of the inefficient, of the extreme, the irresponsible men. The Lowell mills have started up, while the strike officially goes on. The New York builders have produced a plan for arbitration which has been respectfully considered. The voice of the good man who does not love his enforced idleness will be heard; and when employer and the employed get together, by agreement between the one and the real leaders of the other—the sober, industrious, judicious American working-man, good citizen and good family head as he is—the controversy will be settled for good, and there will be an end at last of violence, of law-breaking, and of interference with the right of each man to labor for whom and for what price he will. The excesses of modern union methods seem to be working out the labor problem and in the right way, for if the reasonable and conservative men of both parties to the conflict come together, it will soon be seen that conflict is the unnatural and union the natural thing; that it is not for the interests of capital to be oppressive, nor is it for the interest of labor to be unjust or violent. Affairs seem to be moving in this direction, which is the right direction, for it assumes that capital and labor have common interests, while interference by government assumes, and must continue to assume, that a state of war exists between the two.

The Negro Problem and the New Negro Crime

A WELL-KNOWN and well-informed member of the Federal House of Representatives from Alabama, Mr. Bankhead, recently asserted that since the State Constitution by which negroes are disfranchised became operative in Mississippi, there has not occurred in that State a single instance of the so-called "new" negro crime, by which is meant the crime against white women. The Representative went on to say that, if this crime should become unknown in his section of the country, there would be no "negro problem," so far as the South is concerned. The alleged fact in Mississippi was cited by way of proof that the crime to which we have referred should be attributed to the notions of political and social equality with which the generation of blacks then growing up became imbued during the reconstruction period. The inference drawn was that, with the practical collapse of the reconstruction legislation and the consequent vanishing of notions of political and social equality, the crime would become extinct. In further support of this theory of the origin of the crime, and of the remedy therefor, it is pointed out that this particular atrocity which is the curse of the South, and has compelled the families of white planters in the black belt to migrate from the rural districts into the towns, was entirely unknown before the civil war, and remained unknown for some years thereafter, so long as the ideas and habits acquired under the slavery régime remained dominant in the negro element of the Southern population.

Before accepting this theory, to which Mr. Bankhead is a convert, we should mention that an entirely different cause is assigned to the crime by other men, who also have made a careful study of the subject. Keeping in view the dates at which and the localities in which the outrages have been perpetrated, and marking also the personal history of the criminals, they have arrived at the conclusion that such outrages are sporadic indications of a lapse of the Southern negro into a state of barbarism or savagery, in which the gratification of the brutish instincts is no longer subjected to the restraints of civilization. They point to the condition of things in Haiti as furnishing corroborative proof that a disregard for sexual restraints is characteristic of a community which has undergone social degeneration. This is a plausible hypothesis, and it has been accepted by many persons who have observed, or think they have observed, that the generation of Southern negroes which has grown up since the civil war is morally and intellectually inferior to the preceding generation which was the product of the slavery régime. It is generally acknowledged, we believe, that the new negro at the South is less industrious, less thrifty, less trustworthy, and less self-controlled than was his father or his grandfather. Nevertheless, the theory which imputes the emergence of a new crime to a tendency of the Southern blacks to relapse into savagery cannot be easily reconciled with another class of facts. We refer to the frequent occurrence of the new crime in the Northern States, where the negro cannot be supposed to be lapsing into barbarism, because he is surrounded by the civilizing influences of a white race vastly preponderant in numbers. Exact statistical data are not yet forthcoming, but those who have investigated the matter express the opinion that the particular crime in question is committed even more frequently by negroes at the North than at the South, if the small numerical proportion which they bear to the environing white population in the former

section be kept in view. Moreover, at the North, as at the South, the phenomenon is a novel one: there was in the Northern States, we believe, no instance of the crime which we are now discussing before the civil war. It would be absurd to contend, however, that the negroes in the Northern States are not at the present time as civilized as they were forty-odd years ago. In their case, therefore, we must reject the explanation which ascribes the new negro crime to a lapse into savagery.

On the whole, we are inclined to think that there is some basis for the hypothesis which makes the reconstruction legislation and the ideas generated by it responsible for the evolution of the new negro crime.

This hypothesis fits all the facts, being as applicable to the phenomena reported in the Northern as to those observed in the Southern States. In the Northern States the negro not only possesses the franchise, but is encouraged to exercise it. Neither is the encouragement confined to one of the great political parties, for it is well understood that in certain States of the East and central West the negro vote may turn the scale at closely contested elections. Nor is there any doubt that the negro enjoys more social equality at the North than at the South.

It is true that in our Northern cities black men are debarred by custom, though not by law, from many theatres, hotels, and restaurants; but they are not forced to occupy separate cars on railways and tramways: In Washington for many years negro officials of the District of Columbia have been permitted to attend one of the President's receptions, although Mr. Booker Washington is, so far as we can now recall, the only colored man that has been invited to dine at the White House. There is, in a word, no doubt that at the North the black man has attained not only complete political equality, but a closer approach to social equality, than he is ever likely to attain at the South. It would be difficult not to associate the phenomena as cause and effect, if, upon thorough investigation, it should prove true that the new negro crime is actually more frequent, proportionally to numbers, at the North than it is at the South.

Will the experience of Mississippi, with regard to the extinction of the crime, be repeated in the other Southern States, which have virtually set at naught the reconstruction legislation, by disfranchising the negroes? It is too early to expect an answer to this question, for their new State Constitutions have not been operative for a sufficiently long period. It is said, however, that already in Alabama the number of outrages has noticeably decreased. It would be superfluous to point out the tremendous importance of the matter, not only to the Southern whites, but to the Southern blacks themselves. If the new negro crime became extinct in the Gulf States, the old plantation life might be resumed, and the black laborers would again be brought under civilizing influences, instead of being left to drift into isolated communities. The whole attitude of the Southern white toward his black neighbor would be revolutionized, and the two races would be brought into economic relations that would prove mutually beneficial. Should this prove to be the effect of the new State Constitutions, the American people may have cause to bless the refusal of the United States Supreme Court to enforce the Fifteenth Amendment.

In every Southern community where the new negro crime has been prevalent, there has been engendered a tendency to race aloofness and race hatred; nor can we doubt that the extinction of the crime is the indispen-

sable condition of a revival of the old pacific, trustful, and friendly inter-relations. We sincerely hope that the facts with regard to Mississippi are correctly stated by Mr. Bankhead. If they are, we are inclined to adopt his interpretation of their significance.

Kishinef and the Russian Jews

A GIRL'S VIEW OF RUSSIAN CONDITIONS

(From a private letter)

ODESSA, May 22 1903.

... Brother did not come, after all; but his little Armenian friend is passing the state examinations, and is in a great state about it. He was here a moment ago, to share with us his fears and perturbations about getting his university certificate. We share his fears, and sympathize greatly with the poor fellow, for it is fine to find him working hard and studying; with his wealth, he might very well simply have a good time and not trouble about anything, as most people without self-respect do in his position.

Generally speaking, Lena and I are greatly perturbed; events in Russia fill me with despondency. I am awfully sorry for the Emperor. All kinds of horrible things take place. Every morning I am afraid to open the newspapers. Strikes, outbreaks, murders, anarchical proclamations. The Kishinef attack on the Jews is terrible, but its consequences are still worse: no work, starvation. . . . They say that the Jews really did kill a child, and that the whole trouble arose from that. Others say that this is a lie; but that after the outbreak the Jews crucified a Russian boy in revenge, sewing his eyelids and lips together as a precaution. It is impossible to keep silence about this. It should be either officially disproved or confirmed; otherwise the trouble will continue to grow. The police shielded the rich Jew merchants, for money; but no one did anything for the poor, who were not to blame for anything.

Now every one is over-full of sympathy, and collections are being taken up everywhere; but I am certain that none of the money will reach the poorer Jews who were attacked. Fine arrangements will be made among private persons, or the money will find its way into the anarchists' treasury.

It is certain that two hundred pounds weight of anarchist proclamations were found in the Jews' possession, and that the Jewish students are nearly all for disorder and destruction, that European anarchy has found its way into Bessarabia from Rumania, and is acting adroitly so as to arouse trouble. There was far more political lining to this outbreak . . . trying to evoke passion, discord, and general irritation . . . to fish in troubled waters later on.

And what has been going on in our factories all winter? Three days ago they killed Bogdanovich, the governor of Ufa, with nine shots,—on the Emperor's birthday. Every one loved and spoke well of Bogdanovich. During Lent he ended a strike of the workmen by the most energetic means and acted like a hero, and now they have killed him,—the same strikers, of course. But the worst of all is that we have no men. . . .

And our literature. . . . I shall try to send you all the works of Gorki, Andreïff, and the rest of them. Read them, and find out for yourself. They are all signs of the

times. Gorki is a clever and gifted schemer, who has adroitly caught the tone of our present tendencies, with selfish aims of his own. A general awakening has taken place; our consciences are stirring towards the miserable and downtrodden, and the clever Gorki has seized the opportunity to turn an honest penny by his barefoot literature. They will soon find Gorki out, and sweep him aside, but all the same it is true that all Russia has made a great step forward, and has learned to listen to the cries and groans of the people. It is true that people's consciences have awakened, but it is also true that it was not Gorki who awakened them. This has been preparing for whole decades. Dostoyevsky and Tolstoi only carried on a work already begun, and now the moment has come, and we are passing through a troubled and clouded period, because, though the feeling itself is luminous and beneficent, yet it will give birth to many sacrifices and dark doings, and is already giving birth to them. This is why I say that I am awfully sorry for the Emperor. If I sometimes lie awake all night, in a cold sweat, thinking of it all, how is he to find his way through the labyrinths of all these troubles?

And Macedonia and the murders and horrors in Albania, what does it all mean? How sorry I am for that fine man Scherbina, our consul, murdered by the Albanians! Do you know, when he was going back to his duties the last time, he passed through Odessa, and stopped at the Hotel St. Petersburg,—he had the same room that our little Armenian now has. And imagine! he had a premonition that he would die, so that he even said to Franz the waiter, "It is no good that I am going to; I won't come out of it alive!"

But let me come back to our literature. Andreïff is, in my opinion, higher than Gorki, as far as psychology goes. He describes the awful sores of humanity, but he describes true things, which must be faced. He is interesting not only for Russia. He is still young, and if he does not go crazy he will be a great writer. But my delight and joy, a real moral oasis for me, is Chekhoff.

He is a great national Russian writer, and the more I read him, the more I see his plays, the stronger grow my admiration and love for him. For him, not only the barefooted are worthy of attention; he scourges sins, but finds splendid people, and unhappy and lovable sufferers among the gymnasts, soldiers, officers, the clergy, the higher classes. He knows and loves Russia, and writes from the heart, not like Gorki the self-advertiser! And how mad I get at the flocks of silly sheep who cannot distinguish between advertisement and truth.

Gorki reminds me of the young Jewish swells, with Derby hats on the backs of their heads, fashionable overcoats, walking-canes, and an arm in a sling or a bandaged eye, who have flooded Odessa, and especially the Promenade and Boulevard cafés, since the Kishinef outbreak. What a splendid advertisement! What suffering heroes! Gorki produces exactly the same impression of insincerity on me. Time will show whether I am right; let us wait; if we live, we shall be able to give an account of all these feelings of ours.

I am sore at heart for the poor tattered Jews; our old fruit-seller, our toiling seamstress. I know that I may be killed myself by the mad mob for protecting them, if they make an attack on the Jews in Odessa. But for the knaves whose pockets are bulging with money and proclamations against the Emperor, . . . do you know, I feel like beating them myself! All these days my heart is heavy and sore. . . .