

got rid of the old taboo which forbade them to think and talk about sex, and they still labor under the old superstition that sex is a matter of paramount importance. The result, in my judgment, is a vast emission of piffle. In every division of the subject there is endless and ludicrous exaggeration. The campaign for birth control takes on the colossal proportions of the war for democracy. The venereal diseases are represented to be as widespread, at least in men, as colds in the head, and as lethal as pneumonia or cancer. Great hordes of viragoes patrol the country, instructing school-girls in the mechanics of reproduction and their mothers in obstetrics. The monogamy which produced all of us is denounced as an infamy comparable to cannibalism. Laws are passed regulating the mating of human beings as if they were horned cattle and converting marriage into a sort of coroner's inquest. Over all sounds the battle-cry of quacks and zealots: "Veritas liberabit vos!"

The truth? How much of this new gospel is actually truth? Perhaps two per cent. The rest is idle theorizing, doctrinaire nonsense, mere scandalous rubbish. All that is worth knowing about sex—all, that is, that is solidly established and of sound utility—can be taught to any intelligent boy of sixteen in two hours. Is it taught in the current books, so enormously circulated? I doubt it. Absolutely without exception these books admonish the poor apprentice to renounce sex altogether—to sublimate it, as the favorite phrase is, into a passion for free verse, Rotary, or the League of Nations. That admonition is silly, and, I believe, dangerous. It is as much a folly to lock up sex in the hold as it is to put it in command on the bridge. Its proper place is the social hall.

As a substitute for all such nonsense I drop a pearl of wisdom, and so pass on. To wit: the strict monogamist never gets into trouble.

## Revolution—New Style

By GEORGE SOULE

THE recent victories of the needle-trades unions in New York emphasize the function of labor organizations as creative forces in industry. Not one was fought over simple questions of wages and hours. Not one was an out-and-out conflict for power between exploiter and exploited. The chief gains of each battle were greater cohesiveness and better organization of the industry, elimination of economic waste, and constructive measures like unemployment insurance.

It is a dogma of the extreme left that industry is inevitably drifting toward larger units of production and concentrated capitalistic control. A corollary of this dogma is that the only proper course for labor is amalgamation of the unions and a "militant" spirit leading to strikes on an ever larger scale. At every point the workers must refuse to cooperate with employers. Anything of that sort is damned as "class collaboration."

The lefts in the heat of their dogmas apparently have failed to make a realistic examination of the clothing industries of New York. Here the development has been precisely opposite to that which they say is inevitable. Units of production have been growing smaller. The amount of capital necessary to start a shop is so small that the industry has become overcrowded and competition has been intensified beyond endurance. The comparatively large "inside shops" which make entire garments under one roof have been gradually giving way. The jobbers or stock-houses have been encroaching on their market to the retail trade. The small contractors, making up orders for the jobbers, have been encroaching on their manufacturing function. In the cloak-and-suit industry the jobber furnishes the material, and sometimes even the design, to the contractor, who gets the jobber's order through the bitterest kind of competitive bidding.

The result of all this overlapping is manufacture in wastefully small shops, overequipment of machinery and personnel among the contractors, heavy seasonal unemployment, a dragging down of labor standards, deterioration of quality of the product. No amount of union amalgamation or "militancy" would help a situation such as this. The

need is not for a simple test of power. It is a problem in industrial engineering.

Likewise the type of trade unionism which thinks of the task of labor as a matter of shrewd bargaining with an employer who can if he will grant any desired concessions, and which concentrates on wage rates and hour schedules to the exclusion of problems of industrial organization, would not have much to offer in a situation such as this. A traditional argument is that seasonal unemployment may be minimized by shorter working hours, and that it should be compensated for by higher wage rates. Such arguments did, indeed, crop up in the recent struggles in New York. But a strike for these objects alone, even if nominally successful, could not have made much headway against the industrial chaos which set the limits to the advantages which the workers might win.

A short strike of the men's clothing workers, conducted by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, brought an element of cohesion into their industry which had been lacking ever since the break-up of the Manufacturers' Association and the impartial chairmanship after the 1921 lock-out. A new association of employers was formed and an agreement was made with it. There will be a guaranty of union conditions in all shops. There will be minimum-wage scales based on production—a measure which will tend to deprive the small shops of any competitive advantage. There will be an unemployment-insurance fund, beginning next December, built up by a weekly contribution of 3 per cent of the pay roll, one-half contributed by each side. There will be an impartial chairman to administer the agreement and settle minor disputes. Thus the measures for stability which have been successfully tested in the Chicago market have been introduced in New York, and the industry may be expected to convalesce under a scientific treatment.

The International Ladies' Garment Workers had a more difficult situation, and had been working at it longer. For months before the expiration of their agreement on May 1, they had been endeavoring to bring about a scientific investigation and a remedy for the ills of their industry through

cooperation of the big manufacturers, the jobbers, the contractors, and the union. A joint commission formed for this purpose failed to elicit the necessary detailed information on account of the reluctance of the jobbers to help it. The jobbers, though ultimately involved in the disintegration of the industry, were temporarily profiting from the surplus of contractors and were not prepared to cooperate in good faith. When the agreement expired the union presented demands embodying the best remedies it could devise, and threatened to force cohesion in the industry through a strike. This threat led to the appointment of a competent investigating commission by Governor Smith, which heard all sides at length and eventually handed down recommendations embodying much of what the union wanted. The jobbers at first refused to accept the verdict, but another strike threat at the beginning of the busy season, which was now at hand, brought them to terms.

The remedies offered by the commission are more complicated and extensive than in the case of the men's clothing industry. They include a stipulation that jobbers shall order goods only from contractors having agreements with the union, that such union contractors' shops shall have at least fourteen machine operators and a corresponding number of employees in other branches of the work, that a sanitary label shall be used in products of union shops which shall be subject to the Joint Board of Sanitary Control, that

jobbers shall be responsible for the payment of wages by the contractors, that an unemployment-insurance fund shall be built up by contributions from the employers and the union, and that there shall be an impartial chairman to decide disputes in the industry during the life of the agreement—one year. Regarding further proposals of the union for stabilization of the industry expert investigators are to work under the Governor's commission with full power to get the necessary facts from all sources. Another committee is to devise a code of trade practices as between the contractors and the jobbers.

The United Cloth Hat and Cap Makers have won an agreement for unemployment insurance in New York, and the International Fur Workers are to have one also if it is found to be practicable in their industry.

Thus the power of the unions is being employed, not in aimless or primitive struggles, not in theoretical "militancy," but in order to revivify competitive trades which have run to seed under the profit motive. If we mean by "revolution" the substitution of social purpose in industry for the chaos of individualistic gain, that revolution is on the way in the clothing industries by the invention of a new technique of cooperation and control, by the formation of new group habits and standards. It is built upon the conscious power of labor and the application of painstaking experiment.

## Davis the Double-Edged

(The Nation's Weekly Washington Letter)

By WILLIAM HARD

NOTHING was charmer to the delighted observer of human behavior in this vale of tears and guffaws than the McAdoo delegates in the New York Democratic Convention, who, having wept and prayed and shouted themselves hoarse and worried themselves sick for McAdoo and progressivism, led the march on the convention floor toward Davis and toward what William Jennings Bryan had denounced as an alliance with Wall Street.

George Brennan of Illinois, James M. Cox of Ohio, and other influential individualities, commonly called leaders, or bosses, may have stimulated and facilitated that march. The New York delegation, by seeming to throw itself into the arms of the Klan-denouncing Oscar W. Underwood of Alabama, may have wrenched and frightened the opponents of denunciations of the Klan in Georgia and in Texas into throwing themselves into the arms of Davis. All sorts of influences by bosses, all sorts of influences by intrigues, may be alleged and in part may be proved.

This writer alleges nevertheless, from observation, for instance, of the Georgia delegation, and from observation of the Texas delegation, that not George Brennan, and not Tom Taggart, and not the ghost of Charlie Murphy, and not any other apparition or reality of so-called boss power could go into either of those two delegations and successfully say: "You now vote for Davis because I tell you to."

That sort of thing was totally impossible in large areas of the Democratic Convention in New York. Yet out of those large areas, inhabited by McAdoo delegates, there came a multitudinous support for Davis from ladies and gentlemen who previously had been saying that they would stay in New York all summer and die in their tracks before

they would surrender to New York Wall Street influences.

Then they voted to nominate the attorney of the principal Wall Street banking firm.

How can this apparent paradox be explained? That is the chief psychological and political puzzle growing out of the recent Democratic National Convention in New York.

Its explanation may possibly go back to the excesses which marked the beginning of the convention. Among these excesses was a fervent and sincere but quite exaggerated McAdoo denunciation of Tammany and Al Smith and reaction and the money devil all lumped rhetorically into one lump and damned harmoniously and unitedly as the characteristic and essential outstanding product of the side-walks of New York.

Inquiry, however, regarding New York soon indicated to the delegates that Al Smith, instead of being the tool of big business and the recognized enemy of progress in New York, had promoted numerous pieces of humanitarian and progressive legislation at Albany against much determined corporate opposition to them and was loved by the common people of New York with a personal affection for which there is no parallel anywhere else in all America in the case of any other champion of the common people's feelings and wishes.

This discovery about New York had its weight with the McAdoo delegates. If Smith the monster could turn out to be Smith the popular champion and the popular idol—well, here was wonderland and anything might happen and anything might be believed. Perhaps Davis of New York might be popular too. Perhaps everything was different from what it was thought to be back home.