

tion of numbers as well as of influence. The best that can be done is to make estimates upon the basis of a few definite figures, which we have for specific years, and of some general statements. For example, there seems to be no reason for questioning the oft-quoted assertion in Burke's "Account of the European Settlements in America" that in 1729 the immigrants to Pennsylvania numbered 6208 of whom 5605 were Scotch-Irish. It was in that same year that James Logan, agent and defender of the Penn family in the colony, himself a Scotch-Irishman, wrote in one of his letters: "It looks as if Ireland is to send all its inhabitants hither." Although the account was nearly contemporary, one is inclined to regard as an exaggeration the statement in Proud's "History of Pennsylvania" that in 1749 there were about 12,000 immigrants arriving from Germany, and that in some years there were nearly as many annually from Ireland. Other scattered items, however, seem to confirm Proud's estimate that by about 1760 one-quarter of the population of Pennsylvania was Irish, as well as Franklin's calcula-

tion that by the time of the Revolution this proportion had increased to one-third.

From the contemporary accounts cited, and others, it is evident that Pennsylvania felt no little apprehension as to the number of immigrants pouring into the colony. But population is the first requirement of a new country and Pennsylvania's rapid growth and prosperity were the wonder and envy of all the other colonies. These less favored colonies accordingly welcomed and even offered inducements to immigrants to settle within their borders. We have noticed that the Germans were to be found in considerable numbers outside of Pennsylvania and in the same way the Scotch-Irish were scattered through all of British North America. The latter were even more widely distributed than the Germans and if anything in larger proportions. The most careful estimate that has been made places the Germans, at the outbreak of the Revolution, at about one-tenth of the total population; Scotch-Irish claims would bring their own numbers to one-sixth.

MAX FARRAND.

The Future of the Socialist Party

IN 1908 the Socialist party doubled its vote notwithstanding the beginnings of the new Progressive movement. And four years ago, with Roosevelt in the field, the Socialist high-water mark was reached—901,000 votes. This year, confronted with two conservative parties neither of whom aroused any popular enthusiasm and in spite of the 2,000,000 new women's votes to draw from, the Socialist party has lost nearly one-half its previous vote. It is now likely that it will not exceed 600,000.

One reason for this decline is suggested by the fact that three days after election the Socialist press and the national headquarters were still claiming 1,200,000 votes. Everyone who had access to the news reports knew before the decision had been made between Wilson and Hughes that the Socialist vote had dropped. There was a time when the Socialist party tried to educate its followers rather than to "fake" election returns. There was a time when the party was not so eager to sell its soul for votes.

For nearly twenty years I have been a close observer and participant in Socialist campaigns. During the last four years I have heard many discussions on campaign tactics. Not once have I heard the old familiar questions: "Is this right? Is this in accord with the principles of Socialism?" But over and over I have heard: "Will this catch

the Poles? Will that land the Germans? Will the other scare the little taxpayers?" Once upon a time almost every Socialist speech ended with, "Don't vote for our candidates unless you agree with Socialism." Then our vote grew. Now we practise expediency and our vote declines. With the sorrow that comes with the destruction of one's dearest ideal, I say that in many a city the Socialist organization is to-day little more than an organized appetite for office—a Socialist Tammany, exploiting the devotion of its members instead of the funds of corporations, for the benefit of a little circle of perfectly honest, but perfectly incompetent and selfish politicians, who still persist in thinking themselves idealists. In only this, the weakest and worst phase of our movement, are we really in touch with American life.

The second principal reason for our decline in votes lies in the simple fact that our party has ceased to be American. During the last three years I have watched the falling off of one after another of the Americans who came into the party full of enthusiasm during the late 'nineties and the first years of this century. No party in America can live except through these recruits, least of all the Socialists. But it is not only that Americans are not coming into the party to-day. I have collected the names of nearly fifty people who have filled the highest unpaid positions in our party,

who have been candidates for office when election was hopeless—writers, speakers, organizers—the type of men and women who gave up what the world called careers to devote their lives to what they believed to be the one fight worth fighting—and all these are to-day leaving the movement in the principles of which they still believe. Others are refusing to work within the organization. Moreover, I have asked several members of the party to name one single American of prominence who was working in this campaign without being a candidate for some office. They cannot name one. Intellectually and politically the mind of the party is in Europe.

The war has emphasized this. A careful scheme was set in motion to capture the machinery of the party by those in sympathy with the ruling class of Germany. We sent out a caucus ticket for every national office, backed by a campaign of circularization such as had never been dreamed of in our organization. The effort was largely successful, for the candidates were Socialists whom the members trusted because of their past services. But they were hopelessly out of touch with all things American. Their first thought about every issue was its effect upon the fortunes of the warring nations. On every question they worked in complete accord with the German-American Alliance. Most of our press did the same. Yet it is only just to add that this was partly through the fact that the pacifist movement had been also manipulated in the pro-German direction, and most Socialists followed the pacifists.

To illustrate: The Socialist party and press had no criticism of the invasion of Belgium, the sinking of the *Lusitania*, the Zeppelin outrages, the slave drives in Belgium or the hideous Armenian massacres. But that press and party screamed hysterically over the brutal suppression of the Irish rebellion. This they should have done, and I gladly lent my voice to that protest. I wrote letters to friends in the English Parliament expressing my indignation, and I have the satisfaction of knowing that the letters arrived and may have had some effect. That we as a party left unmentioned other outrages, infinitely more deserving of our condemnation, argues cowardice and a betrayal of our principles.

The most bold-faced appeals were made to race prejudice. Our politicians, utterly ignorant of the American mind, boasted that between Hughes and Wilson, both openly or secretly kicking the hyphen, the Socialists would sneak in and grab the German vote. As the writer of the first leaflet issued by the Socialist party having as its slogan, "Starve the war and feed the people," I certainly did not object to its use. But all emphasis was laid on the

embargo, and nothing was said of the Socialist phase which called for national control of distribution. Yet it was just this socialistic action in Australia which reduced prices, and it was the only thing in which we had any right to be interested. But the Kaiser would not benefit by feeding America, and for fear some of the Germans might not see even this crude bait it was labeled with the published explanation that an embargo "would help Germany."

Except in a few localities it was not this bias toward Junker autocracy that was most to blame for damning the Socialist party. It was rather the pitiful lack of knowledge of American conditions that gave us a platform and propaganda utterly unrelated to the most vital problems of American labor. It could not be otherwise when the party was directed by men who write books to show that American Socialism sprang out of utopian colonies or who, a few weeks before election, wrote of the "Continental Congress" enacting "the first tariff bill," or, in a carefully prepared campaign document, announced that "only one man can prevent war," and then explain that the President has power to levy an embargo. It is not that mistakes were made. Anyone might make mistakes in history, but no one to whom American history and tradition are not a closed book makes these particular mistakes.

These same officials show a complete lack of comprehension of American democracy. They are suspicious of it either in the party or in the government. They would sincerely deny this, just as they have a sincere belief in their infallible knowledge of America. But the facts tell the story. Every effort to secure a national convention was thwarted. The attempt to maintain an open forum for discussion of party affairs was choked off by relegating such discussion to an unread supplement of the party organ. Not a single Socialist paper of influence permits that freedom of discussion which was once our greatest pride. There is also that contempt for the membership which always accompanies distrust of democracy. There are frequent excuses for the "discipline" of the German party. It is not even considered good form to denounce autocracy, and "Prussian militarism" has not lacked its defenders within the Socialist party as an essential preparation for Socialism. Yet those who do this are not seeking personal advantage. They believe themselves the true custodians of the Ark of the Socialist Covenant, and would protect it from unhallowed hands.

This bland aloofness from things American was seen in the complete indifference to the stupendous profits of monopoly, the wide-spread class struggles of the campaign, the relation of the financial trans-

actions of the war to American industry, and a dozen other things that at one time would have held the attention of the Socialist movement. It is illustrated again in the profound indifference of our officials to the great pedagogical revolution that is largely led by John Dewey. Here is a working-class upheaval in a sphere which Socialists once considered their special care. It is a direct outgrowth of Socialist philosophy. But our Socialist writers of program and directors of campaigns and even our elected school officials are ignorant of all this. They are still too provincial to see the significance of any intellectual movement "made in America."

At a time when the American people, and indeed the whole world, is turning against the liquor traffic, the Socialist party allows itself to be dragged at the heels of the brewery and saloon forces. I do not ask the party to declare for prohibition. But in more than one city where Socialist principles are surrendered without a protest by the party liquor is staunchly defended. Socialists in legislative halls have joined hands with the worst enemies of labor in order to protect the liquor interests, and to retain their endorsement of the foreign secret societies.

There is a blatant antagonism to religion that is also un-American. Again I am not a believer in any form of religion. But I hope I am a tolerant enough "free-thinker" not to insist upon victimizing those who believe the supposedly Socialist motto, "Religion is a private matter."

These are some, but by no means all, of the reasons why there were so few of the American founders of the Socialist party upon its campaign platforms this year. They offer a part of the explanation why the United States is the only nation in which there has been a falling off in the Socialist vote since the beginning of the great war.

There was another reason. Our pro-German politicians were very poor politicians. They tried to "get smart with big things," a procedure which Lassalle could have told them is bad politics. They could not outbid the Republican and Democratic candidates. Some Germans voted for local Socialist candidates and cut the head of the ticket to help the Kaiser. Many former Socialist voters, I will not say Socialists, voted for Wilson, not because he was pro-Allies—no person of American mentality and able to lisp the first syllable of American history ever doubted that Hughes and those behind him were more virulently pro-Allies than Wilson—but because Wilson, with his reform legislation and reformer appointments, seemed to offer more of real Socialism than a Socialist party which had lost itself in the wilds of European diplomacy. I think they were wrong. But I know

from many sources that these were their motives.

I do not believe the Socialist party will die. Perhaps this is because for me to believe this would be to believe that twenty years of my life have been thrown away. And it is just because it does mean so much to me and to thousands of others who have never sought to use it for personal advantage—and only those who have stood at the cradle of a movement and then worked and lived for it for almost a generation can understand how much it may mean—that I will not knowingly lie to myself about it. I believe that the principles of Socialism were never so verified as experience is verifying them to-day. I am sure that if the Socialists of this country come to know that truth they will push the well meaning politicians to one side and work out a movement which will be the political expression of American labor.

I should be unfair, and this I have tried most carefully not to be, if I failed to mention some notable exceptions to the un-American character of the Socialist press. I do this the more gladly because the most striking of these exceptions are printed in the German language. The New York *Volkszeitung*, the St. Louis *Labor* and the St. Louis *Arbeiter Zeitung* have stood fair and square against the storms of nationalism which more than once have threatened their existence, and have maintained the principles of Socialism as applied to American and international problems with a courage and fidelity that is worthy of the best traditions of Socialism. I hope it is needless to add that this appreciation by me does not imply that they endorse what I have written or that I agree with them in all their positions. But they are a promise of a better future for the Socialist party in the United States.

A. M. SIMONS.

O. Henry and His Critics

THESE, by the freak of circumstance that wills it so, are O. Henry days. With so much else that should absorb us—with Emperors dying almost unnoticed, with twenty million men struggling on a dozen "fronts," with the cost of living gripping at our vitals, and with the mad diversion of the New Luxury to hold us back from thinking of anything at all—by some odd chance we are all thinking and talking of the man who called himself O. Henry. Our neglected author is dead in his grave, with scarcely a publisher to walk behind his hearse, and lo! six years after his death he is bursting upon us afresh, as it were, with all the splendor of a rising genius. A "definitive edition" of his works is out, published—American slang and all—in war-stricken England.