

Nov.  
First

# New Review

Ten  
Cents

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

VOL. III.

10c. a copy

Published on the first and fifteenth of the month.

\$1.50 a year

No. 16

## CONTENTS:

	PAGE		PAGE
THE "JAPANESE PROBLEM" .....	273	JEALOUSY FARCIFIED .....	287
Austin Lewis		Louis Berman	
THE VOTE .....	275	CURRENT AFFAIRS .....	288
Felix Grendon		L. B. Boudin	
IN FRANCE: SOCIALISTS AND OTHERS .....	277	A SOCIALIST DIGEST:	
Mack Eastman		Italian Imperialism and the Common Characteristics of Imperialism;	
REVISING STATE CONSTITUTIONS .....	282	Balkan Socialist Manifesto: Where Do We Stand? Pseudonyms	
L. B. Boudin		and Conquest; Sweden and the War; The Strategy of Annihilation.	
THE ANGLO-FRENCH LOAN .....	284	CORRESPONDENCE:	
Maurice Blumlein		From Basil M. Manly; J. Koettgen.	

Copyright, 1915, by the New Review Publishing Ass'n. Reprint permitted if credit is given.

## The "Japanese Problem"

By Austin Lewis

**M**OST of the militaristic twaddle in this country has for its burden preparedness against Japan. The fire-eaters depict California as bristling with acute problems involving the Japanese and as being constantly on the verge of war. All this is a wicked and manufactured lie. There are no such problems in California.

It is true that for years the Hearst papers have maintained a policy of deliberate and exasperating insult towards the Japanese. The San Francisco *Examiner* has pertinaciously endeavored to stir up ill-feeling, and to goad a sensitive and fine minded people into indignation by lying articles and vile cartoons. The latter have indeed depicted the Japanese as monkeys, and the editorial comment has been of a character to correspond with the pictures. To all this the Japanese have made no reply, save, at intervals, to issue a dignified book or pamphlet. In all their works they have declined to see any hostility or grounds for hostility against the people of this country. Their arguments have been consistently high-minded. They have refused to acknowledge the demagogic abuse and ignorant clamor, they will not even recognize the existence of ill-feeling, and appear to regard it as a ludicrous impossibility. This attitude is fairly well understood and acknowledged, but is regarded by the war element as evidence of Oriental guile, there is a tradition that the Japanese are "devilish sly."

By degrees conditions have so shaped themselves that, apart from war altogether, the good-will of

Japan is a very important matter to the State of California. The only means of communication between San Francisco and the Orient, now that the Pacific Mail has ceased to run, is a Japanese steamship line. As I write, the morning papers announce that a Chinese competing line may be formed. However, this may be, there appears to be little doubt that for some time to come, travel to the Orient will be at the mercy of people who have long been subjected to continuous and undeserved abuse. This absurd denouement of the anti-Japanese agitation is characteristic of the fate which has attended all the manufactured demonstrations against the same people.

The immigration question has long ceased to be of any importance for there is no immigration; the Japanese do not come. It is more than probable that Oriental immigration would have ceased without any agitation, particularly since the Russo-Japanese War has opened fresh, and in many respects more satisfactory, outlets for Japanese emigrants. At all events, with the stopping of Japanese immigration the clamor raised by the Oriental Exclusion League a few years ago has passed away. Concerning this organization much might be written, but it would not tend to edification. It played a despicable part in the California labor movement. Its effect upon the Socialist Party was even more deplorable, for men who should have known better, and who as a matter of fact did know better, abandoned their principles and, taking sides with the

more corrupt portion of the labor movement, joined in the hue and cry against the Orientals and particularly against the Japanese.

This misconduct, however, on the part of the Socialist Party, has met with its punishment, in that it has deprived itself of the opportunity of playing what might easily have been a very important role in the relations between this country and Japan. For, among other things, Socialism grows even in Japan. On August 29th, Katayama, speaking before the Socialist Party in San Francisco, talked optimistically of the growth of the Socialist movement in his country. Japan has leaped from the feudal to the factory stage in fifty years. Today her social and economic system is so modern that while the conditions of employment in the factory are comparable with those of the *laissez faire* period in Great Britain, and the tendency to organize proceeds as it has done in the modern countries, the actual machinery is much more advanced, and the intellectual grasp of social interrelations is far superior to that of any country prior to now.

Japanese "fraternal delegates," B. Suzuki and S. Yoshimatsu, addressed the San Francisco Labor Council on August 27th. These delegates are supposed to represent labor unions in Japan. But Katayama says that according to law, labor unions do not exist in Japan, for in 1901 the Japanese Diet passed a law prohibiting labor unions and labor movements. What labor movements, then, did the "fraternal delegates" represent? Katayama says, apparently truthfully, that they represented paper unions, and mere aggregations of names, not workers but bourgeois, capitalists, and employers.

Dan Murphy, the President of the Labor Council, who introduced the delegates, said that he hoped "that the mission of the fraternal delegates to this country would, with the help of the trade unionists, result in solving the Japanese problem in California." Paul Scharrenberg, secretary-treasurer of the California State Federation of Labor, announced that "The American labor movement knows no race or creed, and that the trade unionists of America are ever ready to welcome representative wage-earners from Japan, India or any place under the sun."

Suzuki told the Labor Council that he and his colleagues represented the Laborers' Friendly Society of Japan, which was an organization of about eight thousand, had been organized about three years ago, and increased at the rate of about five hundred a month. His concluding words will bear repetition:

"We are learning in Japan that the laborers of the world have the same interests and the same enemies. We are learning that a worker is a human laborer—a world laborer—exposed to the same enemies. I believe that the laborers of the world must so understand each other across the boundaries of

race and nation that at the first blast of the trumpet we shall not be driven as sheep to the slaughter, but shall stand as a rock, firm in our confidence in one another, as the immovable guard of eternal peace.

"I bring the most cordial greetings to you from the wage earners in Japan. I believe we have a common work in the solution of the labor problems of the world. Let us cooperate for the performance of this common task with full understanding and friendship between the laborers of the land of the rising sun and those of the land where the sun has risen."

But what is the problem in California which can be called a Japanese problem and to which the President of the San Francisco Labor Council so mysteriously referred? A close investigation fails to discover any.

It is certainly not in the field of labor, for in the only grade of labor in which the Japanese come into any competition with white labor, they are in advance of white labor, both as regards wages and working conditions. Investigation among Industrial Workers, farm workers, fruit pickers and the like lead to the conclusion that the Japanese by their organized methods get higher wages than the whites engaged in the same occupations. In fact some of the farmers have come into inland towns like Fresno seeking white labor with which to offset the "extortionate demands" of the Japanese. As for scabbing, the Japanese do not scab. On the contrary, wherever, as in the Wheatland strike, a struggle for better conditions has been made, the Japanese have always been sympathetic.

The Oriental Exclusion League has vanished and no one cares anything about it further. Even the school question, which had a basis of reason, has ceased to trouble and for the present, at least, and as far as one can see into the future, there are no grounds for trouble between California and the Japanese.

On the other hand, there is no particularly good feeling. It cannot be denied that racial prejudice exists to as great an extent as ever, and it is certain that the advent of any large numbers of Japanese immigrants into this community would meet with the greatest opposition, and would tend to revive at once the old hostility. This seems to be thoroughly recognized by the Japanese, at least such of them as are at all familiar with local conditions. Thus K. K. Kawakami in a very recent statement gives a sketch of the basis which he regards as essential to the maintenance of peace between Japan and the United States, and among other conditions lays down the following:

1. Japan shall strictly restrict the immigration of her subjects into the United States.
2. The American government shall insure fair and just treatment of the Japanese who are law-

fully in this country. *This will call for the naturalization of the Japanese.*

There is very little doubt that the enforcement of the italicised condition could meet with very considerable opposition in the State of California.

The social dislike is obvious and it is not at all easy to explain. Nowhere, as I have already said, does Japanese labor come into conflict with white labor to the detriment of the latter. But there is unmistakably a latent hostility among the skilled workers against the Japanese. Although the skilled workers are not brought into any contact with the Japanese. Of course this does not apply to the revolutionary portion of the migratory laborers, but which is too small to be of any value in determining things as they are.

Even the employers who use Japanese labor do not like the Japanese. Thus one man who employs seven hundred of them admits their efficiency but does not like them. He complains that the Japanese laborers demand an unusual concession as regards bathing facilities and camp conveniences and that group bargaining is necessary instead of individual hiring. For the rest, he finds them good workmen but would prefer white labor if he could get it of the same quality.

As regards California, the Japanese question is racial and proceeds very largely from the fact that there is a prejudice in the mind of the ordinary Californian that an Oriental is necessarily inferior. But the Japanese is not inferior, cannot be treated as inferior, and hence there arises a sort of puzzled indignation which finds expression in dislike and contemptuous treatment. Even in this respect, however, the Japanese must be approached with caution, for he is not, like the milder mannered Chinese, prone to take insult and stone-throwing without reprisals, and he is a fighter who gives at least as much as he takes.

There are no special grievances or problems in this State which would tend to accentuate any differences which might arise between the governments of the United States and Japan. This conclusion is tame enough and perhaps disappointingly so to Easterners who have been misled by newspaper exaggerations. Indeed, a New York socialist who has recently made a tour of the State and particularly of the rural districts confided to me his great surprise that there is no feeling on the Japanese question. The irritation, unreasonableness and crass provinciality of a few years ago have fortunately disappeared, with the result that a Japanese problem in California might be sought carefully but in vain.

## The Vote

By Felix Grendon

**A**BOUT one hundred and fifty years ago, that tedious windbag and unimaginative "practical man", Edmund Burke, (the model for so many American politicians from John Adams to Ex-President Taft, sang the swan song of chivalry. The dying chivalry he mourned for was the system of velvet phrases and tinsel political etiquette that gave a pleasant veneer to two unpleasant social facts: the parasitism of women on men, and the parasitism of a few hereditary idlers on seven-eighths of the total population. This is not Burke's description of chivalry, it is what the word actually stood for. And Burke himself gave the whole show away by inveighing bitterly against women who demanded freedom in place of "all homage paid to the sex," and who scornfully repudiated "all the pleasing illusions which made power gentle and obedience liberal."

Among those who answered the illustrious phrase-maker was Mary Wollstonecraft. In her "Vindication", this remarkable woman made hash of Burke's "masculine" logic and scorched his polished fatuity to ashes. Her reply had an even more startling effect. For the first time in history, a whole nation pricked up its ears while a woman, in the first person, spoke out boldly for women's rights. It was a piece of dramatic spokesmanship forecasting the self-assertion of a whole sex.

Mary Wollstonecraft was but one of a group of men and women who were saying emphatically that the time had come for taking a leaf out of Plato's Republic and giving women a direct interest in affairs of state. It was a small group, a paltry minority in the British body politic. But it was a minority with one of those bomb-like ideas which, when exploded, can hoist a nation from its lethargy. Unluckily, there was no force strong enough, in the Eighteenth Century, to explode this mental bomb charged with a belief in the rights of women. And so the human movement which the Wollstonecrafts, the Shelleys and their kind had set on foot descended, with very slight accretions of power, from a small minority in each generation to a small minority in the next. For a hundred years or more, the idea that men and women should hold equal political rank (to say nothing of equal social rank) was kept in intellectual seclusion. The great majority of citizens of both sexes derided or feared the idea as a mad notion held by harmless freaks like the Quakers or by dangerous fanatics like the Utopian Communists.

Meanwhile, an industrial Vesuvius belched its horrors upon society and changes of a slow but disrupting character crept into the workshop, the

market-place, and the home. The social innovations came noiselessly, but all the same they were as revolutionary as machinery. Thus, women, unmarried women, began to earn their own livings. And though a self-supporting woman was at first an object of greater public odium than a parasitically supported man, the right of unmarried women to an independent livelihood was at length made triumphantly secure.

The new order of things was not attacked with ferocity, nor was it welcomed with demonstrations of public gratitude. Either of these courses lay open to men: the first, had they been duller and more cowardly than they were; the second, had they been wiser and more daring. As it was, the most momentous change the economic position of women has undergone in modern times, was received in a perfectly normal human way, that is, with a mixture of suppressed hostility and sullen resignation.

Thus, the self-supporting spinster led the woman's movement to its first success through a silent economic revolution. A second success was foreshadowed when young women refused to surrender their acquired taste for self-support to the irrelevant fact of marriage. This second revolution is not yet complete. All the obstacles with which bullying males and kept females blocked the independence of the spinster have been multiplied a thousand fold to block the independence of the wife. Yet no fact in modern life is clearer than that the emancipation of the parasitic married woman is following the emancipation of the parasitic unmarried woman as inevitably as the right foot follows the left.

But emancipation, like everything else, is a relative matter. We may be sure that a Putumayo Indian in the worst days of the Rubber atrocities would have found emancipation in a factory-worker's bench just as the factory-worker would have found it in a minor post among the slaves of Caesar. As soon as large numbers of women were supporting themselves successfully, if meagerly, they looked about for weapons with which to fortify their new position as well as to improve its strength and quality. By the very structure of society, however, the weapons they sought lay in the constitution of the government, the government that they might not speak in except by the favor of their husbands and brothers. Such indirect action was as humiliating as it was ineffectual. On the principle that to do a thing well you must do it yourself, the women resolved to speak not through their male relatives in the third person, but through their own right in the first person. In short, the forces that sent women into the wage and income earning fields, drove them, with irresistible pressure, to demand the right to vote. Which is another way of saying that their two underground economic revolutions

had to be safeguarded by a visible political revolution.

But political equality is like an elegant head of lettuce with the heart cut out. Thanks to an ingeniously devised machinery behind the scenes, each extension of the franchise in America and England has been attended by a deft shearing of the powers the franchise conferred. To an elector in Oliver Cromwell's day, the vote was a real instrument for protecting his interests. To an elector in King George's day it is little better than a scrap of paper. Voting was a simple and important process at a township meeting in the New England of the 17th century. It was a complicated and unimportant process in the New York of the nineteenth century. To-day, when voting offers the elector what George William Curtiss called a choice between "Boss Platt for honesty" and "Boss Tweed for reform," the face value of the franchise is next to nothing. And this is probably one reason why men are at last prepared to make women a present of the precious vote and all its spurious glamor into the bargain.

On the score of immediate gain, the driving minds in the movement for women's rights cherish no illusions. They know that the vote will not emancipate women in any thoroughgoing sense, that it will not put men and women (or even women and women) on an equal economic footing, that it will not so much as yield women equal pay for equal work. Yet men who uphold the great tradition of liberty (not by imitating its forms but by perpetuating its initiative), are urgently inviting women to share the franchise. Why? Because the vote extended to the other sex, will have a significance out of all proportion to its face value. It will be a public record of the two revolutions that women have quietly effected in their economic status. It will be a convenient tool for putting an end to the pecuniary parasitism of one sex upon the other. It will be a symbol, as Walter Lippmann says in *The New Republic*, of a spiritual change in the relationships of men and women, a change from association for chiefly gallant or matrimonial purposes, to co-operation for chiefly social and political purposes. With votes for women gained (now or later), comes a momentous stage direction in the great drama of life: exit, the phantom struggle for political equality; enter, the solid struggle for economic equality. For the first time in any national history, all the adult citizens of both sexes will have the constitutional right to make their economic needs articulate in the first person. The situation opens up the most dramatic opportunities. For if men and women can ever learn to assert this right in effective concert, civilized democracy will begin.

# In France: Socialists and Others

By Mack Eastman

**T**HE war has changed almost nothing in political doctrine in France. Every party finds its ideas more than justified by recent events. The bishops explain the world-conflagration as a punishment from Heaven. According to Monseigneur Marty, our generation was ignoring God: "It was therefore necessary that He should reply to the provocations of an impious society by defending against it His despised rights." Secular doctrines had brought us "very near to ruin". True, the Germans invoke the Most High, but, says Mgr. Guillet, their Lutheran heresy has been "poisoning Christian peoples for two centuries and throwing them out of their traditions." Heretics and unbelievers between them have done the mischief.

But to the more thorough-going militarists, though the war is of God, it spells not chastisement but salvation. General Rébillot is persuaded that a few years more of peace would have been the end of France: "War alone could save us. It was then that Providence inspired Emperor William to make war on us." It is a holy war, it withdraws us from petty pleasures and from "this furore after material well-being which Socialism wishes to make the ideal of the proletarians."

For the material welfare of the bourgeoisie, the pious General feels less scorn. Unconscious of any inconsistency, he complains that the enemies of France were allowed to "pursue freely in our territory a veritable economic invasion." Thus the complete industrialization of the great struggle has forced an economic interpretation upon the attention of even a clerical militarist. Indeed, one of his confrères has gone so far as to style this war a mere phase of the general industrial war between the nations. A Belgian minister proposes an economic coalition among the allied countries, and his French commentator speaks of "the immense field of economic battle where, after the war, it will be a question to pursue the common enemy." Art as well as Religion has been tainted with the materialistic idea, and the "Divine Sarah" complains of the deluge of German shoddy.

Now while a part of the bourgeoisie has a vague notion that German industry was the original foe, the Maxian Socialists go further. Jules Guesde still affirms that Capitalism itself is the fundamental cause of international rivalry and strife. "Nonsense!" retorts Hervé. "Were there no wars before Capitalism? The question of nationality is the root of the matter. A century ago it was Western Europe; to-day, the Balkans are in travail." More cautiously, Charles Albert avows that "the struggle

between capital and labor has not yet become (no matter how much we may so desire) the unique pivot of the world." One factor in the situation which all recognize as either a major or a minor source of the trouble is Imperialism. The same Hervé writes: "We shall never realize the harm our colonial gluttony has done us in Europe—the imbecile gluttony of a people with a low birthrate, whose eyes are larger than its stomach." Capitalism, overproduction, nationality, colonial expansion, are phenomena variously stressed by various minds. However, all agree that out of these primary causes sprung a secondary cause which in time overshadowed its parents and became the principle menace to peace—viz., militarism. The French Socialists do not regret their opposition to international militarism.

Nor do they admit that they have been inconsistent. "Our attitude has been honest and logical," Hervé assured me with his convincing fervor. At Amsterdam, the Germans had imposed their Marxian dogma upon the International: the class struggle was to exclude all else. Hervé pushed their argument to its logical conclusions: antipatriotism, antimilitarism, the general strike. At Stuttgart and Copenhagen they shrugged their shoulders at his deductions. Finally in 1912 at Basel he pressed the point; he talked with them in the corridors. "If war threatens, if mobilization be ordered, will you join us in the general strike?" They hesitated, they were not strong enough, the general strike was a Utopia. There was nothing left for Hervé but to rally to the theory Jaurès expounded in his masterly study, *L'Armée Nouvelle*. Nevertheless, had peace been maintained a few years longer, he believes the German anti-militarists would have been strong enough to save the situation.

But while Hervé frankly avows a change of front, other French Socialists have no such avowal to make. Jules Guesde, for example, read me the declaration of the Parti Ouvrier in 1893 to the effect that if the workmen of one country, "traitors to their class," permitted an attack upon a peaceful neighbor, the latter would have "no more ardent defenders" than its own proletarians. Though he never applied the epithet "traitor" to the workmen of Germany, he knew that France was the victim of aggression. He knew it because the Socialist leaders had been in daily contact with the French Government during the diplomatic crisis. Opinion on that point was almost unanimous. On leaving Viviani two hours before his own death, Jaurès observed—"La diplomatie allemande est d'une hypocrisie et

d'une brutalité dont je me suis pas suffisamment rendu compte."

From Guesde, we turn to another veteran of French Socialism, to Vaillant, the spiritual son of Blanqui. "And what of your famous anti-militarist resolutions?" I asked. "Ah, yes, but the German Socialists never gave them their hearty support. And when last August they marched upon French territory, we had no alternative but to defend our soil. The International is not anti-national. Socialism must progress within the national framework. The independence of nations must be defended, especially when it is a case of protecting the homes of democracy against a military autocracy." Not only so, but Vaillant and Sembat were among those most violently opposed to the abandonment of the national capital. "I advocated the defence of Paris to the last man and the last monument, for Paris defended meant France saved." Vaillant is an old Communard and retains the spirit of the Commune.

So much for the parliamentarians. Let us call on the General Confederation of Labor.

The explanation of the Syndicalists is clear and simple. For twelve years they had vainly striven for the principle of international labor congresses which should "form an international mentality and create currents of opinion broad and unified," capable of grappling with the war problem. From 1905 onward they had sought without success to have the annual conferences of national secretaries discuss anti-militarism and the general strike. The German labor leaders, supported by the others, refused to debate political ideas; these were the property of the socialist parties. When the catastrophe was approaching last July, on the twenty-seventh, at Brussels, the presidents of the French and German organizations met. Jouhaux pressed these questions upon Legien: "What do you count upon doing to stave off the war that is in preparation? Are you resolved to act? For our part, we are ready to respond to your call or to move at the same time, if it be so agreed." Legien could give no answer. Still hoping against hope, the Confederation organized demonstrations in Paris and on July 30th wired a final appeal to Berlin. Meanwhile the leaders became cognizant of the desperate efforts the French government was making to avoid disaster.

Next evening they heard that Jaurès was murdered. They realized in their anguish that he was only the first victim of the coming war. In their Manifesto of August 1st they confessed themselves "submerged by events." "You women who are weeping at this hour, we have done everything to deplore the accomplished fact." The proletariat had not understood the situation "unanimously enough."

In the course of his eloquent oration at the funeral of Jaurès, Jouhaux exclaimed: "Driven into the struggle, we rise to repel the invader and safeguard

the patrimony of civilization and generous ideology which history has bequeathed us. . . Emperors of Germany and Austria, junkers of Prussia and great Austrian seignors, you who, through hatred of democracy have willed this war, we undertake to sound the knell of your reign. We shall be the soldiers of freedom to conquer for the oppressed a régime of liberty, to create harmony among the peoples by a free entente among the nations. . . We have not lost all hope of seeing the German people, these millions of organized workmen, awake from their unhappy slumber, shake off the baneful grip of Emperor and junker, and by a supreme effort, in which we shall be happy to co-operate, end forever this dishonoring 'caporalism' and join us on the road of liberty."

On October 3rd Merrheim expostulated with Graber, of the International Bureau, for making a bogey of Czarism: "We fail to grasp the difference between the Kaiser's imperialism smothering liberty in Germany and the Czar's Muscovite imperialism strangling it at St. Petersburg." The German workers have been and must be "the perpetual dupes or victims" of their Kaiser and their military junkers. On October 31st Jouhaux wrote that "Prussian Imperialism on the same ground as Russian, was an evil principle"; French syndicalists hoped "that this war might be the last if each people did its democratic duty at home"; and he repeated: "We have no other aspirations, if circumstances permit, than to aid it [the German proletariat] to win the liberties for which it was struggling yesterday."

In subsequent letters, the C. G. T. has reminded the international organizations of their failure to support its anti-militarism in time. Now peace is impossible until the invaders are repulsed, for "the conditions essential to social progress are the inviolability and the independence of nations." However, it heartily endorses the proposal of the American Federation for a congress of organized labor to be held after the war at the same time and place as the general peace congress. In its attitude on this point the C. G. T. appears to enjoy the support of the mass of French syndicalists.

Nevertheless there are certain exceptions. The most striking of these is Pierre Monette who resigned from the Confederal Committee because "some militant syndicalists used language worthy of pure nationalists" and the C. G. T. refused to concern itself with the peace question. To such criticisms the characteristic reply seems to be: "When our German comrades get off our grass, then we shall talk peace without appearing ridiculous."

Meanwhile the Confederation joins in the anti-alcoholic campaign and participates in the relief work of the Comité de Secours National. But the syndicalist dissenters have their counterpart in the Socialist Party.

For the Socialist ministers have their critics too.

Some of the rank and file think Guesde, Sembat and Thomas ought not to have been delegated to the ministry. They could have given effective aid while retaining their freedom of action and while refusing to assume any responsibility for the conduct of the war. "Is it not scandalous," they ask, "to see our leaders acquiescing in the censorship which even Clemenceau refuses to accept?" I put the question to Guesde, who replied promptly: "Of course we do not like the censorship but we cannot have our own way. For the present the censorship appears to me a very small affair beside the German cannon." But the critics claim that their representatives in the ministry have accomplished absolutely nothing of a socialistic character. Even the munition workers are left with starvation wages. The Party is leaderless and its action negligible. The ministers admit the charge, and Guesde declared to me with energy: "My experience in two ministries has convinced me more than ever of the impossibility of any co-operation between the two classes save for a definite object like national defence." Accordingly he and his confrères will leave the government the day peace is signed. Even so, the malcontents affirm that had Jaurès lived, his conduct would have been wiser.

On one point alone some men of the advance-guard feel Jaurès was mistaken. He overstrained the progress of internationalism among the German social-democrats. Shortly before his death he was preparing an article in which he meant to make certain concessions to Professor Andler whose views on "Le Socialisme imperialiste en Allemagne" he had so harshly criticised. However, all dissensions within the party are hushed in this hour of trial. Is this true of the nation?

What is the "Union Sacrée" which has given birth to so much lyrism? It is the instinctive drawing together of all section of the population while their common heritage, their national integrity is in danger. But it is not so interpreted by everyone. The royalist Maurras seizes with delight upon Anatole France's eulogy of King Albert as a "point in 'The Path of Glory' where we can join Anatole France and communicate with him". And he asks pathetically: "Between royalists and patriotic republicans would it be impossible to harmonize ideas if not men?" To the Clericals the "Sacred Union" means a return to Rome. "Never, since the most glorious epochs of the history of the Church, has France been uplifted by so powerful and spontaneous a revival of Catholicism". "In some churches", General Rebillot assures us, "there was a shortage of wafers for the mobilized soldiers who requested it after confession". To stimulate this revival, the clericals leave no stone unturned. At the call to the colors, in the camps, trenches and hospitals, they follow up the troops with Catholic influences. I

have seen amulets and scapularies that gentle ladies deftly pinned in soldiers' coats. The ultramontane proprietor of an ancient chateau has allowed his outbuildings to be used as a hospital where the wounded are enveloped in religious influence. "Never", wrote the châtelain to a friend of mine, "never have we been so happy as since the war". "Never", cried Paul Bourget, "never have we lived so fully." On the strength of such elucubrations, cultured and charming university professors in America have assured more or less credulous audiences that France is happy as happy can be.

"Has there been a religious revival?" I asked Professor Allier, a Protestant divine whose religious discourses were remarkably successful all winter. "There are more individual cases", he replied, "but there is no collective movement." My impression of the Catholic revival is similar. It is "localised" and ephemeral. Yet it challenged attention. Even Hervé hopes that after the war Catholics and Socialists will meet on a common platform of social reform.

Professor Andler is convinced that the war is full of lessons in co-operation and that hereafter "no class will have the same power of resistance as in the past." The conservatives hope the working class will not have the same power of attack. In the *Gaulois*, Arthur Meyer asks: "Are there any of the troopers who in fighting for their country aspire toward the triumph of the proletariat?" No, they live in the "Union Sacrée". *Le Temps*, the great capitalist journal of France, hopes they will remain there. Will they do so? Let *La Bataille Syndicaliste* reply: "There are no 'toilers of heroism' who promise us an era of paradise after the war. What grounds have they? I fancy they know nothing about it. Do they see around them any symptoms of this great happiness which awaits us?" And again: "Have the employers renounced their ante-bellum practices of shearing bare the flock of the exploited? For months . . . the whole of French capitalism has given itself over to operations of this kind." "The Sacred Union!" exclaimed Marck of the C. G. T., "c'est de la blague"! Compère-Morel sums up Socialist opinion thus: "Tomorrow as yesterday, the forces of labor and capital drawn face to face will find themselves in antagonism again, organised nationally and internationally. Against that, no one can do anything, *Le Temps* any more than ourselves." In fact, the great organ of social peace lately criticised the composition of the munitions committees which, by including labor representatives, made a dangerous concession to the syndicalist spirit. As Hervé remarks, while *La Guerre Sociale* is preaching social peace, *Le Temps* reawakens social war. At the tribune of the Chamber in the name of the "Union Sacrée" Renaudel rebuked the press which was inculcating distrust of the

working class, and attacked the manufacturers of war material who make scandalous profits and yet reduce wages. Guesde hopes that the terms of peace will be so wise as to leave "no room for race antagonism but only for class antagonism which the triumph of Socialism alone can cause to disappear." If then the "Union Sacrée" is sacred only for the moment—if the struggles of parties and classes is to recommence, what are the political prospects for the near future?

Creeds died hard and *L'Action Française* suggests obliquely that "the Monarchy can spring only from the victory of the French armies"; while a letter from a French royalist officer at the front predicts that "we shall not remain divided in a republic" but "united in a kingdom". However, to the nation at large royalism is merely a respectable superstition.

The Clericals and Nationalists are more formidable. They have high hopes that the Church and the Army will be restored to their ancient positions of dominance. "France is Catholic as she is military", declared Paul Bourget, "because she is born thus . . . The Church and the Army will save you, their prosecutors, because you are Frenchmen". "Happily", says Bishop Marty, "happily the Christianity that was in us, has awakened our ancient warlike energy." "Between the Church and the Army", writes Junius in the *Echo de Paris*, "there is such a close and intimate moral relationship that hatred of the priest and hatred of the officer are two phenomena constantly associated. In hating both, the doctrinaires of anarchy are logical. They discern in these personages the living incarnation of order".

Maurice Barrès, the apostle of the *Revanche*, calls on his countrymen "to swear that after the war we shall continue to give first place to the heroic virtues of warlike and religious souls." Thus Christ and Mars are yoked together. Barrès himself is not a believer, but he venerates "this mysterious force", Tradition, "as men adore the gods."

The other day, at a recital of war-poems given by the pupils of Madame du Minil, several charming maidens uttered prayers touching His Imperial Majesty which could hardly have been pleasing to Him who said: "Love your enemies." But they were pleasing to that nationalist and royalist audience, and the more appalling the sentiments, the more frenzied the applause. Some of the poems put into metre the miraculous prose of General Cherfies who, in his role of military critic, insists that Paris was saved by Geneviève; the good saint flung back the Huns of von Kluck as in earlier days she had frightened away the Huns of Attila. The plaudits which greet him encouraged the mystic strategist to discern a "religious awakening of our profoundly Catholic race buried an instant beneath the ashes

of what remains of the evil eighteenth century." To the mind of Paul Bourget, this Catholic renaissance is so vigorous that if any statesman re-opened negotiations with the Holy See, straightway all honest men would hail him "a great Frenchman."

But Benedict XV has said "A pope can wish and preach only peace." "Then why", asks the Socialist Sixte-Quenin, "have the faithful in all lands worked for war? Why do they glorify it?" Junius foretells that the France of to-morrow will be a military France because she will be in the same implacable dilemma of having to "subordinate everything to military effort or die". The very thought of this militarist paradise drives Henri Lavedan headlong into poetic prose; especially does the bayonet inspire him: "It is so national and French, this bayonet, that in our earliest infancy, long before we can talk, it imposes itself by a mysterious attraction upon the admiring ecstasy of our vision." When we are grown up, we plunge this pretty toy into the sounding "drum of human chests". "All honor to the bayonet!" Overcome by such antics of the imagination, the *Bataille Syndicaliste* proposes "to thank for their irresistible clownery all the grunTERS of the rear-guard, the greybeards unfit for military art, who go off crying; 'Kill, crush, sabre! Vive la guerre!' . . . and the poor wretches, afflicted perhaps with rheumatism cannot even budge from their arm-chairs."

Yet nothing is too grotesque for the wilder type of French nationalist. At a time when Parisians strolling in the woods on a Sunday afternoon can enjoy the rumble of hostile cannon, French chauvinists are boldly dividing the spoils of victory. At the aforementioned recital, with the ecstatic approval of their hearers, nearly half the charming amateurs demanded imperiously that we go "right to the Rhine". "The Prussian state", decrees Charles Maurras, "must return to its primitive elements." The re-conquest of Alsace-Lorraine no longer suffices.

His disciples outstrip Déroulède who said in verse: "We shall retake only that which from us was taken." No country thrills the imagination of Maurice Barrès more than "the valley of the Sarre, the divine Moselle, the grand duchy of Luxembourg, all these lands which eternally await us" . . . "territories which were promised us from all eternity". Waxing bolder he annexes purely and simply the left bank of the Rhine as the only way of "closing the frontier" and guaranteeing the future. For no matter what form of government the Germanic people may adopt, "it is their destiny, their instinct and their will to throw themselves upon us as soon as they can." Barrès is joined by Berthoulat, Jullian, Bérenger, Onésime Reclus (son of Elisée! and a cohort of historians who demand the "natural boundaries" of France. Socialists and Radi-



cals oppose them. "To the articles, the brochures, of our nationalists" says the Editor of *La Paix par le Droit*, "the Nationalists across the Rhine will soon oppose mountains of in-folio." Furthermore, the Germans are not "a dirty race." Barrès in turn denounces "the scandalous voice of this Professor Rhuysen" who is "a weakling in mind and heart." However, the Bordeaux professor is well supported. Longuet, Hervé, Compère-Morel follow up with strong articles. *L'Humanité* declares that by their aggressive palaver the nationlists "exalt the unity of the German people to a perfect paroxysm and bind them solidly to the Kaiser's imperialism."

As Jaurès pointed out, a similar phenomenon was observed in 1870. "What practical influence have these annexationists"? I asked the veteran Vaillant. "None whatever", he replied, "in France, but unfortunately they have in Germany. Their wild words are reproduced by the whole German press. They injure our cause." And this opinion appears general.

If the allies win, there is no danger of militarist reaction in France; all attempts will prove abortive; the soldiers, many of the officers, the great mass of the people, are war-haters now as never before. A non-com. writing to my friend de Marmande, describes a church full of French and German wounded. "Ah, what handclasps I received from the German wounded! In their tragic situation, all of them, of whichever nationality, could measure all the horror of war. In their presence the wildest militarists could not help blushing for their ideas." But should the Germans win, their militarist gospel would be consecrated by success. "No socialist party", declared Jules Guesde, "would then be able to withstand the wave of imitative militarism which would sweep around the world." There are only a few dissentients who think that a war of attrition ending in a draw alone can bring disarmament and lasting peace. They maintain a discreet silence. Likewise there are a few Socialists who are pacifists even in war time. When Guesde cried: "We must save France!" Rappoport retorted: "Yes, but a France without Frenchmen." With half a million of her young men under ground, the outlook for France is depressing. Yet the Party will stand by the country "right to victory."

And after? "A formidable growth of Socialism", opine many leaders. Hervé predicts wide social reforms effected through the co-operation of the Socialist Party with true Radicals: "Marxism is about dead." The Marxians forsee progress, but without such co-operation. There may be some nationalisation of industry to lessen the pressure of unemployment, and there is some talk of nationalising land and buildings in the devastated departments. Will Socialism and Syndicalism federate? Ah, there's the rub! Some syndicalists will advocate

such union, while others will advocate more strongly than ever the complete autonomy of the labor movement unhampered by political alliances.

So much for France. But France is not a law unto herself. Her future will be determined by that of Germany. Will defeat democratise the Empire? It is the general hope, but, as Haurès observed, you cannot impose democracy upon a people at the point of the bayonet. Andler recounted one incident which encourages hope. During the Agadir crisis, the professor found himself in a Breslau café engaged in conversation with Prince L. Suddenly the Crown Prince arrived and there followed a debauch of noisy jingoism. Prince L. remarked to Andler: "You must be disgusted with this stupid chauvinism . . . Well, it is because the régime has been a success, but if war broke out and we were defeated, we should have a democratic revolution like yours." Economic failure, he added, would produce the same effect. And so French Socialists are inclined to hope that a democratized Germany may join a demilitarised federation of European states.

Meanwhile, pacifist France, Socialist France, yes, says Jean Grave, and anarchist France, must fight like the France of 1792, a war of liberation. "In the interest of the nation, in the interest of our working class, in the interest of democracy, of civilisation, of Socialism,—right to the end! right to victory!"

BOARD OF EDITORS

Frank Bohn	Paul Kennaday
William E. Bohn	Robert Rives La Monte
Louis B. Boudin	Joseph Michael
Floyd Dell	Arthur Livingston
W. E. B. Du Bois	Robert H. Lowie
Max Eastman	Helen Marot
Louis C. Fraina	Moses Oppenheimer
Felix Grendon	Herman Simpson
Isaac A. Hourwich	Wm. English Walling

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Arthur Bullard	Gustavus Myers
George Allan England	Mary White Ovington
Charlotte Perkins Gilman	William J. Robinson
Arturo Giovannitti	Charles P. Steinmetz
Harry W. Laidler	J. G. Phelps Stokes
Austin Lewis	Horace Traubel
John Macy	John Kenneth Turner

Published by the New Review Publishing Association

256 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

ALEXANDER FRASER President	JULIUS HEIMAN Treasurer	LOUIS C. FRAINA Secretary
-------------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

Subscription \$1.50 a year in United States and Mexico; six months, \$0.75. \$1.75 in Canada and \$2.00 in foreign countries. Single copies, 10 cents.

Entered at the New York post-office as second-class mail matter.

# Revising State Constitutions

By L. B. Boudin

THE PROBLEM of revising our state constitutions has been engrossing the attention of our "statesmen" and students of our system of government for quite some time past, and has been constantly growing in importance. It is agreed on all sides that our state constitutions are, with but few exceptions, antiquated, unwieldly, and sadly in need of revision. But a constitution, like the tariff, may be "revised" in many ways: It may be revised "upwards" from the people, as well as "downwards" to the people. And as in the case of the tariff it depends entirely on who does the revising: the people who want to make the constitution an instrument of government *for* the people; or those who want to protect the special class interests by making it an instrument of government *of* the people. The peculiar kind of revision that befalls any state constitution therefore depends largely on the special political conditions of that state. Nevertheless, there are general tendencies discernible in the revisions which have occurred during the past decade or so. At first the tendency, originating in the west, was for a revision "downwards". But the tide has turned, and the tendency is now markedly "upwards". The proposed New York State Constitution, is as typical an example of the "upward" trend as the Oregon Constitution was of the earlier tendency.

Before proceeding to discuss this proposed Constitution,—the offspring of the brains of such eminent statesmen as Elihu Root, Geo. W. Wickersham, J. G. Schurman, and Morgan J. O'Brien; not to mention Messrs. Wm. Barnes and "Al" Smith,—we will do well to find out wherein the problem which confronted this aggregation of statesmen consisted,—in other words, why revision was at all necessary, why our state constitutions are by common consent unsatisfactory.

The general dissatisfaction with our State Constitution and the consequent problem of revision, is due, mainly, to a concurrence of two circumstances: the theory of the division of governmental powers which prevailed at the time when our state constitutions were originally framed and the theory of the supremacy of the Judiciary which has grown up since. The theory of the division of powers turned our constitutions into a system of "checks and balances" well suited for the government of a people who believed, with Jefferson, that the less government the better, but utterly unsuited for modern governmental purposes. As is the case with all antiquated machinery, the workings of the

Jeffersonian rural democracy system of government is marked chiefly by its inefficiency and waste. It is therefore natural that in these days of economy and efficiency, scientific management, etc. there should be a hue and cry on behalf of the "business interests", the "tax payers", and the "government expert", for a revision which would abolish this division of powers, or, at least, so concentrate all important powers in one department as to reduce the others to a mere shadow of their former self.

At the same time the working class as represented by the Socialist and trade-unionist, and the "small man" generally as represented by the radical reformer, have been clamoring against the old system, principally because the growth of the Judicial Power has taken out all the substance of the theory of division of powers, leaving a mere hollow form to serve as a basis for the omnipotence of the Judiciary. Besides, these social classes have come to recognize to a very large extent not only that a modern community generally needs positive and not merely negative government, action and not merely non-interference, but that their own special interests lie in the direction of the concentration of governmental power and responsibility.

But the concentration of power and responsibility that the working class and the radical "small man" want is of an entirely different character from that which the big and small "business interests" and the academic "government expert",—the "efficiency engineer" of the shop transplanted into politics,—want. The former want to abolish the power of the courts to veto and pervert legislation,—technically known as the power of the courts to declare legislation unconstitutional,—thereby making the power of the legislature to legislate co-extensive with the growing needs of the people, while at the same time making the legislature more responsible to the people and permitting the people to share directly in the work of the legislation by means of the initiative, referendum and recall. They also want the executive and judiciary to be directly responsible to the people to insure that they will carry out and interpret the mandate of the people whether expressed directly or through their representatives, in the spirit in which it was given. They therefore want the power to recall *all* elective officials, including judicial officers. In short, they want concentration of governmental powers in the hands of the people, and responsible to the people.

Not so with the "substantial" elements of the community and their governmental experts. They

want to remove the power as far as possible from the people, and to make the government responsible to themselves instead of the people. They therefore begin by refusing to admit the people into a direct share in the work of the legislation, or to make any part of the governmental machine directly responsible to them. So far they are merely "conserving" the past. But that is not enough for them. They are bent on some radical departures. So they want to transfer all power from the legislature, which is the branch of the government nearest the people and most amenable to their will, to the more remote and less responsible executive and judiciary. If they could have their choice they would place all power directly in the hands of the Judiciary, — the safest and least responsible of the three "departments." Unfortunately, this is quite impossible: the judicial machinery is so unsuited to the work of every-day government that whenever and wherever tried it has proven the most inefficient and the most costly form of government. So our "substantial elements" are compelled to strive for the next best thing: concentration of power in the hands of the executive, with a supervisory power in the courts by way of re-insurance.

Thus are the lines clearly drawn between progressive radicalism and reactionary radicalism. But here a third element enters to complicate matters, — the "boss" representing the professional politician. The professional politician makes a living,—and some times a fortune,—by manipulating the "sovereign power" of the people for the benefit of our "substantial elements", collectively or singly. In order that he may continue to thrive two things are necessary: The people must not have any direct legislative power, not to directly call an official to account,—for the greater the *direct* power of the people the less the goods which he can "deliver". Whatever power the people have must be of a "representative" kind, so that he can manipulate it, and get his "legitimate" or illegitimate graft in the process. But, on the other hand, there must be *some power* left to the people. The day that the "people's representatives" would cease to have any power would be the last day of the professional politician in politics,—with the disappearance of the commodity in which he trades his trade would become a matter of history. It is true that we have had many governors who were as subservient to the "machine" and the "boss" as the meanest legislative hack. But, on the other hand, our political annals are full of the ever-recurring story of the fight between the governor and the "boss". The fact is, that even under existing circumstances, the governorship is,—for reasons which cannot be gone into here,—the weakest point in the "boss" system. The professional politician is, therefore, the true conservative: he is in favor of the *status quo*. He

is opposed alike to the extension of power of the people and to the removal of this power further "up" to the governor. He is also the sworn enemy of efficiency and economy, because that means depriving him of his bread and butter.

Such was the problem; and such the forces that met to grapple with its solution during the summer months of this year of grace 1915 at the Capitol in Albany. Or, rather, to be exact, only two of the three forces which I have described really "met",—the "substantial elements" and the professional politician. The third force, the working class and the other radical elements, were not represented in the "meeting", so it could only *petition*. The petition,—and it should be noted here that it was the petition of the working class only, for the other "radical elements" did not have enough life in them even to get up a petition,—contained 25 prayers. They were all turned down, except two which got into the petition by mistake. And not only were all the demands of the working class turned down, but they were not even provided with a decent burial. They were just laughed out of court, like the demands of some irresponsible crank. Which is not at all surprising: a class that cannot muster the strength or the intelligence to get even a representation in the "meetin'", and must therefore present its demands by petition, cannot expect to be taken seriously.

With the working class eliminated from its deliberations, the "labors" of the Constitutional Convention resolved themselves into a contest between the "substantial element" and the professional politician, both sides being encouraged and at the same time admonished by the wise words uttered by Elihu Root, the presiding genius of the Convention, at a dinner of the Academy of Political Science, held for the purpose of considering the problems before the Constitutional Convention:

"There are indications extensive and numerous of a reaction from certain extreme views, from certain enthusiasm for new devices in government. *But we must remember that if reaction goes too far the pendulum will swing back the other way.*"

The result of these labors is a constitution which not only utterly ignores the needs and demands of the working class, but which is considerably worse in many important particulars from the present one. But here again I must make a reservation, I should have said: "I believe *will turn out to be* considerably worse." For nobody knows what it actually contains. And this not only because of its inordinate length, its highly technical language, and the hodge-podge, thoroughly unscientific manner in which it was pieced together rather than constructed. These difficulties, great as they are, might perhaps be overcome by a sufficient number of experts who could explain its provisions to the

uninitiated. But there is one difficulty in the way of finding out what this constitution contains which no amount of expert knowledge can possibly overcome,—the power of the Judiciary to say that it contains whatever pleases it to put into it. This power, which the working class wanted abolished but which this constitution seeks to perpetuate, makes it utterly impossible for us to know at the time we vote upon a constitution, either now or hereafter, what the constitution contains. So that even an *advocate* of the adoption of the proposed constitution is forced to admit that:

*"To tell just what the new constitution provides, one would have to know the minds of the judges and foretell their opinions. Hence it would be mere guess-work to attempt any estimate of the positive value of the home-rule provision . . . The significance of this depends on the content of meaning that may be imparted to it by the courts."*

The important changes introduced into the new constitution are a substantial curtailment of the powers of the Legislature, and a corresponding increase of the powers of the Legislative.

At the Constitutional Convention dinner of the Academy of Political Science which I have already mentioned, Prof. F. J. Goodnow gave an account of the Chinese Constitution, framed by the revolutionists who had overthrown the Manchu dynasty and established the republic, and of its abolition by the "conservative statesman" Yuan-Shi-Kai, China's present dictator, for the guidance and instruction of and as an object-lesson to the New York constitution makers. According to this account the Chinese Constitution was framed by "the radical and theoretical Western-educated Young China", and its chief fault was that it attempted to give self-government to a people who were not used to it. "It was so framed", said Prof. Goodnow, "as to lay *greater emphasis* on the Legislature, to which the people were quite unaccustomed, than on the executive, with which they were all familiar."

The New York Constitution makers there present and notably Mr. Root who presided at the dinner as well as at the Constitutional Convention, evidently heard Prof. Goodnow to good purpose. Unlike "radical and theoretical western-educated Young China", they have framed a constitution which lays *greater emphasis on the Executive than on the Legislative*. Not, of course, because we are unaccustomed to selfgovernment, but because they want us to *become disaccustomed* from it. The "new idea" in American political science evidently is not to attempt to educate people to self-government by giving it to them but to make them unfit for it by depriving them of it. It is this "new idea" that dominated the New York Constitutional Convention and its proposed Constitution.

# The Anglo-French Loan

By Maurice Blumlein

THE Anglo-French loan is not the private affair of a part of the banking world, based on pro-ally sentiment. Neither is it a shrewd attempt by the borrowing parties to enlist the co-operation of the American people by first creating a partisan interest.

To understand what the loan really is we will begin by letting the facts and figures speak for themselves.

The amount, 500 million dollars for 5 years at 5 per cent., is the joint obligation of the governments of England and France. It is "floated", or offered for public sale here, through the medium of underwriters; that is, a large number of banks, bankers or individuals subscribe to varying amounts, the minimum being a million dollars, which they resell for a small commission to any investor. The amount underwritten must be taken over and paid for, whether it is resold or not.

After bargaining for over a week with the underwriters the Commission representing the borrowers compromised on 500 million dollars instead of 1000 million originally demanded, besides conceding a number of attractive features to insure the resale of as much of the issue as possible.

The bonds are in denominations as small as \$100 to run five years, after which the holder has the option to take his money or secure new bonds running from fifteen to twenty-five years at 4½%. In other words, if the war is over at the time of the "conversion", the holder makes some extra money by the transaction because even 4½% is about 1½% more than these governments have paid for money in peace times. The small investor has also been given the privilege to subscribe for the bonds previous to public sale at the same price as the underwriters pays who does not resell—about 96¼. The price, later on, when the subscriptions are closed is 98. In this way the small investor has been placed on a par with the biggest holder. This procedure is unusual in so high-class a security, it being more apt to occur in ordinary times when the big holders want to fleece those whom they invite.

The foreign commerce of the United States up to the outbreak of the war showed a steady increase in volume and also in the excess of exports over imports. In 1913 for the first time the total of both exports and imports exceeded 4 billion dollars. In 1914 it was a similar amount though a trifle smaller, of which the proportion done with Austro-Hungary and Germany was nearly 6 hundred million dollars, the excess of exports to these countries amounting to 150 million.

The war cut off at a stroke this enormous trade of nearly 600 million dollars resulting in a period of acute depression. Step by step, however, this situation was transformed by the readjustment of industry to war conditions together with the rapidly increasing need of certain products by warring nations, temporarily in a position to consume more than they can produce. How far this change has progressed can be seen from the following figures:

	1914	August 1915
Exports	\$110,367,494	261,975,771
Imports	129,767,890	141,729,638
Excess	19,400,396	120,246,133

	1914	Eight months 1915
Exports	\$1,311,349,656	\$2,231,763,266
Imports	1,270,361,263	1,150,639,079
Excess	40,988,393	1,081,124,187

Thus if the present ratio is maintained, our foreign trade by the first of the year threatens to exceed a total of 4½ billion. In this total the imports show a tendency to decrease so that the growing volume is accounted for a preponderance of exports never before known. Moreover, whereas formerly in peace times much of the profit from our trade expansion accrued to the benefit of foreign investors who bought securities in this country, Europe cannot send over capital for investment now and the income from the present expansion is reverting to owners here far more than in the past.

Let us now see what bearing this has on the present loan. Europe, or rather the Allied nations, are coming to owe us sums like 100 million a month, a situation that never existed before. In the beginning it was simply taken for granted that we would be paid in money or securities. About six months ago, the accumulation of this one-sided exchange began to make itself felt in a scarcity of American dollars among the purchasers of American exports, together with a great plenty of these dollars at home. Because our money went to a premium in Europe, European money began to be quoted at an increasing discount here and at the same time the centres of money in this country were becoming loaded with accumulations and balances.

To have assets in the shape of money is no benefit to the owner unless the money can be made to bring him an income. In other words, he must keep on reinvesting his accumulations if he does not want to simply consume them. The medium through which reinvestment takes place are banks and bankers; they must find persons engaged in production and sale who in turn find it profitable to borrow money in connection with the movement of merchandise. No bank, no matter how overloaded it may be with money, feels safe in loaning it unless

the borrower can employ it in some activity productive of profit. Therefore, for a number of months after the outbreak of the war the banks and owners of money were simply holding on to their accumulations and were being oppressed by them in an unproductive state.

A statement comparing the banking position of the same week of 1914 and of 1915 will show that while the loans in 1915 have increased by about 500 million, the deposits have gained a thousand million. It will also show that this year the money accumulated in the way of deposits exceeds the money loaned out, whereas last year the reverse was the case:

Week ending October 2, 1914.

Loans	Deposits	Cash
2,202,131,000	1,996,283,000	424,756,000

Week ending October 2, 1915.

2,778,191,000	2,959,700,000	509,774,000
---------------	---------------	-------------

To sum up, we now have the following symptoms to account for:

1. Rise in the value of the American dollar or decline in the value of foreign money, which means the same thing; the English pound declined from 4.86 to 4.49 showing a discount of nearly 8 per cent. French and most other money registering an even greater difference.

2. Continued increase of exports of merchandise and imports of money payments, which seemed to be making matters worse because we didn't want any more gold shipments even though they were due as trade balances.

The invisible mechanism at the root of the trouble involves the elementary functions of money. Money is not a commodity that we can consume by using it up like other products. The only use to which it can be put is to circulate other commodities, produced and consumed. Therefore it must be mobile so that the consumer can always command the sums to enable him to continue to purchase. Even where the movement of products is one-sided, i. e., one centre or nation is regularly selling to another without buying in return, the money must always remain liquid so that the consuming nation can readily secure the necessary proportion to continue purchasing. In other words, it makes no difference whether the movement of goods is in one direction only or not, money must be capable of traveling in any and all directions, otherwise purchasing-power that most sought and needed element of present system is either unnecessary limited or destroyed.

In this connection the role of the consumer is that he must have and own, or create and maintain enough values so that either the temporary or permanent indebtedness shall be in such moderate proportion to actual or potential assets as to insure security of ultimate payment.

Thus while money clears periodic balances, debts

permanent beyond this point of clearance must then be accounted for by the transfer of property or title thereto.

Money therefore must not accumulate so as to lose its mobility. Otherwise it becomes inactive metal whose power to draw an income is no greater than that of a bag of gold on Robinson Crusoe's Island. That is how the gold shipments from abroad were coming to oppress our banking world, which had to accept this metal and take it out of circulation.

At the same time we were not alone getting more money than we could employ in industry as it then existed, but because the English and the French, having become very big customers, had to pay us with American funds, we were charging them a premium for our money, so that their purchases were becoming more and more expensive on account of the fact that they were paying two profits. Therefore England and France were being forced to the conclusion that they must buy from us as little as possible, because whatever they managed to secure elsewhere they got cheaper so long as they did not have to pay the premium we were asking for liquid money. And there is no denying that in the case of a number of articles, particularly food-stuffs, they could buy to advantage if necessary in other parts of the world.

It was finally an urgent necessity on *our* part to export money in the shape of extending an interest-bearing loan to our customer, thus enabling him to buy our products and enabling us to reinvest the proceeds of sales so that they become income bearing instead of being inactive.

This is made even more clear if we study what the alternative would be if we didn't make the loan. We would be holding more money here and we would certainly not sell as many commodities. The result would then be that we would be circulating a smaller proportion of products with a larger proportion of money. Prices would rise but values would not grow in proportion, because, after all, we are then circulating the same value with relatively more money than we required to circulate it previously. In other words we would be measuring a certain quantity of wealth by say \$2 now, which we measured by \$1 before the accumulation of money took place. Furthermore, as this accumulation only occurred in one country the rest of the world would still be measuring with a one dollar standard which would not alone have an unfavorable influence upon purchasers from us during the war, but even more serious consequences whenever the war happened to end.

The trouble is not due to any lessening demand but to the increasing difficulty with which the consumer was burdened in paying us. We were

charging an increasingly high price and after we got his money he was troubled to get it back and we were troubled what to do with it. Therefore, the first point of pressure was on the side of the banker and he foresaw that if the difficulty were not solved without being permitted to go further, it would ultimately also reach the rest of the community.

If we put two and two together we can now also understand why the bankers were so apparently honest with the public in placing the Anglo-French loan. Aside from the fact that a foreign loan to Europe is a new departure in this country, and therefore calls for unusual inducements and explanations, this is really secondary to the main point that the banking world was anxious to have the producers and exporters understand what the loan really meant rather than to simply hold it themselves as an investment. In other words, the bankers will get all the benefit that results from the placing of this loan because of the consequent increase of production and exports which will expand agriculture and industry generally. The bankers therefore really look beyond the loan rather than at it. From the point of view of the future this is even more true because the same relation that gave rise to this particular flotation promises to repeat the phenomenon at regular intervals.

This is one of those rare instances where the interests of the capitalists and the workers of a country temporarily coincide. American capitalism happens to be in the fortunate position which enables it to peacefully enlarge its markets. Of course this is the purest luck and has nothing to do with foresight. But as long as it happens to be that way, the development in this direction cannot be denied nor should it be. The American worker will be temporarily benefited so far as capitalism can confer genuine benefits upon the wage workers, which really means that the pressure of wages, hours and competition will be a good deal more moderate than it would have been if things had gone along in the old way. However, there is no reason why the worker should oppose the tendency which means an increase of the market by loans to the purchaser. What is important from the socialist point of view is that whenever we reach the end of our tether in this peaceful-enlargement-of-the-outlet process, in other words, after our period of luck has blown over, our capitalism shall then be made to do the only other peaceful thing possible, by making internal changes involving the proper distribution of wealth to the worker when external measures like the present one are no longer peacefully possible. We need never for a moment lose sight of the fact that such attempts at creating class harmony, like the present one, are mere transitions which delay antagonisms without in the end preventing their reappearance in full force.

# Jealousy Farcified

By Louis Berman

WHAT a pity it is that no machine has been invented to generate plays for the American Public! Here is a suggestion for the genius of Mr. Edison and the philanthropy of Mr. Ford. Let them put their heads and pockets together upon this problem. I am sure the resulting organ would be welcomed with open arms. For it is a fact, unfortunately, that the human psychology is still largely inexact. So that no playwright, however practised in avoiding ideas, in shunning originality, in concealing actualities, and in studiously refraining from any criticism of society, can be depended upon to satisfy the intellectual and artistic needs of our theater-frequenters.

What therefore does the producer of the Broadway play do? He expects the fulfillment of certain specifications. First you must have a plot—a dramatic plot which consists of motion and commotion. Then—comes the rub. If you are going to adopt the idealist pose (for which President Wilson is a good model) you will flourish the morality of the judge's bench, the church pulpit, the newspaper editorial. Hence the hero (preferably a Christy-Gibson-Flagg idiot) must save the heroine from the wiles of crooks, white slave men, society men, stage Ishmaels of one sort or another. If you fear to take the risk of inducing ennui in the Tired Business Man or Woman with such stuff, you will deal in the moral currency of the street, the smoking room, and intimate anecdote, the popular morality which winks and guffaws at its own exposures of the highbrow morality it pays homage. In a word, you must specialize in claptrap or commit what the claptrap-worshippers call cynicism.

Messrs. Winchell Smith and Victor Mapes probably acquired these regulations in some previous existence. For they know them so well and practice them so perfectly that they achieve effects comparable only to instinctive actions and reflex movements. In *The Boomerang* they have applied their unconscious wizardry to the theme of jealousy. Jealousy is always either a greed, a hysteria, a tyranny, or a hypochondriasis of property. In its average form, it is an induced, suggested, acquired malady due to the bacillus of tradition. Most people are jealous not because they want to be but because they are expected to be. What part institutions like romantic monogamy and the romantic novel and drama have played in epidemicizing it remains for analysis. Certainly, it offers manifest possibilities for a genuine comedy of social criticism.

Now observe how Messrs. Smith and Mapes have handled it by mixing the sentimental and the cynical

moralties. First they went for "safety first" by backing themselves with the public's perennial interest in their priests, the medical profession. So they put on the stage a Dr. Gerald Sumner and his office. Your normal man has never been to a physician except in fear and trembling. What better way of tickling him than to exhibit the dreaded torture chamber with its hated examining table, cabinet of instruments with a prominent obstetric forceps, and a microscope distinguishedly absent, sterilizers, bandages, holy water antiseptics, hypodermics, vaccines, bugs? And then to be reassured about the doctor. To discover that he is a jolly good fellow, a good judge of golf-sticks and bull dogs. To find that he is merely a Wall Street broker or Nassau Street lawyer mis-equipped with a stethoscope and a thermometer, counts much more than the fact that he is a fairly veracious example of the fashionable practitioner, general or specialist.

The doctor, however, is merely an appendix to the nurse. The playgoer may not be edified by the realistoid doctor. But the cockles of his heart will surely be warmed by the entirely fictitious nurse. And in her wake comes the plot—a manly young man suffering from nothing-the-matter-with-me, alias the stage symptoms of disappointed love, alias jealousy, towed by a womanly mother. After some slap-stick humor of the Charlie Chaplin species involving a physical examination and a hypodermic injection, the doctor proceeds to treat his case of jealousy by infecting as many as possible of the principals with the disease.

The second act, in which the epidemic passes the incubatory period and symptoms develop, shows the home of the fool-hero, Riverside Drive, at its worst. He is partly cured of his affection when complications ensue. The nurse evolves into the inevitable long-lost heiress and, surprisingly enough, in love with the doctor. That disciple of Hippocrates turns up to unburden a burning conviction to the effect that a love affair should be treated like a gamble in war stocks. Yet another plot is engineered to create jealousy in the fool-hero's ladylove. She too bites of the root of madness as a prelude to the third act which is simply beyond dissection. It is a delirium of jealousy. Anyhow it is all to show that the doctor is jealous of his patient, because of his secret love for his nurse who, as aforesaid, secretly loves him, but seems to love the patient. And, no doubt contrary to all expectations, it winds up to the tune that—

Jack shall have Jill,  
Nought shall go ill,  
The man shall have his mare again.  
And all shall be well.

The moral: if you treat jealousy as something pathological, you will get the worst case of it possible yourself. Thus jealousy has its triumph and commonsense its fall.

# Current Affairs

By L. B. Boudin

## Peace or Progress in Russia.

UNTIL the outbreak of the present war it was customary to speak of "peace and progress" in a manner as if the two things, if not exactly synonymous, were at least complementary, or, rather, conditioned upon each other. Peace was supposed to lead to progress, and progress depended upon peace. The great war, which has led to so many revaluations of accepted values and has revolutionized our thought in so many directions, has shown, however, that situations may arise when these two things part company and even become mutually exclusive. Such a situation has now evidently arisen in Russia.

Much has been written about the alleged unanimity of the Russian people in this war, and with considerable justification: there can be no doubt of the fact that this war is more popular with the people of Russia than any that Russia has engaged in since the "national" war of 1812. Nevertheless, the Russian people were by no means *unanimous* for the war at the beginning, nor are they now. The opposition proceeds from two diametrically opposed directions: the extreme left and the extreme right. The opposition of the Socialists was both expected and natural. The opposition of the most reactionary groups was *unexpected*, but nevertheless quite natural. The extreme reactionaries in Russia, who look upon the German government as the most efficient representative of the "sacred principle of autocratic monarchy", dislike the idea of fighting their natural ally side-by-side with their sworn enemies: French Republicans and English democrats. From the very beginning of the war the reactionaries were, therefore, constantly intriguing and agitating for a separate peace. So much so, that their organ "The Russian Flag" was nicknamed "The Prussian Flag."

Then came the great débâcle, — due not so much to Russia's unpreparedness as to her constitutional inability to prepare. Modern warfare is as much an industrial as a military problem, — in the long run perhaps even more so. But Russia's governmental regime has seriously crippled her industrial development, and has therefore placed her at a decided disadvantage in any war with her great antagonist, who is industrially the most efficient country in the world. And whatever industrial resources the country possessed could not be "mobilized" by the lot of corrupt and incompetent bureaucrats and court favorites who were running the

Russian government. This task required not only a government constructed on entirely different lines from the present Russian government, but also a government which possesses the fullest confidence of the people, and which, on its side, has full confidence in the people, and is therefore willing to have them co-operate in the work on more or less equal terms with itself.

When the inevitable consequences of its own rottenness were full upon it, the Russian government found only two possible courses open for it: It must either sacrifice the national interest and conclude a shameful peace which would probably cripple the country's economic development for a generation. Or it must sacrifice its own special interest, — the special privileges and the graft that accompanies it, — and give the people such a share in the government as would permit the organization of an efficient government along modern lines, the only kind of government that could hope to successfully cope with the problem of conducting a modern war. The vast majority of the people were not only ready but eager to take up the task so shamefully bungled by the autocratic-bureaucracy, and in their enthusiasm to continue the war pressed for the change which would make its further continuance with any reasonable expectation of success possible. But the arch-reactionaries and the court camarilla would rather accept defeat at the hands of the "foreign" enemy than give in to "the enemy within our own gates". The imbecile on the throne is wavering. At first it looked as if he was ready to inaugurate some substantial reforms in an endeavor to win over the people's representatives. But soon other counsel prevailed and the people's representatives were flatly defied.

What the outcome will be it is impossible to foretell. From present indications it would seem that Nicholas II. is ready to follow the precedent established by Louis XVI, and so many other illustrious patriots on the throne, and sell out to the foreign enemy, rather than capitulate before the "internal enemy". Whether that will be the course followed, and if so, whether the matter will end there; or the Russian people will follow the French example in their turn and continue the war to the bitter end in despite of their God-given ruler, and incidentally dispose of him and his rulership; or whether "saner counsels" will prevail and the leaders of the people will compromise their cause, no one can tell. But whatever happens, one thing is certain: Russia evidently can have peace *or* progress, it cannot have both. At this juncture peace means reaction, war means some progress at least, and possibly revolution.



## The Revolutionary Proletariat has Spoken!

AT the very time that our nationalistic-militaristic pro-Germans were attempting to befuddle the minds of the public in general, and of the working class of this country in particular, by a bogus "Peace-Convention", held in our Metropolis of the West, the representatives of the revolutionary proletariat were quietly holding a real Peace Conference among the mountains of Switzerland. It was epoch-making in the truest sense of the word. It was the first real attempt at the re-building of the International,—for its attendance was not limited either to "Entente" or "Alliance" countries, nor yet to "neutrals", but included the representatives of the entire international revolutionary proletariat within reach.

And this very first attempt has shown that where real revolutionaries gather there the International is again, or, rather, *still alive* and pulsating with energy. At this historic meeting of revolutionaries, almost within hearing of the roar of the cannon of the "western front" sat side-by-side German and French proletarians,—comrades met to devise means to stop the frightful carnage which has been devastating the world for more than a year. More than that: they met in the interest of a *common cause which transcends the momentary exigencies of the present situation*. Their purpose was therefore not merely to devise means of stopping the present carnage, but also to prevent the recurrence of similar carnage in the future; and not only to prevent carnage, present or future, but to prevent injustice and tyranny in times of peace as the result of the triumph of brute force in time of war.

The manifesto adopted by this Conference does not therefore, declare merely for peace; but for just peace,—a peace that would not bear within itself the seeds of future wars, or of strife between different nationalities in times of peace which would necessarily becloud the class struggle and retard the great emancipatory movement of the working class. Such a peace must be a peace without annexation of conquered territory, under any guise and by whatever name it may be called, and without indemnities.

*Such is the peace the revolutionary proletariat wants and no other.*

Herein lies the great gulf between the peace demands of the revolutionary Socialists and those of bourgeois pacifists, a gulf which we must never overlook in our anxiety for peace. Bourgeois pacifism is philanthropy applied to war, and its motives and methods are those of ordinary philanthropy; while Socialist pacifism means the motives and the methods of the class struggle applied to war.

Your typical bourgeois philanthropist appears on the scene whenever there is some "horror", and exceptional situation; and he always applies himself

to remedying consequences, never to removing causes. His sympathy is aroused by starvation or disease in acute form. But the most philanthropic of them all will starve his workmen slowly by underfeeding them, or drive them into premature death by slowly poisoning them in his factory if his business demands it. His philanthropy is a combination of "nerves" and bad conscience. So is his pacifism. He is much disturbed over the "horrors" of war, although he does not give a thought to the cruelties of peace. He cannot stand the "frightful carnage" when concentrated in dramatic form on the military battlefield,—it gets on his nerves. But he bears with perfect equanimity the no less devastating carnage of the industrial battlefield; the accounts of which, happily, are not spread before him at the breakfast table in lurid colors by his favorite newspaper.

Not so the Socialist. Although we are no more callous to horrors than the weak-nerved philanthropist, and are as ready as he is to exert ourselves in the amelioration of any extraordinary conditions of misery, it is nevertheless *the ordinary, the chronic* conditions that engross most of our attention. It is the remedying of basic evils, instead of the alleviation of acute conditions that we consider our proper sphere, and the chronic evils can only be remedied by removing the causes which produce them. Similarly in the problems of peace and war, we are more concerned with the cruelties of peace than with the horrors of war. For it is only by removing the causes which produce the cruelties of peace that we can abolish the horrors of war. And if we are so unalterably, so vehemently opposed to war, it is not so much because of the temporary horrors while it lasts, as because of the permanent cruelties which it leaves in its wake, by reason of intensified national animosities and the widened sphere of their operation, and the weakening of class-solidarity, making the cruelties of peace more general as well as more intense while at the same time deferring the day of final emancipation.

This imposes upon us a task quite different in its character from that of the bourgeois pacifist. "Peace at any price" is a good enough peace for him. He may have his pious wishes about "a just peace", but he'll be satisfied with any peace,—so long as he can be done with this "frightfulness" that has gotten upon his nerves. Our main concern is the future,—*the conditions under which the nations and the classes will have to live after the 'frightfulness' is over*. We cannot therefore work for, or accept, any peace at all, *but only such as is consistent with our aims and purposes*. That is why we are so earnest about the conditions we attach to the peace we so ardently desire,—*without those conditions the peace may not be worth having from our point of view*.

# A Socialist Digest

## Italian Imperialism and the Common Characteristics of Imperialism

**I**MPERIALISM is a general phenomenon, possessing general characteristics. If one centers his attention upon the Imperialism of Germany, it is simply because that Imperialism is the most developed and the most dangerous. Marx, a half century ago, in his preface to *Capital*, told the German critics who denied the German applicability of his theories, that in the developed industrialism of England was mirrored the future industrialism of Germany. The tendencies of capitalist development are universal.

While Imperialism is a general phenomenon, each national Imperialism possesses its own peculiar characteristics, determined by the degree of economic and political development achieved in each particular nation. While in Germany, France and England, Imperialism is distinct from nationalism, Imperialism simply identifying itself with nationalism in order to secure a popular sanction for its purposes, in Italy Imperialism and Nationalism are developing one with the other and are really a common movement. Imperialism strengthens the development of Nationalism and Nationalism strengthens the development of Imperialism. This is due to the fact that the rise of Italian Nationalism was coincident with the development of Imperialism, and the cause of the peculiar and undeveloped social conditions in Italy, the two movements became practically merged into one.

The Italian Nationalist and Imperialist movement started in 1902, and did not become powerful until the European crisis of 1908, culminating in Austria's annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina. The Nationalist movement then became a general movement, and developed Imperialistic ambitions. The conquest of Tripoli in 1911 was claimed as a triumph of their own making by the Nationalists and Imperialists.

In the *Forum*, T. Lothrop Stoddard has an interesting article summarizing the intellectual manifestations of Italian Imperialism. The ideas of the Italian Imperialists are in all essential respects identical with the ideas of the German Imperialists. The pertinent parts of this article are as follows: (It must be borne in mind that Stoddard often uses the terms Nationalist and Imperialist as synonymous.)

"First of all, what is the Nationalist concept of the nation? Professor Maraviglia answers as follows: 'It is the unique form of truly real solidarity, in time as in space, not only between those who dwell together behind determined frontiers under a regime of community of language, laws and customs, but also between the generations which spread from the remotest ancestors to the most distant descendants.' And Signor Rocco adds: 'The national society is the unique social aggregate which maintains interests eagerly, continually, combatted by the other national societies, and which it must defend 'da se,' by its own means; because above the nation there is no higher society which can give justice to the nation.'"

"This last quotation brings out the Nationalist tenet of the vital function of war as the creative, formative and sustaining principle of national life. The national society is isolated in the midst of other and necessarily hostile societies. Wherefore,—"the struggle for life, a universal law, is the unique source of human and national perfection; war is, after all, the most loyal form of the struggle between two human collectivities, and the most educative for both of them." "The war question," says Professor Sighele, "is for Nationalists, the primordial question. The warlike virtues are, for us, the primordial virtues." Professor Corradini is "a profound admirer of war, creator of peoples and vigorous men"; "sole hygiene of the world, sole school of sacrifice, unique cause of virtue and heroism." Professor Giorgio del Cecchio thus writes of the "Goodness of War":—"What more salutary purification from all wilfulness and impure passion, what more radical surgeon for egoism, than war? It is before all else, an inner experience, revealing to the individual, suddenly and as by a miracle, his aptitude for self-mastery; this it is which is its true and supreme nature. He who despises death is alone truly worthy of life." It is of especial importance to remember that these and subsequent utterances were all made prior to the outbreak of the European War, and thus reflect Nationalist psychology before it had been stimulated by the great conflict.

"Pacifist protests are met in the following fashion: "But,' object some,

'the Italian race is not a warlike race. Only one more difficulty to overcome! Our efforts, all our efforts, will tend precisely towards making it a warlike race. We will give it a new Will, we will instil into it the appetite for power, the need of mighty hopes. We will create a religion,— the religion of the Fatherland victorious over the other nations. We will convert our people. Is it the first time that religions have had their converts? And, when every Italian shall be joyously persuaded that he has every chance of dying in war, his mentality will be transformed even in time of peace. Active, daring, adventurous, energetic, he will no longer have as his sole conception an increase of wages or fortune, comfort or enjoyment. His aim will be no longer to live, but to do something by his life.'"

"The repudiation of "pacifism," argue the Nationalists, is nowhere more necessary than in Italy, for, while Italian unity was being achieved, the other nations were appropriating the earth. And yet, what nation is by nature more destined to expansion? Signor Rocco thus develops what may be called the theory of retarded appetites: "Our country is poor, because a part of its soil is sterile and because capital is lacking. But, in return, we are prolific. Hitherto we have had to submit to the injustice of nature, for we were not numerous and the others outnumbered us; we were divided while the others were united. But, today, we also are numerous, we also are united, we will soon have overtaken, even surpassed, the others. Consequently, we also claim our place in the sun. The others have conquered first, then labored. We have labored first, often abroad for the foreigner; it remains for us to conquer. It is said that all the other territories are 'occupied.' But there have never been any territories *res nullius*. Strong nations, or nations on the path of progress, conquer, not free territories, but territories occupied by nations in decadence." Indeed, insists the author of the anonymous brochure *Il Nazionalismo*, published like Signor Ricco's book early in 1914, "From the Italian point of view, what is war but armed emigration? The Socialists, who pretend to suppress war, merely transpose its field of action by fomenting the struggle of classes at home. They should understand that, with us, the problem is not the distribution but the augmentation

or wealth. And this problem can be solved only by economic or military conquests."

"But the future conquests of Imperial Italy are not solely military or economic in character. They must be cultural as well. Signor Rocco hopes that Italy will know how to "create a culture peculiar to itself, and to impress in its turn, as already in Renaissance times, as France yesterday, as Germany today, its national seal upon the universal intellectual move-

ment." According to Signor Rocco, the radius of Italian effort constitutes a truly far-flung battle line. "We must know how to conduct the struggle against the industrial expansion of Germany the demographic and linguistic invasion of the Slavs, the capitalism of France, the antipathetic and dangerous brutality of those countries which, according to their selfish interest, repulse or assimilate our emigration." Truly a comprehensive programme.

the disadvantages of the feudal militarism of Germany.

"The Balkan states are forced by the predatory character of their ruling classes to destroy, with their own hands, their independence and their future.

"It is for these reasons that we, the Socialists of the Balkans, faithful to our Socialist past, and in agreement with our Bucharest resolution; we, who have always welcomed each step leading to an effective understanding, and who have encouraged all concessions that might serve to bring about a reconciliation of the Balkan states in the interest of their independence and their neutrality, we now reject as fatal for the proletariat of the Balkan peoples all ententes and coalitions which are intended for aggressive ends, for conquests or to further dynastic plans, and that, far from leading to peace or any effective understanding, will only provoke new catastrophes.

"The International Socialist federation of the Balkans reaffirms through its bureau the declaration of the Socialist fraction of the Skoupchtina of August, 1915, which said:

"The Socialist federation heartily desires a closer alliance of the Balkan peoples; it energetically demands such action. But it rejects any artificial coalition which serves the temporary interests of one or the other of the groups of imperialist powers. A real understanding among the Balkan powers will lead to and assure peace, while any military coalition favored by the great powers, will only bring the danger of new wars. A real understanding will eliminate the possibility of conflicts between the Balkan states; a military alliance, on the contrary, will only increase such possibilities. An understanding of the Balkan peoples will guarantee their existence, while a military alliance, inspired by the great powers, will render their existence doubtful. An understanding will untie the Balkan powers; alliances, concluded in the interest of the great powers, will divide them.'

"In struggling step by step against the imperialist policies of the great powers and of the Balkan governments, we are preparing the road to the victory of a federated republic of the Balkan powers, the only form of organization that conforms to the interests of the proletariat of the Balkan peoples.

"Long live peace!

"Long live the federated republic of the Balkans!

"Long live international Socialism."

## Balkan Socialist Manifesto

**T**HE Socialist of the Balkan States have issued a manifesto, signed by the executive committee, of the Inter-Balkan Socialist Bureau, which reads as follows:

"Recent actions of the great powers have shown once more the fatal results of the policy pursued by the Balkan governments. The powers of the Quadruple Entente are seeking by threats to force Greece and Serbia to cede territory to Bulgaria, in return for which concessions the latter is to be forced by these great powers to enter into a new Balkan alliance by declaring war upon Turkey.

"At the same time an ever strong pressure is being exercised, following the defeats of Russia, by Austria and Germany at Bucharest to push Roumania into the war, or at least force her to adopt a neutral policy favorable to the central powers.

"The fire that has already devoured Serbia now threatens such of the Balkan peoples as have hitherto remained neutral.

"In protesting, in agreement with the Socialist parties of Greece and Serbia against the attacks directed against the autonomy of the states and the sovereignty of the peoples, we at the same time protest against the criminal policy of the Balkan states, which by their thirst for conquest, their cruel egotism, their past filled with hatred and jingoism, have not only facilitated, but have provoked the intervention of the great powers in the affairs of the Balkan peoples.

"Since their formation into autonomous states, a formation in itself, very largely the result of the diplomatic combinations of European powers, the Balkan people have not been able to escape from the control of these great powers. If from time to time one of these states has sought to assert its independence, if it has momentarily raised its head, it was only to stagger back and become the instrument of

some other great power or group of powers.

"The speculation of the bourgeois classes of the Balkans, which consists in supporting the palms of the great powers, in order to receive rewards from them in the shape of assistance in plans of conquest—this speculation has been revealed by the manner in which the Balkan peoples have become but merchandise, always either victims or dupes.

"The powers of the Quadruple Entente in demanding cessions of territory from Greece and Serbia, wish to prove that the support given to these states during the first and second Balkan war was not gratuitous. During the decades that the Balkan states fought each other for reciprocal spoliation they were always supported by one group or the other of these powers. Now the time for settlement of debts has arrived.

"Russia, France and England now demand territorial cessions of their proteges, Serbia and Greece; Germany and Austria demand of their protege, Bulgaria, that she shall repulse all understandings with Serbia and threaten her 30-year ally, Roumania, with persecutions, because the latter sympathizes with Russia.

"The nationalist and imperialist policies of the little Balkan states have had as their fatal and inevitable result, to make them instruments in the policy of European imperialism. They are to be forced either to attack Turkey and thus prepare for the free entrance of Russia into Constantinople, which means the practical subjection of the Balkan region within a very short time, or else to aid the central powers and the victory of German and Austrian imperialism by maintaining their neutrality even by the force of arms.

"Saved by Germany, Turkey will become a colony with all the disadvantages of Asiatic despotism, masked under a pseudo parliamentarism, with all

## Where Do We Stand?

THE Berlin *Vorwärts* discusses this question in a rather noteworthy editorial, alluding to Heine's utterance: "We stand behind the Chancellor and the Kaiser".

"We are not even certain where the imperial chancellor stands, for he has repeatedly declined to commit himself precisely. But we should know where we stand in relation to the government and the bourgeois parties. It seems that a large number of the socialist leaders hope to see the policy of Civil Peace', (Burgfrieden) finally lead to a Bloc policy. But that requires logically that after the war there should not rise a violent clash between social democracy and the bourgeois parties. And yet, the policy of the bourgeois parties and the economic organizations behind them is unequivocally ordained. It only awaits military sanction. It now behooves social democracy to take its stand accordingly. We find that some comrades accept imperialistic ways of thought and their consequences; we find many comrades anxious, from reasons of interior politics, not to have conflicts between the social democrats and other parties. That foreshadow Bloc policies.

"That would finally mean that the party no longer acts according to its principles but according to the direction given by those heretofore opposing it. The party would then be guided by the fear of being isolated, of losing contact with the bourgeois parties and the good will of the government."

*Vorwärts* point out that thus the party is being manoeuvred by its leaders into a position *radically different even from that occupied by its majority on August 4, 1914*. Then the parliamentary fraction in its official statement declined responsibility for the governments' policy and its consequences.

"But that statement is now forgotten. Our journalistic and parliamentary spokesmen have since gone far beyond. Under the protection of the 'Burgfrieden' and in view of the impossibility of effective resistance they have fixed more effectively the policy of the party. They have swallowed unconditionally the policy of the government, assumed responsibility for it in the past and the present, more and more, made future criticism utterly difficult so that by now—in open conflict with the unanimous resolutions of the party—they are ready to continue the truce of the classes, to remould the social Democracy into a social-political reform party. The policy of August 4, has led to the dictatorship of the right wing over the party. Within that right wing views

and tendencies have gained the upper hand of which many believed heretofore that they would be utterly impossible within the social democracy.

"The party now in reality faces a fateful hour. The decisions to be made by its leading organs are of such serious import as never before. It is not merely the question as to our attitude toward the war and toward single governmental measures. *More is at stake: the preservation of the character of the party, its peculiarity, originality and independence not only in the ominous time of war lent also later on during the not less ominous times to come. The whole future policy of the party is to be determined. Openly it is demanded that we give up our former party principles and party tactics, that we co-operate with the bourgeois parties in a block policy, that we take our place as a party equally with the other parties in the turmoil of bourgeois parliamentarism.*

"That in truth is the decision facing the leading organs of the party. The last word will be spoken by history."

Such news as are escaping the German censor make it plain that the socialists of Germany are far from being a unit of the question of the war policy of the parliamentary majority. In many places the leading and active forces of the party raise their voices against the war patriots in the socialist ranks. We note such an awakening in *Braunschweig* where a conference of party delegates passed strong resolutions against the endeavor of the party executive to suppress the free expression of opinion within the party and approval of the stand lately taken by Comrade Haase.

A conference of delegates of the electoral district of *Gotha*, after hearing the report of their representative Block (one of the old guard) took an unmistakable position as to the quarrel in the party:

"The conference does not stand for the policy of the parliamentary majority. It protests particularly against the onesided attacks in a part of the party press and that of trade organizations—against the opposition which demands no more nor less than its established right to express its opinion freely and candidly. That demand corresponds with the first principle of the party, the principle of free speech, and with all party traditions. Since there cannot be too sets of rights in the party the conference declares the hateful proceedings against comrade Haase as reprehensible since Haase unquestionably has the right of trying to gain support for his views.

"The conference requests comrade Haase in the interest of the party to remain loyally at his post."

A similar conference in *Wiesbaden* pronounces unanimously its support of the position taken in the manifests signed by Haase, Bernstein and Kautsky.

The delegates of the election district *Hoechst-Unsingen* also protests emphatically against those who would curtail the right of free speech of the parliamentary party minority.

Delegates of the *fourth Berlin* election district, the most populous in all Germany, declare emphatically their support of the same manifesto and express sympathy for Haase who has been disciplined by the party executive.

On the other hand are the socialist war patriots busy to get in many districts moral support for their actions. Thus we see the once glorious movement in Germany weakened and divided in a way that would seem to make the split inevitable. The patriotic intoxication is followed by a late *Katenjammer*, the extent and severity of which is still a matter of guess-work.

## Psuedonyms and Conquest

THE anti-war Socialists of Germany point out, in *Vorwärts*, that the leaders of the pro-war majority now in control of the Party favor conquest under various pseudonyms. Suedekum in an article in the *Hamburger Echo* favors two forms of virtual annexation:

- (1). "Necessary protection for the boundaries of our country" and even
- (2). "Far reaching economic bonds as parts of the treaty of peace".

Thus Belgium might be politically free—but "bound" economically and from a military standpoint!

The *Hamburger Echo* and other pro-war Socialist papers have long favored the military form of subjection. There is no reason to doubt that the newer form of "economic" annexation is equally widely favored. This seems now to have been the cause of the Socialist split in the Prussian Landtag (five against five). One of the anti-war members now asserts that the pro-war faction favored both this "economic annexation" and military overlordship.

The New Yorker *Volkszeitung* points out that one of the pro-war groups, which favors a peace "corresponding to the sacrifice in blood and property" stands on the same ground as the anti-Socialist National Liberal Party. "Two parties with a single thought", it remarks.

## Sweden and the War

IN a recent interview, Hjalmar Branting, the Swedish Socialist leader, discussed the position of Sweden, and the Socialist opposition to the war element:

"If the English-Swedish trade negotiations fall through, and at the same time trouble should arise in Finland, the situation produced by these two misfortunes would be an alarming one. It would then be impossible to restrain the pro-German element of this country from rushing into war. This element is numerically small, but it is powerful beyond its numbers. We must not ignore the possibility of such a catastrophe, and I cannot help viewing the situation with grave apprehension.

"I still have hope that the difficulty with England will be satisfactorily settled, and the possibility that the Germanophile interests in Finland will stir up trouble there is, I think, remote. I do not, therefore, consider this prospect of war particularly threatening at the present time, but it is distinctly within the range of possibilities.

"You know, of course, that my party in Sweden stands almost unanimously for peace. A few days ago, three of our members were accused of authorship of the war book and voted out of the party, but these were almost isolated examples. They do not in any sense represent the spirit of the party.

"I cannot help feeling that our misunderstanding with England, might have been settled some time ago, if it had not been for the fact that the Swedish members of the commission have been a little too theoretical in their views. The English members have presented a practical issue to our traditional rights as an independent nation.

"We have argued that Sweden had a right to carry on an uninterrupted trade with another neutral country like America. Of course, in theory, Sweden has such a right, but some of us are forgetting that this is not an ordinary situation which can be settled by considerations which would hold in times of peace. England is plainly interfering with our sovereign rights, but so is Germany, and if we are to take action against every nation that has in this war committed offence against Sweden, we must fight the whole world. We have protested against England's interference with our imports, and that is as far as we should go. I am sure that the Swedish point of view in the whole matter has been too narrow.

"The Swedish Government has played absolutely square on the question of the transit of supplies to the Allies and Germany. Sweden has held firmly to the strictly neutral position.

The trouble has come through the illicit commerce, which has gone on between this country and Germany—trade forbidden by the government, and which the government has done all in its power to prevent. But by means of falsified certificates, and the other subterfuges commonly used, Swedish traders have done a tremendous secret business with Germany.

"I don't mean to say that our Swedish traders are either more or less honest than those of other nations, but there are enough dishonest traders everywhere, who yield to the temptation of great profits held out to them. Most people do not realize how great this illegal business has been. I do not refer to open smuggling, but to the misuse of guarantees, etc. Every conceivable substance has crept into Germany in this way—most of all, perhaps, copper. In the ordinary way, I

do not think Sweden has been of material assistance to Germany during this war, but in this secret way Germany has received a great deal.

"Concerning the war talk which one hears so much nowadays, the war element does not represent the nation. Not even the conservative party itself wants war. I have recently spoken with the premier, and the foreign minister, and they are both inclined to discountenance the work of the extreme activist, who have been spreading war propaganda.

"The Swedish nation is still inflamed against Russia for the espionage and diplomatic scandals, which she has been guilty of in this country, but it is only a small element that believes that we ought to strike against Russia, taking advantages of Russia's misfortunes and forgetting that we would have to reckon with her later."

## The Strategy of Annihilation

THIS greatest of all wars is showing the frightful character of war in all its savage simplicity.

Its a question of being able to kill off a sufficient number of your opponents before they do it to you. "If in the past," says the *New Republic*, "victories have seemed a substitute for annihilation, that was because military organization had not sufficed fully to bring out the terrible logic of complete efficiency in war".

"War used to consist of the sacrifice of lives in order to win victories and thereby to impose terms on the vanquished. The results accomplished by the victory were supposed to be worth the cost. But in this most fearful and destructive of all wars, victory consists in an indefinite process of successful carnage. War has been so efficiently organized that its real nature has finally been revealed in all its incredible maleficence. A populous nation in arms cannot be defeated until its able-bodied men have been killed or prevented from organizing into military units. In order to diminish the loss in men, no effort is spared to obtain superiority in metal, and to this end prodigious sums of money are spent and corresponding debts incurred. Not content with its toll of existing life, war exacts a similarly costly tribute from the life of the future. Millions of men will have to labor for decades with no result but the repair of wasted material. Millions of human beings will be deprived of innocent and wholesome satisfaction because the fruits of their work have been consumed in killing other human beings. Really scientific war has no strategy except that of sheer annihilation and destruction."

The *New Republic* describes this "strategy of annihilation" as follows:

"The Allies capture a few hundred yards of trenches on one sector of the line. The Germans score a similar success on another. Occasionally the few hundred yards increase into several miles, and the experts affect to believe that a railway junction or some other strategic point or line of a successful offensive appear to be disproportionate to the cost in ammunition and men. Since the middle of November hundreds of thousands of soldiers have been killed and an unimaginable amount of suffering inflicted on their surviving comrades without effecting anything but insignificant changes in the military situation.

"On the eastern front the fighting results in much larger territorial gains and losses. The armies advance and retreat over hundreds of miles; great victories are won and lost; and hundreds of thousands of soldiers are captured. But the net results are not any more conclusive. . . . The German victories in Galicia and Poland have been as brilliant as anything in military history. If the Germans had only the Russians to deal with they would have inflicted a decisive defeat upon the enemy; but their victories tactically complete as they are, are indecisive.

"Futile as this terrific fighting appears to be, it possesses a hideous and frightful conclusiveness. It is pre-eminently successful in achieving what has always been an essential object of hostile armies—that of killing a large number of their opponents. The percentage of losses among the troops which participate in the engagements is enormous and unprecedented."

# Correspondence

## Manly Answers Hourwich

To the NEW REVIEW:

Dr. Isaac A. Hourwich's article "The Walsh Report on Immigration" completely misrepresents the position of Mr. Walsh, as Dr. Hourwich would have known if he had taken the trouble to read the report with any degree of care. Mr. Walsh in his separate statement, as noted in connection with his signature, specifically dissented from the section of the Manly report which dealt with Immigration on the ground that he was opposed on principle to any restrictions whatever on immigration.

I am sure that in justice to Mr. Walsh you will, after verification from the report itself, publish a correct statement in a position at least as prominent as Dr. Hourwich's original article.

I have no desire to enter into a lengthy discussion of the proposal for excluding those who refused to become citizens after reasonable time, which so greatly roused Dr. Hourwich. His statement, however, that one-fifth of the total population, and one-half of the population of many large cities consists of foreign-born non-citizens seems to me a compelling reason for urging a measure, which without the imposition of any hardships except learning to speak English and taking out citizenship papers, will bring some degree of unity out of the present heterogeneity.

The political weakness of the working class is in large measure due to the existence of this one-fifth foreign-born non-citizens, who are for the most part workers. To bring this one-fifth into political potency and to remove the residence qualification, which disfranchises an almost equal number of migratory workers and others whom modern industry forces to travel in their search for a job, should be one of the chief endeavors of those who wish to see the workers come into their own.

Could there be any more absurd picture than that which Dr. Hourwich paints of the United Mine Workers' suffering the loss of a large proportion of their members because they could not speak English? Has Dr. Hourwich so little faith in the Mine Workers' organization that he believes they would suffer their brothers to be deported rather than provide the means

for educating them or force the government to provide the means?

The one-fifth foreign-born non-citizens are at present submerged industrially, politically, and socially. The coercion involved in making them achieve a position of political potency from which they may remedy many of the other evils under which they now suffer, does not seem to be harsh. The situation from a national standpoint is almost identical with that which the unions face industrially. The proposed action in using some degree of coercion to bring all within the bonds of citizenship is similar to that used by labor organizations to promote the solidarity of labor by imposing obligations to act in writing with their fellow workers.

I am deeply touched by the picture which Dr. Hourwich paints of the hardships of sales agents for foreign companies, but I am somewhat interested to know when he was chosen as champion of this particular class of the population.

Washington, D. C. BASIL M. MANLY.

## German and Bohemian Socialists

To the NEW REVIEW:

THERE could hardly be a more amusing example of naïveté than the letter from Charles Pergler which you published under the heading, "A withering criticism of German Socialism." The Bohemian Socialists denouncing the nationalist backslidings of German Socialists is a picture not dissimilar to that showing the Kaiser, Roosevelt, and Blatchford thundering against jingoism. American Socialists may not know much about Bohemian Socialism, but they must surely be aware that the Bohemian Socialist party has for years worked hand in glove with the nationalist bourgeois parties of Bohemia. I am pointing this out not because I find pleasure in criticizing a fellow-Socialist in these critical times, but only to prove that at least some of the vituperation heaped upon German Socialism has its origin in a very questionable internationalism.

What good purpose can this very often abominably unfair criticism of German Socialism serve? It can only arouse feelings of bitterness and revenge. The accusation that there are jingoes within the German party, will

only provoke the retort that these are also to be found in the American party. If you quote offensive words spoken or written by German Socialist, a German Socialist will have no difficulty in quoting to you the no less offensive words of some American Socialist. Such mutual criticism is destructive of the ideal of internationalism and must retard the resurrection of the proletarian International, if the latter is to be something more than a conventicle of the Socialist "unco' guid." And if at the present time, you see more black sheep in the German ranks, remember that you have not been through the fire.

Formerly it was the practice of the serious Socialist journalist and publicist to attend to the shortcomings of his own government when dealing with international politics. In doing so he not only avoided the pitfalls of national prejudice, but also concentrated his efforts on the only point where they could accomplish something. That policy is even now being pursued by the anti-war Socialists of England and Germany. Why not try it in the United States?

The powerful capitalist press of this country seems to be bent upon war with Germany, and is poisoning the minds of Americans against Germany. Where is the propaganda of the S. P. of America? Where the NEW REVIEW?

J. KOETTGEN.

New York City.

## Important Announcement

Our readers will notice that we have not issued the October 15th issue of the NEW REVIEW. The reason for this suspension is strictly of a business and editorial nature. We have had difficulty in getting out the magazine early enough to satisfy the demands of the news dealers and bundle agents handling the NEW REVIEW. This has occasioned serious complaints. In order to overcome this business handicap, we were compelled to miss an issue. All subscriptions will be extended one issue. The magazine will hereafter appear regularly, on the 10th and 25th of each month, so as to reach our readers a few days before the date of publication.

NEW REVIEW PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION

## Make Your Dollar Go Far

If you are a Canadian comrade support Cotton's Weekly, published at Cowansville, P. K. Price 50 cents per year. In clubs of 4 or more 25 cents for 40 Weeks. U. S. rates \$1.00 per year.

If you are an American comrade support the Appeal to Reason, Girard, Kansas. Price 50 cents per year. In clubs of 4 or more 25 cents for 40 weeks. Canadian rates \$1.00 per year.

## Cotton's Weekly

### STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, ETC.

required by the Act of August 24, 1912, of the NEW REVIEW, published semi-monthly at New York, N. Y., for Oct. 1st, 1915.

Editors: Frank Bohn, 362 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y.; William E. Bohn, East Orange, N. J.; Louis B. Boudin, 302 B'way, New York, N. Y.; Floyd Dell, 2 W. 15th St., New York, N. Y.; W. E. DuBois, 70 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.; Max Eastman 2 W. 15th St., New York, N. Y.; Louis C. Fraina, 256 B'way, New York, N. Y.; Felix Grendon, 141 E. 26th St., New York, N. Y.; Isaac A. Hourwich, 27 Cedar St., New York, N. Y.; Paul Kennaday, 780 Park Ave., New York, N. Y.; Robert R. La Monte, New Canaan, Conn.; Arthur Livingston, Columbia University, N. Y.; Robert H. Lowie, Museum of Natural History, New York, N. Y.; Helen Marot, 206 W. 18th St., New York, N. Y.; Joseph Michael, 115 B'way, New York, N. Y.; Moses Oppenheimer, 1875 Marmion Ave., New York, N. Y.; Herman Simpson, 121 W. 120th St., New York, N. Y.; William English Walling, Greenwich, Conn.

Managing Editor, None.  
Business Manager, Louis C. Fraina, 256 B'way, New York, N. Y.

Publisher, New Review Publishing Association, 256 B'way, New York, N. Y.

Owners: (If a corporation, give its name and the names and addresses of stockholders holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of stock.)

New Review Publishing Ass'n, 256 B'way, New York, N. Y.

Richard P. Appleton, 76 4th St., Newark, N. J.; Jessie Ashley, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y.; Louis B. Boudin, 302 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Anna P. Boudin, 477 E. 16th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Maurice Blumlein, 103 Water St., New York, N. Y.; Morris Berman, 1212 Beverly Rd., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Alexander Fraser, 413 First St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Louis C. Fraina, 256 B'way, New York, N. Y.; Felix Grendon, 141 E. 26th St., New York, N. Y.; Isaac A. Hourwich, 27 Cedar St., New York, N. Y.; Bertha W. Howe, Great Kills, S. I., N. Y.; Leo Hermann 1208 49th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Herbert W. Isay, 256 B'way, New York, N. Y.; Paul Kennaday, 780 Park Ave., New York, N. Y.; Louise W. Kneeland, 970 Park Pl., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Eleanor Kneeland, 970 Park Pl., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Hildergarde Kneeland, 970 Park Pl., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Philip L. Liebman, 302 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Arthur A. Livingston, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; M. Michaelovsky, 235 W. 71st St., New York, N. Y.; Joseph Michael, 115 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Moses Oppenheimer, 1875 Marmion Ave., New York, N. Y.; Mary S. Oppenheimer, 1875 Marmion Ave., New York, N. Y.; George Oberdorfer, 2398 Eighth Ave., New York, N. Y.; Isaac Ortman, 106 Livingston St., New York, N. Y.; Charles Edward Russell, 1025 15th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.; Herman Simpson, 121 W. 120th St., New York, N. Y.; J. G. Phelps Stokes, Stamford, Conn.; J. B. Segah, Orono, Maine; Ray Simpson, 203 W. 118th St., New York, N. Y.; Sarah S. Simpson, 203 W. 118th St., New York, N. Y.; William English Walling, Greenwich, Conn.

Known Bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders, holding 1 per cent. or other securities: NONE.

LOUIS C. FRAINA,  
Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 1st day of October 1915.

J. P. Levenson,  
Commissioner of Deeds, New York City,  
N. Y. Co., Clerk's No. 1074, Reg. No. 17024.

(Seal)  
My commission expires February 2, 1917.

NOW READY!

NOW READY!

# SOCIALISM AND WAR

By LOUIS B. BOUDIN

Author of "The Theoretical System of Karl Marx"

This is a book Socialists have been waiting for.

It is the first adequate Socialist analysis of the great war.

The chapter dealing with the economic basis of imperialism alone would make this book worth while.

It applies the Marxian interpretation to the puzzling phenomena of the war.

## CHAPTERS:

- I. CLEARING THE GROUND.
- II. THE ECONOMIC CAUSES OF THE WAR.
- III. THE IDEOLOGIC CAUSES OF THE WAR.
- IV. THE IMMEDIATE CAUSES OF THE WAR AND THE STAKES INVOLVED.
- V. THE WAR AND THE SOCIALISTS.
- VI. SOCIALIST VS. BOURGEOIS THEORIES.

The analysis is strictly scientific, although the style and presentation are simple and direct.

Price, \$1.00 Net

Special rates on quantities to Radical and Socialist locals. Write for rates.

New Review Publishing Ass'n

256 BROADWAY . . . NEW YORK CITY

A NEW VOLUME by ARTHUR M. LEWIS

# The Struggle Between Science and Superstition

A most entertaining and illuminating book on the age-long conflict between scientists searching for new truth and priests striving to chain the human mind with the authority of church or ancient book. It holds the attention of the thinking reader as no adventure in fiction could do, since it carries us over the blood-stained trail of the pioneers of human liberty. The high lights in the book are the burning of Giordano Bruno and the official record of the recantation extorted by threat of torture from the aged Galileo in which he abjures the terrible heresy of asserting that the earth moves 'round the sun. Cloth, 50 cents.

This is the FIFTIETH VOLUME in our fifty-cent LIBRARY OF SOCIALIST CLASSICS, containing most of the important Socialist books to be had in the English language, with the exception of some larger volumes necessarily sold at higher prices. The remaining forty-nine volumes are:

Anarchism and Socialism, Plechanoff.	Militant Proletariat, Austin Lewis.
Art of Lecturing, Lewis.	Origin of the Family, Engels.
Class Struggle, Kautsky.	Out of the Dump, Marcy.
Class Struggles in America, Simons.	Positive School of Criminology, Ferri.
Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels.	Puritanism, Meily.
Doing Us Good and Plenty, Russell.	Rebel at Large, Beals.
Eighteenth Brumaire, Marx.	Revolution and Counter-Revolution, Marx.
End of the World, Meyer.	Right to Be Lazy, Lafargue.
Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History, Kautsky.	Russian Bastille, Pollock.
Evolution of Banking, Howe.	Sabotage, Pouget.
Evolution of Man, Boelsche.	Science and Revolution, Untermann.
Evolution of Property, Lafargue.	Social and Philosophical Studies, Lafargue.
Evolution, Social and Organic, Lewis.	Social Revolution, The, Kautsky.
Feuerbach, Engels.	Socialism for Students, Cohen.
Germes of Mind in Plants, Francé.	Socialism, Morris and Bax.
God's Children, Allman.	Socialism, Positive and Negative, LaMonte.
High Cost of Living, Kautsky.	Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, Engels.
Human, All Too Human, Nietzsche.	Stories of the Struggle, Winchevsky.
Law of Biogenesis, Moore.	Story of Wendell Phillips, Russell.
Life and Death, Teichmann.	Ten Blind Leaders, Lewis.
Making of the World, Meyer.	Triumph of Life, Boelsche.
Marx He Knew, The, Spargo.	Value, Price and Profit, Marx
Memoirs of Marx, Liebknecht.	Vital Problems, Lewis.
Marx vs. Tolstoy, Darrow and Lewis.	What's So and What Isn't, Work.
	World's Revolutions, Untermann.

## The Fifty Volumes and A \$10.00 Share of Stock for \$15.00

Our publishing house is the property of nearly 3,000 Socialists, each of whom has subscribed \$10.00 for the purpose of publishing the International Socialist Review and the greatest possible number of the best revolutionary books. Nine hundred more of the \$10.00 shares are still for sale. Each stockholder has the privilege of buying all our books and some other books for sale. Each stockholder has the privilege of buying all our books and some other books at cost. If we can sell these 900 shares within the next few weeks, it will enable us to double our output of Socialist literature. That is why we offer this 50-volume library NOW for LESS THAN COST with a share of stock.

Send \$15.00 and we will send the fifty books by express and a fully-paid certificate for a share of stock. The expressage to any railroad station in the United States or Canada will not cost you over \$2.00,—from that down to 31 cents, according to distance. If you wish us to send by mail, add \$2.00 for Canada, any foreign country or United States east of Denver; \$3.00 for Alaska, Panama, United States island possessions and Pacific coast points.

If you already have part of these volumes, you can substitute any \$1.00 book published by us for two of them, a \$1.50 book for three, or a \$2.00 book for four.

This is the biggest and best offer on Socialist books ever made. Reason, we are long on books and short on cash. Start a Circulating Library with these books and watch results. Address

**CHARLES H. KERR & CO., 349 East Ohio Street, CHICAGO**